

A. M. D. G.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS



VOLUME 96

1967

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE
Woodstock, Maryland

FOR JESUIT USE

PER.

EX

3701

W/6EX

INDEX TO VOLUME 96

ADDRESS AT FORDHAM UNIVERSITY. Peter Arrupe	65
BORGIA'S INFLUENCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRAYER-LIFE IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. Otto Karrer	340
CAMPUS AS CLIMATE FOR MORAL GROWTH, THE Michael P. Sheridan	244
CONCERT: ORATORIO FOR A SEASON OF WRATH, THE. John L'Heureux	60
CONFERENCE ON ECUMENISM IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. Augustin Cardinal Bea	318
DANGER OF THE VOWS, THE. John Courtney Murray	421
EXILE FROM BURMA. Sigmund J. Laschenski.	365
GOD'S CALL FOR SERVICE. Thomas J. McGuire	475
IGNATIAN SURVEY: 1966. Robert C. Collins, ed.	229
INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES, THE Robert F. Harvanek	196
MAN WITHOUT A JOB? Marc Oraison	47
MODERN RULES FOR THINKING WITH THE CHURCH. Juan Masia ..	81
NOTES ON AUTHORITY. William W. Meissner	483
OBEDIENCE OF JUDGMENT AND INTELLECTUAL HONESTY. Alex- ander F. McDonald	471
QUEST FOR RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY, A. Edward F. Heenan	295
RELIGIOUS OBEDIENCE IN THE MODERN WORLD. Joseph J. Sikora	435
SAINT AUGUSTINE AND THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES. Joseph A. Slattery	212
SHARED DECISION-MAKING IN THE CHURCH AND IN RELIGIOUS ORDERS. Heinrich Ostermann	459
SMALL COMMUNITIES IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. Francis X. Shea	302
SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT DURING THEOLOGY. John G. Mil- haven	330
TALK ON OBEDIENCE, A. Peter Arrupe	428
THEOLOGATE: A CRITIQUE, THE. Charles J. Donnelly	335
31ST GENERAL CONGREGATION: LETTERS FROM THE FIRST SES- SION, THE. James P. Jurich, ed.	5

31ST GENERAL CONGREGATION: LETTERS FROM THE FIRST SESSION, PART II, THE.	James P. Jurich, ed.	143
TIME OF CHANGE, A.	Raymond C. Baumhart	84
TRIBUTE TO JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, S.J., A.	Walter J. Burghardt	415
TURNING FORTY.	Patrick J. McGeever	75
TWO DECISIONS.	Daniel J. McCarthy	35
WORD: FOR PRIEST AND POET, THE.	John L'Heureux	308

NOTES AND REPORTS

COMMITTEE ON PRAYER.	Richard P. Kane, ed.	93
COMMUNICATIONS WITHIN THE SOCIETY.	Richard P. Kane, ed.	99
FERDINAND C. WHEELER, S.J. (1885-1965).	R. Emmett Curran	271
FREEDOM-AUTHORITY-OBEDIENCE.	Richard A. Blake, ed.	511
GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF THE AMERICAN NOVITIATE, THE	Gerald P. Fogarty	113
REMINISCENCES OF FATHER PATRICK DUDDY, S.J.	R. Emmett Curran	389

READERS' FORUM

APOSTLESHIP OF PRAYER, THE.	Eugene M. Rooney	120
PRIEST AND POET.	William T. Noon	530

CONTRIBUTORS

ARRUPE, PETER.	Address at Fordham University	65
———.	A Talk on Obedience	428
BAUMHART, RAYMOND C.	A Time of Change	84
BEA, AUGUSTIN CARDINAL.	Conference on Ecumenism in the Society of Jesus	318
BLAKE, RICHARD A. (ED.).	Freedom-Authority-Obedience	511
BURGHARDT, WALTER J.	A Tribute to John Courtney Murray	415
COLLINS, ROBERT C. (ED.).	Ignatian Survey: 1966	229
CURRAN, R. EMMETT.	Ferdinand C. Wheeler, S.J. (1885-1965)	271
——— (ED).	Reminiscences of Father Patrick Duddy, S.J.	389
DONNELLY, CHARLES J.	The Theologate: A Critique	335
FOGARTY, GERALD P.	The Geographical Location of the American Novitiate	113
HARVANEK, ROBERT F.	The International Congress of the Spiritual Exercises	196
HEENAN, EDWARD F.	A Quest for Religious Community	295

JURICH, JAMES P. (ED.). The 31st General Congregation: Letters from the First Session	5
———. The 31st General Congregation: Letters from the First Session, Part II	143
KANE, RICHARD P. (ED.). Committee on Prayer	93
———. Communications Within the Society	99
KARRER, OTTO. Borgia's Influence on the Development of Prayer-Life In the Society of Jesus	340
LASCHIENSKI, SIGMUND J. Exile From Burma	365
L'HEUREUX, JOHN. The Concert: Oratorio for a Season of Wrath	60
———. The Word: For Priest and Poet	308
MCCARTHY, DANIEL J. Two Decisions	35
MCDONALD, ALEXANDER F. Obedience of Judgment and Intellectual Honesty	471
McGEEVER, PATRICK J. Turning Forty	75
McGUIRE, THOMAS J. God's Call for Service	475
MASIA, JUAN. Modern Rules for Thinking With the Church ..	81
MEISSNER, WILLIAM W. Notes on Authority	483
MILHAVEN, JOHN G. Spiritual Development During Theology ..	330
MURRAY, JOHN COURTNEY. The Danger of the Vows	421
NOON, WILLIAM T. Priest and Poet	530
Oraison, MARC. A Man Without A Job?	47
OSTERMANN, HEINRICH. Shared Decision-Making in the Church and in Religious Orders	459
ROONEY, EUGENE M. The Apostleship of Prayer	120
SHEA, FRANCIS X. Small Communities in the Society of Jesus ..	302
SHERIDAN, MICHAEL P. The Campus as Climate for Moral Growth	244
SIKORA, JOSEPH J. Religious Obedience in the Modern World ..	435
SLATTERY, JOSEPH A. Saint Augustine and the Spiritual Exercises	212

BOOK REVIEWS

BURNS, ROBERT IGNATIUS, S.J. <i>The Jesuits and the Indian Wars of the Northwest</i> . New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1966 (Thomas E. Morrissey)	262
GELPI, DONALD L., S.J. <i>Functional Asceticism: A Guideline For American Religious</i> . New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966 (Robert E. White)	126
RAHNER, KARL, S.J. <i>Christian In the Market Place</i> . Translated by Cecily Hastings. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966 (Edward J. Murphy)	124

RATZINGER, JOSEPH. <i>The Open Circle: The Meaning of Christian Brotherhood</i> . Translated by W. A. Glen-Doeple. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966 (Patrick J. Ryan)	255
SCHILLEBEECKX, E., O.P. <i>Marriage, Human Reality and Saving Mystery</i> , 2 volumes. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965 (Robert H. Springer)	258
SELECTED READINGS IN CATECHETICS (Daniel J. Fitzpatrick and Kenneth J. Hezel)	400
SELECTED READINGS IN HIGHER EDUCATION (Michael P. Sheridan)	265
SELECTED READINGS IN THE THEOLOGY OF REVELATION (Avery R. Dulles)	129
XAVIER SPECIALIST (the writings of Georg Schurhammer, S.J.) (Robert E. McNally)	394

WOODSTOCK
L E T T E R S

W I N T E R 1 9 6 7

VOLUME 96 NUMBER 1

INTRODUCTION

For almost two years WOODSTOCK LETTERS has been publishing articles on the 31st General Congregation, in the hope that these articles will help Jesuits understand and implement the Congregation's decrees. Since the history of the Congregation is an important part of this understanding, this issue presents another, and more personal, view of the first session. Prepared by associate editor James P. Jurich, S.J., from the *Lettres de Rome* edited in the Province of Montreal, this article complements the account given in the official *Newsletters*.

Daniel J. McCarthy, S.J., a faculty member of Loyola Academy, Wilmette, Illinois, is an unusual Jesuit. He left the Society and made a second decision to re-enter based on the realization that many priests fail to see that when they reach a critical point in their lives, there is no real question about their love of God, or of their vocation. We are grateful to the author for allowing us to print this highly personal article. Marc Oraison comments on a related problem, the need of priests today to be engaged in professional activity.

John L'Heureux, S.J., a fourth year theologian at Woodstock, is the author of *Quick as Dandelions*. His second book, *Rubrics For a Revolution*, will be published in February.

Fr. Arrupe's address at Fordham was one of the highlights of his visit to the United States.

Juan Masia, S.J., of the Toledo Province is a missionary in Japan. Together with Raymond C. Baumhart, S.J., a research associate at Cambridge Center for Social Studies, he is concerned with the articulation of the changing experience in today's world.

The construction of new Jesuit houses has caused many Jesuits to rethink the role geographical environment has in the formation of scholastics. Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J., presently studying at Yale, traces the development of 156 years of tradition concerning the location of novitiates in this country.

The editors wish to thank their outgoing managing editor, Raymond A. Schroth, S.J., for his creative efforts and interest in publishing WOODSTOCK LETTERS.

CONTENTS

WINTER, 1967

INTRODUCTION

- 5 THE 31ST GENERAL CONGREGATION: LETTERS FROM THE
FIRST SESSION • *James P. Jurich, S.J., ed.*
- 35 TWO DECISIONS • *Daniel J. McCarthy, S.J.*
- 47 A MAN WITHOUT A JOB? • *Marc Oraison*
- 60 THE CONCERT: Oratorio for a Season of Wrath • *John
L'Heureux, S.J.*
- 65 ADDRESS AT FORDHAM UNIVERSITY • *Peter Arrupe, S.J.*
- 75 TURNING FORTY • *Patrick J. McGeever, S.J.*
- 81 MODERN RULES FOR THINKING WITH THE CHURCH • *Juan
Masia, S.J.*
- 84 A TIME OF CHANGE • *Raymond C. Baumhart, S.J.*
- REPORTS • *Richard P. Kane, S.J., ed.*
- 93 Committee on Prayer
- 99 Communications Within the Society
- 113 HISTORICAL NOTE: The Geographical Location of the
American Novitate • *Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J.*
- READERS' FORUM
- 120 The Apostleship of Prayer • *Eugene M. Rooney, S.J.*
- REVIEWS
- 124 Theological Essays • *Edward J. Murphy, S.J.*
- 126 Guidelines for Religious • *Robert E. White, S.J.*
- SELECTED READINGS
- 129 The Theology of Revelation • *Avery R. Dulles, S.J.*

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

WOODSTOCK LETTERS solicits manuscripts from all Jesuits on all topics of particular interest to fellow Jesuits: Ignatian spirituality, the activities of our various apostolates, problems facing the modern Society, and the history of the Society, particularly in the United States and its missions. In general it is our policy to publish major obituary articles on men whose work would be of interest to the whole assistancy.

Letters of comment and criticism will be welcomed for the Readers' Forum.

Manuscripts, preferably the original copy, should be double-spaced with ample margins. Whenever possible, contributors of articles on Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit history should follow the stylistic norms of the Institute of Jesuit Sources. These are most conveniently found in Supplementary Notes B and C and in the list of abbreviations in Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. W. J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 609-16.

STAFF

Published by the faculty and students of Woodstock College. Editor: Edward J. Mally, S.J. / Managing Editor: Patrick H. Samway, S.J. / Associate Editors: Robert C. Collins, S.J., James P. Jurich, S.J., R. Emmett Curran, S.J., Michael C. Reilly, S.J., Edward F. Salmon, S.J., Raymond A. Schroth, S.J., Richard A. Blake, S.J., Peter D. Fordi, S.J., Richard P. Kane, S.J. / Book Editor: Kenneth DeLuca, S.J. / Business Manager: Paul L. Horgan, S.J.

THE 31ST GENERAL CONGREGATION: LETTERS FROM THE FIRST SESSION

a spirit of fraternity

Edited by JAMES P. JURICH, S.J.

In a lecture given last fall at Woodstock, Professor Oscar Cullmann, one of the best-known Protestant observers at the Second Vatican Council, declared that it would be misleading to judge the Council by the final conciliar texts alone. A study of the interventions by the bishops and of the events surrounding the Council is also very important for an adequate picture of the renewal begun within the Church. Fortunately for students of the Council, much of this information is now available in print and more will be, thanks to the many theologians and journalists who have written about the Council.

With some validity, the 31st General Congregation has been called the Jesuit counterpart to the Council. Inspired by the Council's call for adaptation and renewal, the Congregation has attempted to face and solve many of the problems of the Society. The final decrees are now available, but here, too, it may be misleading to judge the Congregation just by its decrees. The debates, the personalities, and the surrounding events are also important for our fuller understanding of what has taken place. With the welcome relaxation of the rule of secrecy, the official Newsletters have helped to provide us with this other dimension. Their official character, however, often and quite understandably

Translated by James P. Jurich, with the assistance of Anthony Aracich, Kenneth DeLuca, William J. Kerr, John LaBonte, and Brian O. McDermott.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

resulted in a kind of bloodless impersonality in the printed accounts, especially during the first session.

Happily, the Province of Montreal supplied the French-speaking Jesuits of Canada with a series of more personal communications from Rome. During the first session nine bulletins under the title *Lettres de Rome* were prepared and distributed by the Provincial's office. They contained "non-official news of general interest" edited from letters written by "usually well-informed sources." The result is a wealth of valuable information which cannot be found elsewhere. The members of the Congregation are shown to be individuals with a genuine concern for the Society's welfare, personal reactions, and a sense of humor.

For their current interest and future historical value WOODSTOCK LETTERS presents in two parts an English translation of *Lettres de Rome*. A few sections which the editors did not judge to be of general interest to our readers have been omitted. Other sections would have duplicated what WOODSTOCK LETTERS has already printed on the first session in an earlier article based on the official Newsletters; these also have been omitted, but references are given to the pertinent places in the previous article.

Thanks are due to Fr. Irénée Desrochers, S.J., Provincial of Montreal, for permission to publish this translation, and to Montreal's "envoyé spécial" at the Congregation, who is responsible for most of the original letters.

May 10, 1965

The refectory reading is the life of St. Ignatius, in Latin, by Fr. Ribadeneyra. . . .

The neighbor opposite me is Fr. Dezza, former provincial, former rector of the Gregorian, former president of the Association of Pontifical Universities, etc. He enjoys an extraordinary reputation here, but unfortunately his eyesight is not good. Some people are talking about him as the future General. He speaks French well. . . .

May 11, 1965

For two days we have not come together for a full meeting; we are waiting for the preparatory commission *ad detrimenta* to complete its work. Therefore, we are taking advantage of this opportunity by holding private or partial meetings. Today there were two meetings of this type, the first with the Belgian fathers and all those (except for the

French) whose working language is French, the second, which I have just left, with the French fathers and all those French-language members who were interested in taking part.

What strikes me in these meetings is the great openness of spirit shown by all the fathers. Everyone, I feel, has the sense of an urgency in the Society. Everyone is saying that the eyes of the younger men are fixed on the Congregation. The younger Jesuits are not physically here, but they are certainly present by the influence they exert. Fr. Sheridan of the Province of Upper Canada admitted that the present Congregation is much more interesting than the one in 1957, which he also attended. He has the impression that this one is a great deal more lively and free and that everyone shares this feeling of urgency and wants to work sincerely for the needed reforms.

• • •

Conversations revolve around the future Father General. There is no outstanding candidate in sight yet. They say that no man is great in the eyes of his valet. I realize from listening to the conversations in the assistancies that there are hardly any great provincials in the eyes of all the delegates.

One French father, who was passing by just when the qualities of the future General were being discussed in the corridor, stopped and said: "The future General should be a man: (1) who sleeps; (2) who knows how to listen; (3) who doesn't want to do everything by himself; (4) who likes to walk in the garden now and then."

• • •

We spent the afternoon striking a balance between the advantages and disadvantages of a generalate for life or for a definite term. The arguments are strong on both sides, and it is still impossible to foresee which direction the Congregation will take. One of the main arguments advanced by some for not touching the general's life term is that it would be necessary to have recourse to the Pope and finally to the Roman Congregations, and this could take considerable time.

• • •

In Rome they look a little jealously (I mean the other religious congregations) on the fact that the Pope has in a way officially opened, on its first day, the General Congregation of the Jesuits. It seems that this has never been done for any other religious congregation.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

May 13, 1965

Our fathers from Poland (four out of six) have just obtained their exit visas and arrived here. Going across the Iron Curtain, they passed from one world into another.

• • •

For the first time in history, the Congregation has lifted the very strict rule of secrecy and will send out newsletters to Ours from time to time according as there will be *materia circa quam*. There is also a liaison committee for the public press. The newsletter for Ours seems to me to be particularly important for stimulating everyone's interest and prayer for the work of the Congregation. Evidently these newsletters will be able only to outline the topics studied, but even this will be a great deal.

May 14, 1965

We are missing two of our principal stars: Frs. Rahner and Lombardi. Fr. Lombardi suffered a thrombosis and cannot come; Fr. Rahner was refused permission by the German government. He was just named professor at the State University of Munich as the successor to Romano Guardini; but since he spent his time at the Council or in preparing treatises for the Council, he has not given many courses. Now, whether we like it or not, he has to give his courses if he wants to remain professor. . . .

• • •

. . . For three days we have been meeting in small and private groups according to language, and little by little the opinions of the different assistancies became known. The Americans almost en bloc, and also the French, were for holding the discussion (on the length of the general's term) before the election; on the other hand, the Spaniards on the whole were upholding the juridical point of view, namely: the Congregation does not have the power to treat this problem before the election of the general, and treatment of it is not opportune, for it runs the risk of lasting a long time and of being divisive.

What happened to the next-to-last general chapter of the Dominicans can happen to the Jesuits: being unable to reach an agreement, the Dominicans had to have recourse to the Pope. He delegated a cardinal to preside over the chapter, the one which elected Fr. Browne.

• • •

. . . While waiting for the meeting to begin, we were invited to hear some of the experts, who are giving talks on the subject of the meeting. For example, Fr. Arrupe, Provincial of Japan, gave us a conference on the structural organization of the Society's government. Fr. Giuliani, the director of *Etudes*, is going to speak to us on what St. Ignatius thought about a life term for the general.

May 16, 1965

The Congregation is now "in full swing," as the English say. Saturday was typical. We sat all day listening to the pros and cons of the generalate for life or for a definite term. The session in the morning began at 9:30 and ended at 12:30, followed by dinner here at 1:00. The afternoon session began at 4:00 and ended at 8:00, with supper at 8:30. In short, there are two sessions of three or four hours each, always in Latin, and in a Latin spoken differently by the Spaniards, the English, the Americans, the Germans, the Poles; that's enough to bring us to the saturation point. In this way we have suffered, endured, swallowed, recorded, and digested, more or less, between thirty-five and forty speeches. As one of the Americans said as he left the hall and stretched full-length: "What a day!" And yet he added: "Here are the best minds in the Society!"; that's apparent!

May 17, 1965

Telegram: GENERALIS ELIGETUR SABBATO 22 MAII.

(Signed) Swain.

• • •

The die is cast: the General will be elected Saturday morning. . . . After fifty-seven speeches, not one less, and perhaps a few extra because of the many spontaneous interventions, the Congregation decided it had had enough of that and proceeded to the vote on the problem of the length of the general's term. I said to the vote; in reality, it's a series of votes, seven in all, each one bringing a clear answer to a question posed by the presiding officer, each one marking a progression over the one before it.

• • •

. . . Some members had asked Father Vicar General for permission to speak in their mother tongue during the Congregation. Before beginning the session the other day, he wanted to know what possibilities

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

were open to the members of the Congregation in this matter of language.

Here are the results of this inquiry (which can be communicated, since it does not deal with the topics discussed). Of the 217 members present, the following numbers claim that they can understand these languages: French: 156; English: 131; Italian: 114; Spanish: 89; German: 66; Portuguese: 42.

That French had the majority surprised the Americans, who had indeed thought that English was the language used the most.

May 22, 1965

Telegram: ELECTUS GENERALIS PATER PETRUS ARRUPÉ
PRAEPOSITUS PROVINCIÆ JAPONICÆ.

(Signed) Swain.

• • •

The election

I have just lived an event of first importance, a fascinating event from beginning to end. And yet the session was not a short one. We were up at 5:00, and at 6:15 we all went to the chapel for a concelebrated Mass with Father Vicar and a representative of each of the eleven assistancies. At 7:15 we had a solemn procession to the great hall of deliberations, where the superior, Fr. Bottereau, locked us in, preventing us from leaving until the election was over. Then Fr. Giuliani, the director of *Études*, gave us a Latin exhortation on what kind of man the future Father General should be. A whole hour of meditation followed, on our knees, for the most part. At 9:15 the first vote began. After writing down his own name and the name of the father for whom he was voting, each one filed up in order of seniority, knelt before the altar, and pronounced the oath by which he took Christ as his witness that he chose the man most suited to be the future general. There were 218 of us in the hall, and this vote took exactly one hour.

Now you have to realize that this Saturday had been preceded by four days of intensive inquiries . . .

Thus for four long days I asked for information about the leading fathers suited to be general. I went to see Frs. Dezza, Swain, Martegani, Byrne, Rosa, Laurent, Renard, etc. The Canadians held some private colloquies. From the outset, the same names kept coming up. I have no scruples about naming them, for the Roman newspaper *Il Tempo* gave them Tuesday morning. The Jesuits, it said, are going to elect the black pope. The favorites are Frs. Dezza (Italian), Mann (from India),

McMahon (from the United States), Arrupe (Japan), Oñate, Hirschmann, Swain, Tucci (of *La Civiltà Cattolica*), etc. The paper said this about Fr. Arrupe: "There are those who put the accent on the internationalization of the order. They are talking a great deal about Fr. Pedro Arrupe, a Basque, who has exceptional talents, talents proven several times with practical results, since he succeeded in making teams of Jesuits from the most diverse nations—Americans, Spaniards, Germans, etc.—work together."

Toward noon, Fr. Arrupe was declared General of the Society of Jesus, elected on the third ballot. The session lasted from 7:30 to 12:30, five hours!

No one has the right to know the name of the man elected before the Sovereign Pontiff. So Fr. Secretary made his way to the far end of the hall and had the door opened, banging on it full force. The waiting messenger was instructed to go quickly to Msgr. Dell'Acqua, who was waiting for him. Fr. Secretary handed the messenger an envelope containing the name of the man elected, a sealed envelope, so that the messenger—a Jesuit—could not know what the name was. During this time, according to the directions of the *Formula of the General Congregation*, the newly elected took the prescribed oaths—the oath against Modernism, and the others—then sat down to receive the homage of the fathers present. The *Formula* says: "Let all approach . . . and, kneeling on both knees, kiss his hand; the one who has been elected can refuse neither the election nor the reverence shown (remembering in whose name he ought to allow it)."

Then the doors opened, the whole Curia community came, preceded by the cross, and the procession formed to go to the chapel, where the Blessed Sacrament had been exposed since morning. There everyone sang the *Te Deum*, and then we had benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Afterwards, the whole community again formed to conduct Father General to his room, and the non-electors paid him homage in the same way. Finally, at 1:30 we had dinner, when for the first and only time there was "Deo Gratias" from the beginning of the meal.

I think I have already written to you that I had dined with Fr. Arrupe upon my arrival and that he knew all the Canadian missionaries in Japan quite well, and that he has great esteem for the Canadians as missionaries.

The press will undoubtedly give you some detailed information about him; I'll give you some here. He is a Basque like St. Ignatius, but he spent only five years in the Society in Spain. He made his studies in Holland, Germany, and the United States, and he has worked in Japan since about 1938. They were preparing him to be a chaplain for doctors

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

in Spain, so they made him take special studies in medicine. He made use of it in Japan at the time of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, where he was the master of novices in 1945. He is the one who created, brought into the world, supported, and sustained the Province of Japan. He was its Vice-Provincial and Provincial from 1954 on, that is, for eleven years. He has untiring energy, sleeps very little, and is a man of great simplicity. Since he was living on my floor, I used to meet him every morning with his water-jug, which he went to fill at the common faucet. He speaks Basque, Spanish, French, English, German, and Japanese.

. . . Over there where they went to get him, people used to call him the typhoon of Japan!

And there we have it: the 28th General of the Society is now serving . . . and life goes on. ~..

May 25, 1965

Yesterday we christened our new General. The first impression is a good one. This is a determined man. He conducted the Congregation with an admirable mastery and dexterity. In a few entirely straightforward sentences, but ones filled with the supernatural, he succeeded in thrilling all the Jesuits present.¹

• • •

He said all this in a Spanish-sounding Latin and at machine-gun speed.

Before he was named General, I met him on the stairs, which he was climbing quickly and vigorously. I said to him as we passed: "You're climbing these stairs like a young man of thirty." He answered: "I certainly wish I still had the strength I had when I was thirty." In the morning at breakfast, we used to arrive at just about the same time. I'm not in the habit of lagging behind in the dining room, but I was hardly in the middle of my meal when he had finished and was leaving the refectory. Furthermore, the things most Jesuits consider necessities—eating, sleeping, resting, or amusement—he considers contingencies which he has to pay attention to from time to time because the rule requires it. Fr. Swain, who knew him in Japan, told me that he sleeps scarcely four hours in a twenty-four-hour day. On the eve of his election, he was serving table in the dining room, unpretentiously, like a novice or a junior. (Just in passing, it is edifying to see our provincials and our well-known men, e.g., the rectors of Fordham and St. Louis,

¹ This is a reference to the General's first address to the Congregation. For the text, see WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1966) 14-17.

serving table this way when they are a lot more used to being served.)

They tell me that the Americans studying in Rome (Bellarmino, Russicum, Gregorian, etc.) did not seem very enthusiastic at the announcement of the election of a Spaniard. But I think they will get over it, for Fr. Arrupe is certainly the least Spanish and the most American of the generals that the Society has had till now. He was in the Society in Spain for only five years; all the rest of his life has been spent outside of Spain, where he returned only to hold brief conferences in the interest of Japan. On the other hand, not only did he study in the United States, but since 1945 he has lived with Americans in Japan. (As an aside, he speaks English very well, better than he speaks French.)

To conclude in a few words about our new General, the impression he gives is that he knows what he wants, and what he wants he wants with obvious eagerness.

Last night we had an unusual incident. At table the reader announced: "At 9:15 Father General will go on television and will be questioned about his past career and about his future plans for the Society." Right after supper (which ends here at 9:00), everyone crowded into the recreation room facing the television, which had not been used since my arrival. It was the first time they had turned it on, and, it seems, they turn it on only on solemn occasions like this. Father General appeared on the screen and answered questions for a quarter of an hour. Since he was not yet too sure of his Italian, he asked to speak in Spanish, which was immediately translated into Italian. They questioned him at length on his stay in Japan (they made him pronounce four or five sentences in Japanese), on the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, on his role at that time as a doctor (as a young man studying in Madrid he won first prizes in medicine, therapeutics, etc.). They asked him about the future, about what the Congregation was going to decide, about the renewal of the order, etc. He managed very well, saying that the Society was at the service of the Church and that the necessary reforms would be undertaken by the General Congregation now in progress.

• • •

A French provincial told me that in France the question of the schools has become a serious issue and that many of the fathers are opposed to having the Society concentrate its strength in the schools as in the past. He added: "I quite agree, but where are vocations to the Society going to come from?"

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

Bills to pay

May 26, 1965

Going to dinner with the Canadians on Sunday, I walked with Fr. Durocher, the general treasurer. I asked him: "Who is going to pay the expenses for all the delegates staying here?" He answered: "Each and every province, not, however, according to the number of delegates, but according to the number of members of the province." That means that provinces with large numbers—New York, for example—are going to have bigger bills to pay. When I was paging through the *postulata*, I came upon one on precisely this point, a request that the provinces no longer be uniformly represented by three delegates but that they be represented in proportion to the number of subjects in the province. It even cited the case of Lower Canada and New York. The former was just divided and, with about 800 members, had six delegates at the General Congregation, whereas New York, with more than 1100 members, had only three, and yet New York was going to pay three times more than Montreal or Quebec.

May 27, 1965

From a French provincial: "I've been a prefect of studies and a prefect of discipline in a school, then rector of the same school. I know the younger men, with whom I've always been in contact, quite well. I've just made a visitation in our scholasticate. I told the scholastics on my arrival: "Tell me everything that you want, but please don't think only of your personal bruises. Think of the Society you form a part of, and tell me especially what has to be done to improve its efficiency in the world today.'"

May 29, 1965

I can tell you especially about the prevailing atmosphere in this milieu. It exceeds, I believe, anything they dared hope for up to this point. The General Congregation has taken a direction and a movement which nothing can hold back any longer. The election of the General, which was obviously not one of "compromise," released a current of hope and confidence which they wish to see reach the far-off borders of the worldwide Society as soon as possible. We had dinner on Sunday, the 23rd (the day after the election), with our fellow Canadians (the Fathers Provincial, the delegates, the professors at the Gregorian, the biennists, and the two brothers from the Curia—about twenty in all). Our electors were extremely optimistic and delighted with the serious and frank character of the work they have undertaken. Everyone is determined; they feel that now there is a leader at

the top . . . and that the path we're taking is one upon which we're being encouraged, above all, to *go forward*.

Elected a week ago, Father General has already spoken on five or six different national television networks. The first time that they came to tell him that a TV crew was asking him for an interview and that they were finding out if he was prepared to do it . . . he simply answered: "Certainly; that's part of our apostolate." He is a very simple man, without formality or any taste for splendor or remoteness. He is also an interior man, a man of prayer with an obvious Ignatian spirit. Finally, he is a missionary, with a soul open to the whole world, and an organizer! They even say that those opposed to him before the election were opposed for this reason: he is rather enterprising; he has been so involved in initiating things. . . . He is also the one who, before the election, was defending the new formula for special Assistants (technical advisers) above the Regional Assistants—a formula which is now being studied and which will undoubtedly be adopted; they were speaking of it then as the Arrupe Project.

Two months ago, when he arrived in Rome at Fr. Swain's request to work on the preparations for the Congregation, they say that he gave new encouragement to Frs. Delchard and Renard, who had been working at the job for almost a year and who were beginning to lose confidence. He put fresh life into the work and restored everyone's spirit.

In the Curia there is an atmosphere of life, of eagerness, and, above all, among the fathers of the Congregation, a great spirit of *fraternity*. I think the daily concelebration (two or three groups each day) means a great deal here. The fathers (superiors, delegates, provincials) freely serve in the dining room. There is an atmosphere of charity. Everyone feels united in an experience which leaves no one indifferent.

May 29, 1965

There are five concelebrations a morning. I've concelebrated every morning for fifteen days. The rite is very simple. They're using the good old altars of yesteryear, but that's no problem. Pray hard.

June 1, 1965

To a Father Minister

. . . I received a new package of *postulata*: Nos. 1591-1626. Paging through them, I noticed that at last someone thought of these poor ministers in our houses. Until now it was a question of changing just about everything in existence, but not the ministers. I discovered two *postulata* which were concerned with the lot of our ministers. The first began in this way: Our legislation is very good, but its execution is poor, and that is largely due to the fact that we do not know how to

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

choose the men most suited to be ministers in our houses, for this is a very important post. They should not appoint young fathers without experience or authority, etc.

The second *postulatum* says that formerly the office of minister was honorable and filled with responsibility but that it has lost its luster in a great many houses.

June 3, 1965

Peanut butter

When I came into the dining room this morning, I met our Fr. Harvey, who was all smiles. He said to me: "All the Congregation's problems have been solved. Life is rosy, and the Americans have great power: there's peanut butter on all the tables!" As a matter of fact, for the first time since our arrival, there were little jars of peanut butter (either Canadian or else American) on the tables. It had to be an American who bought a fifty-pound tin of it. Fr. Durocher, the treasurer, smiled at the discovery, and Bro. Gravel marvelled at it. He told me: "It always does some good to have a general congregation. After the last one, we had an apple at breakfast. Now they've added a little piece of ham, and next it's peanut butter. This will be something for us who'll still be living here after you're gone. . . ."

June 6, 1965

Exclusive interview by our "special representative"

As I entered the dining room the other day at noon, an unhopd-for chance! There was no one next to Father General. . . . I hurried over, saying to myself that the occasion wouldn't occur a second time. As a matter of fact, we are in a period of constitutional vacuum, or rather of intermediate authorities: there's the General, and there's the Congregation, the supreme authority; between the two, there's no one at present, for the Assistants have not yet been elected. When we do have the Assistants, the places at the table of honor will be jealously reserved for them, and goodbye to a seat near the General. I must say that my luck is all the greater because right now Father General is often absent from meals (which he takes instead in the international houses in Rome in order to meet the Jesuits in these houses, e.g., the Gregorian, the Pio Latino Americano, the Brasilio, the Bellarmino, etc.) and because the provincials would like very much to be near the General in order to talk to him about their problems and concerns. But while we're waiting for the election of the Assistants, it's a free-for-all, and, provincial or no provincial, I'm taking advantage of it. I had the right of first occupant, and I installed myself.

We have "Deo gratias" at dessert time, as has been the custom since the General's election. The conversation was in French, in more or less these terms:

". . . Can I trust what the press and the magazines have said about your past career—for example, what *Newsweek* has just written in its last issue?"

(Making a gesture of denial) "Above all, don't trust *Newsweek*. It's terrible what these people are making me say. They wrote that I feel that I'm as much a Shintoist as a Jesuit. The people who read this statement are going to ask themselves what kind of General the Society now has at its head. . . ."

"The article presents you as the first Jesuit General of the twentieth century, and makes you declare that if you're elected, you're going to undertake this and that. . . ."

"Yes, it's enough to make me subject to the tribunal *de ambitu*. I never said any such thing, all the more since I was not at all thinking that the Congregation could be considering me. . . . Anyhow, I think the prize belongs to the Russian radio, which presented me as a second Ignatius of Loyola who would work hard to restore to the Society of Jesus its former power. . . ."

"Is it true that you arrived in New York at 4 A.M. and that, finding no one home, you sat down on the front steps and began typing?"

"The truth is better yet. I arrived at one of our houses in New York at 11 at night, but a neighbor told me that there wasn't anyone there for the moment and that I would have to wait. So, I sat inside the entrance, and with my typewriter I typed some letters that demanded immediate attention. Two hours later, a father arrived and was quite surprised to find the Provincial of Japan typing at such a late hour. . . ."

June 8, 1965

Father General is a very simple and charming man. . . . There is nothing "official" about him. . . . For example, after dinner at noon he leaves the chapel and goes to the recreation room for coffee. He is immediately surrounded by four or five people, usually of the same language, and he spends recreation like every good Jesuit—talking, joking, laughing. All around him other groups have formed and carry on just as if the General were not there in the room. At one time it's the Spaniards who gather around him, at other times it's the Italians, and at others it's the Americans. (The Americans have been won over and have come around to considering him as one of their own.) When recreation ends, he leaves quite simply like the rest of us, but with this difference, that he does not take a siesta.

Still, he is up at 4 or 4:30 A.M. and is on the go and working from that time on. It seems that he does not meditate on his *prie-dieu*, but squats in Japanese fashion, a practice which he has kept up for twenty years. A father to whom he gave a demonstration told me that he takes off (or doesn't put on) his shoes, kneels down, and sits on his heels. The

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

other day during a visit to the Americans' Loyola house, he showed them the Japanese manner of praying.

At six o'clock he concelebrates with fathers from a different assistancy each morning. You should hear the exclamations at the board when some fathers see themselves put up to say Mass at six in the morning: "That's an impossible time!" "It's going to wear us out!" "I'm not awake until seven o'clock; before that I'm not responsible for what I do!" etc.

I have already said that the General began to visit, one by one, all the international houses in Rome. . . . His first gesture, meanwhile, was to have all the coadjutor brothers in Rome come to the Curia on Sunday morning. Nearly 150 came. He celebrated Mass for them, spoke in Italian (for the occasion, he read an Italian translation of what he himself composed in Spanish), and then ate with them on the roof of the Curia.

Now, almost every day at dinner time, he is absent from the Curia. He is meeting the fathers, scholastics, and others of the other houses and speaks to them in Spanish or French or English (he's not taking too many chances with his Italian yet; they tell me that he has asked Bro. Auger to speak to him in Italian so that he can learn it as soon as possible).

The fathers in Rome are beginning to realize in the face of this phenomenal activity why some people in Japan had nicknamed Fr. Arrupe "the typhoon," thus emphasizing the speed of his passing through and the effects of his visits.

In Japan Fr. Arrupe had been in the habit of speaking by a direct radio contact with Spain, which was picked up by the receivers of our fathers and transmitted to the faithful. This is why he asked where the Teletype was upon his arrival at the Curia. It is probable that one day he will have one installed so that he can speak to the whole Society.

Father General has been received in private audience by the Sovereign Pontiff. Our Bro. Auger accompanied him and even had himself photographed with the Sovereign Pontiff and Father General, which made one wag say: "The three greatest clerical powers in Rome: the Pope, the General, and Bro. Auger!" I might emphasize in passing that our Bro. Auger enjoys an extraordinary reputation in the whole Curia. One father spelled it out for us the other day: "He's the perfect type, faithful and intelligent. Don't try to force your way into Father General's room; he'll keep you from getting in and will protect the entrance to it. Don't try to worm any secrets out of him, either; you won't learn anything—he's a tomb. But if you have some favor you want to ask of him, he'll willingly do it for you if he has the time. Along with

that, he's intelligent. He knows right away what you want and what has to be done."

• • •

. . . Father General has just delivered a very inspiring speech. . .

This speech, delivered in its entirety with a single burst of enthusiasm and animated by an ardor and inspiration which had us hanging on his every word, won for the General a round of applause from the fathers of the Congregation. The General smiled and said: "I wasn't expecting applause, but I thank you"—which drew new applause for him.

You will have to read the entire text of this speech.² Even written down and in translation, it will, I hope, retain a little of the warmth of the original. . . .

June 9, 1965

Last night, Fr. José de Sobrino, Provincial of Andalusia, and, like our former Provincial, Fr. Dragon, a film expert, showed us the film he made on the Congregation. It is a half-hour color film which shows the different phases of the Congregation. The sections showing the papal audience and the General's election are very fine. As for the stars, they're first-rate: I appear quite distinctly in it twice, a fact which drew some jealous comments. Fr. de Sobrino is going to have copies made and offer them to the different provinces. Perhaps one day you'll see how the Congregation unfolds and how people eat there. ("Too much refectory!" was one father's brickbat after the movie.)

Just in passing, I point out that all the *postulata* sent by our scholastics are at the disposal of all the delegates in the antichamber to the *aula*. There is almost always someone busy reading them. In the catalogue of the *postulata* sent to us, they take up Nos. 1733-1831, which makes nearly a hundred of them. Nos. 1733-98 comprise the *postulata* written in Latin, and Nos. 1799-1831 are the ones written in French. *Postulatum* No. 1822 is the one on the "worn-out" (*déphasés*) fathers, and it's presented to us under the Latin title *De laboribus pro sociis aetate pro- vectis*, accompanied by No. 1823: *De novis orientationibus dandis quibusdam sociis*.

I think it is good to point out also that each delegate has in his possession all the *postulata* sent to Rome, whether they have been approved or not by the provincial congregations, whether they are public or private *postulata*, collective or individual, etc. In the subcom-

² WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1966) 19-21.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

missions responsible for studying the *postulata*, they take account of every one sent to Rome and have to make a judgment on all the *postulata* concerning a particular subject. Some subcommissions have only three or four of them, but others have a hundred. I must say that several of them repeat what others say; for example, you can see a considerable affinity between some *postulata* coming from Canada and those coming from the United States.

Sacred soil

Upon arriving in Rome, I asked where the subway was, and I was quite surprised to learn that the Roman subway has only one line and is of little importance. They told me this: Roman soil is sacred; it is filled with ruins, old monuments and churches, catacombs, etc., etc.; they cannot disturb all that to put in a subway. I think this can be compared to the Congregation. The entirety of the *Constitutions*, rules, decrees, approbations, etc., forms a sacred soil which they cannot upset as they please but which all the same can be broken through at certain places to allow a subway line to be put in. And this is really what the present Congregation is trying to do: to break a subway line through while avoiding upsetting the essential. For my part, I think it will succeed.

June 11, 1965

Plenary sessions of the Congregation have resumed here . . . and the speeches, too. Yesterday afternoon we heard seventeen of them. In the face of the tide of speeches threatening to engulf them, the fathers have asked that all interventions in the *aula* be limited to seven minutes. When the time is up, a clock rings and, whether he likes it or not, the speaker has to stop. If he doesn't, the red *non placet* lights of the most impatient among the fathers light up. We are now on the question of the Assistants and the assistancies, and on this subject the opinions are pouring down. . . .

Inexhaustibility

It still seems that the General's activity fails to wear him out. Not only does he preside at the plenary sessions, but often enough he takes part in commission meetings, receives visits from other religious superiors, answers the requests of the press, radio, and television, visits our houses in Rome, etc. He still receives the provincials, acquaints himself with their problems, and learns the Roman customs. Tomorrow, Saturday, the Spanish ambassador is honoring the General with a banquet. The cream of Roman aristocracy, diplomacy, bureaucracy, and Jesuitry has been invited. Monday, at *La Civiltà Cattolica*, the

General is giving a press conference for more than fifty journalists, including radio and television reporters, from all over the world. Moreover, I have heard it said that negotiations are in progress with some corporations of the General Motors, Philips, Esso type with a view to consulting them on ways to reorganize the Jesuit Curia and make it more efficient. I don't think we have seen anything yet . . . and we will have to expect a lot of other surprises.

The General himself gets some surprises when he reads the newspapers. The other day he opened up *La Stampa* and saw an entire article on him and the work he had to undertake. His program for governing and reforming was set forth in five points: (1) to decentralize the government while preserving its efficiency; (2) to see to it that Jesuits truly live evangelical poverty; (3) to make sure that young Jesuits have a formation adapted to the needs of our times; (4) to select ministries and apostolic works which will really be for the greater glory of God; (5) to increase the Society's missionary mobility and availability. Amazed, he sent for Fr. Tucci, director of *La Civiltà Cattolica*, and asked him how it happened that this journalist could be so well informed and could have guessed so correctly. Fr. Tucci smiled and told him that this whole program had already appeared word for word in the article by Fr. De Rosa published in *La Civiltà Cattolica* of May 15. Only the journalist in question did not indicate his sources. . . .

In India

For some time we have been having conferences each night on the Society in the world. We have had one on the Society in Switzerland, one on Russia, another on the Vatican Observatory, and another on the Society in India. The Society there is strongly organized and forms an assistancy, but it suffers from not being able to get the missionary help it needs, so that preliminary diplomatic discussions are in progress. . . . The only missionaries easily admitted into India are ones coming from the Commonwealth, but not the Americans.

June 13, 1965

Short circuit

What I foresaw and even gave you a hint about in my letter has just happened, and sooner than I thought. Father X. came to me with a letter he had just received from Canada. He said to me: "See how quickly news travels. I got a letter from Canada in which a father tells me about reading the mail from Rome now making the rounds. Now, one passage talks about a French father who described the qualities of the future general: a man who (1) sleeps, (2) listens more than he talks,

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

(3) walks in the garden, etc. And the father ends his letter by asking me if I am the one who wrote such a thing." So the circle is complete. My news is coming back to me. Two weeks after leaving Rome, the news is back there again. And evidently Father X., who found the item very amusing, has made the rounds of all the fathers of his assistantcy to show them this paragraph. So now when I mix with them, they greet me with remarks like this: "Ah! you're the father who's writing to Canada the clever reflections you've heard people make here!" As a tiny bit of comfort, there's the Provincial, Fr. Richard, to whom I passed on the two bulletins. When he returned them to me, he said: "Very, very interesting! It's a happy idea and an initiative worth continuing. I'm going to write to Fr. Socius to encourage him along this line." On the other hand, I had to go and prepare the ground with Fr. Harvey and tell him that his historic remark about the peanut butter was in the news and had started making the rounds in the Province. . . .

Low voltage

I have already said that the investigation into the question of the "worn-out" got me to collect a great number of amusing bits of information on the subject. To begin with, I see that the French have another definition of the *déphasés*. They start from the idea of electric current, and they say that a *déphasé* is someone who is running on 110 volts when the rest of the world is operating on 220 volts. . . . We would say, in our "Français" language, that he is a person whose batteries are run down. . . . During a discussion on the subject, I had asked that one of these fathers begin translating the work—written in Spanish—of our Father General, *Memorias del P. Arrupe*. They answered me: "Write to your Socius that you have found an ideal occupation for one of these "worn-out" fathers: let him translate Father General's memoirs into French. I pass on the suggestion. . . .

Bedside readings

In my spare time I have been reading the latest two volumes of the works of Père Teilhard de Chardin. When I arrived here, I saw the volume *Science et Christ* in the recreation room, brought it to my room, and saw on the back: *Biblioth. priv. Praep. Gen. S.J.* I said to myself, "Anyhow, the new General has other fish to fry," and held on to the book. . . .

June 15, 1965

Press conference

The big news this morning is the press conference which Father General gave yesterday afternoon to the international press agencies

and the important newspapers, all of which were invited to meet at *La Civiltà Cattolica*. There are quite a few conversations and get-togethers going on now in the corridors and near the newspaper tables. People are commenting on Father General's statements and showing one another the newspaper headlines. *L'Avvenire d'Italia* emphasizes that this is the first such conference given by a general of the Jesuits. The *Osservatore Romano* gives an objective report and points out only that Father General answered a question about Fr. Teilhard de Chardin. The *Pace Sera* (crypto-Communist) praises the General's broadmindedness, but finds a way to contrast him with the Pope, etc. . . .

An Italian father told me that these rather resounding statements by a General of the Jesuits are something to which the Roman Curia is not at all accustomed. They will be carefully noted and scrutinized not only by the Vatican Curia but also by the Communist newspapers, which are going to try to set the Pope and the General in contradiction. The affair would be all the more serious because for two or three months the Pope has harbored a great fear of Communism with regard to Italy and would be inclined to harden his position, as Pius XII did. Fortunately, the results of the elections in Sardinia have not confirmed his fears. . . .

These were the journalists who had asked Fr. Arrupe right after his election to meet with them in a press conference. The General had agreed while asking them to give him beforehand the questions they wanted to ask him. Five of these questions, which the General considered to be the most delicate, were selected and printed, followed by his answers. He spoke in Spanish for almost two hours, with some of the answers given partly in French and English. Each journalist received an Italian text of five full pages, each page devoted to the answer to one particular question.

• • •

Teilhard de Chardin

Fifth Question: "What is your opinion about the fact that, in spite of the *Monitum* of June 30, 1962, in which the Holy See pointed out 'the serious errors,' both philosophical and religious, which 'abound' in the writings of Teilhard de Chardin, some Catholic commentators and authors today exalt Teilhard, without the necessary reservations, as one of the greatest masters of Christian religious thought in the contemporary world?"

I shall answer with two observations. The first concerns the writers and journalists who speak about Fr. Teilhard. There are some who praise him

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

unconditionally, but they are not to be found among the Jesuits. The two most recent books written by Jesuits on the thought of Fr. Teilhard, *La vision de Teilhard de Chardin* by Piet Smulders, and *La pensée du Père Teilhard de Chardin* by Émile Rideau, while sympathizing with Teilhard's ideas, do not fail to make the "necessary reservations" regarding some points which are ambiguous or erroneous.

The second observation has to do with the difficulty of grasping the precise and definitive thought of Fr. Teilhard. He wrote an enormous amount during his long life, but he ceaselessly returned to the same ideas, re-examining and correcting them, with the result that there are many texts, sometimes differing and contrary, bearing on the same problem. Many of his writings which are now published were not intended for publication but were preliminary sketches in which certain things were not sufficiently developed and others were imperfectly expressed.

Moreover, ambiguities and errors, which certainly were not desired by Father Teilhard (who wished to remain completely faithful to the teaching of the Church), can be explained. For one thing, the area in which he was working was until then unexplored, and the method he employed was new. On the other hand, he was neither a theologian nor a philosopher by trade, and so it is quite possible that he did not see all the implications and all the philosophical and theological consequences of certain of his intuitions.

It must be said, however, that in the work of Fr. Teilhard the positive elements far outweigh those that are negative or give rise to discussion. His vision of the world exerts a very beneficial influence in scientific circles, both Christian and non-Christian. Fr. Teilhard is one of the great masters of the thought of the contemporary world, and the success he has met with should cause no surprise. As a matter of fact, he has made an impressive attempt to reconcile the world of science and that of faith. Proceeding from a scientific inquiry, he employs a phenomenological method which is favored by many of our contemporaries, and he crowns his synthesis with a spiritual doctrine in which the person of Christ is not only at the center of the life of every Christian but at the center of the world's evolution, just as St. Paul insisted when he spoke of Christ "in whom all things stand together." Thus one cannot but recognize the richness of the message which Fr. Teilhard offers our times.

Furthermore, the spiritual profundity of Fr. Teilhard, which no one disputes, is rooted in his religious life as he lived it in the school of St. Ignatius. His project is wholly in line with the apostolate of the Society of Jesus: to show how all created values find their complete synthesis in Christ and work together for the glory of God.³

June 17, 1965

Last night the six delegates from Quebec and Montreal had an intimate get-together with Father General. He does this with national

³ This is a translation from the official French version of the complete text of Father General's answer.

groups just about every night in order to get to know his subjects and their problems. He has a wonderful simplicity. He is not at all like the traditional superior they show us in all the dramas which portray the Jesuits. . . . He obviously has the gift of putting everyone at ease. He has remained the same man as he was before: simple, gracious, smiling, without affectation or pretense. You would almost say that he is not conscious of being General, or that if he is, he doesn't make a show of it. There is no sham or veneer or artificiality in his attitude. The way he appears to people is the way he really is. . . . Not only does he put himself on our level, but he seems to consider himself quite simply as one of us, as someone who is searching along with us, one who does not have all the answers ahead of time and who cannot make all the decisions by himself. In his address on June 7 (found in *Newsletter* No. 8), there is a sentence which describes the man: "Etsi collegialiter, estis tamen vos omnes meus superior (Although it is in a collegial sense, all of you are, nevertheless, my superior)."⁴ From this comes his great deference toward each of the members of the Congregation. . . . We had discussed beforehand whether we would use "Your Paternity" in talking with him, something which seemed to me to be obsolete and not at all suited to the man. Once we were there, not a single person used this expression, which would have struck a wrong note in that atmosphere. I'll give you just one example. When one of us made a suggestion, he answered: "I already had that idea in Japan, and I explained it to the provincials of the other religious orders, but without further success—which made me reply: 'This is still one of those original Arrupe ideas!'"

He has a great interest in the younger men, whose ways of thinking and problems he seems to understand very well. Several times he has had the opportunity to show us his very great sympathy toward them. Furthermore, this is the feeling not only of the General but also of the whole Congregation. In the decisions we have taken, we have very often considered the repercussions they will have among the young Jesuits.

Oriental liturgy

This morning from 8 to 9:30 I assisted at a solemn Mass celebrated in our church in the Byzantine rite by Fr. Mailleux together with fathers from the Russicum and the Oriental Institute. Fr. Mailleux arranged for seven concelebrants and a choir which should have been heard on the most famous stages of the world. The "Gospodi pomiluis"

⁴ WOODSTOCK LETTERS, 95 (1966) 19.

broke over us in successive waves which rolled in and out in harmonious rhythm. All the Orientalists, Byzantinists, and Russian specialists which Rome can count as her own seem to have met in our church with their icons, ornaments, censers, missals, etc. Father General followed the entire Mass as he knelt in front on a prie-dieu, and Fr. Mailleux at one point recited a prayer in English for the General. It struck me that we poor Latins still have a way to go before we catch up with the daring of the Eastern Church, which during the Mass passes from one language to another (but not to Latin) without any embarrassment.

Jesuits and Dominicans

Yesterday afternoon the Master General of the Dominicans, Reverend Father Fernandez, was our guest in the dining room. For the occasion, the two tables of honor had been placed next to one another, and the two Generals took the two center places. Since they are both Spaniards, people thought it would be a good idea to have Spaniards at these tables, and for this event they ferreted out all of the more presentable ones we had: Fr. Abellán, the Secretary of our Congregation; Fr. de Sobrino, Provincial of Andalusia; Fr. Iturrioz, director of *Razon y Fe*; etc. Truly Spain was being honored, and the cry "Arriba España!" must have echoed in the hearts of all the Spaniards present.

The General of the Dominicans came for coffee in the recreation room and chatted with several fathers he knew. At one point, the man I was talking with said to me: "You see our gravedigger there." I looked at him—uncomprehending, and afraid to understand too much. He explained: "There is the gravedigger for our Father General. He's the one who buries him when the General dies." I got the idea, and I asked him whether there was reciprocity here, that is, whether our General was also the gravedigger for the Master General of the Dominicans. He answered: "In principle, yes; in practice, since the Dominican General is not named for life, it rarely happens that he dies in office, but our General can't escape it. . . ."

June 19, 1965

Traffic problems

The Congregation has resumed its sessions, and, this time, has ended up voting for the resolution on the relaxation of secrecy, which allows me at last to speak about what is taking place in the *aula*. To understand the present situation, you must realize that all the commissions have completed their work and that the schemas, resolutions, and declarations are flowing before the Congregation, and the people want all of them to go through at the same time. Right now the Congregation

resembles a traffic circle where six highways (our six commissions) converge, with each one pouring a long line of cars into the circle. Since each car, that is, each decree or declaration, must, on the average, go around the circle three times—the first time, for the general presentation; the second, for the discussion, and the third, for the vote, you can imagine the congestion this creates. . . . Nevertheless, some less important measures have been adopted, thus freeing the traffic circle.

Secrecy

This is certainly not the most important question in itself, but for the correspondents it is probably the most practical and the one which was awaited with the most impatience, especially since the solution reveals the Congregation's frame of mind. Those who have already rummaged through this booklet they call the *Formula Congregationis Generalis*, which is our Bible and our rule of conduct here, know that in paragraph 25 there is an express prohibition against communicating to others what takes place inside the Congregation. It even says there that superiors will have to punish anyone who is guilty of violating secrecy. That's so as not to encourage correspondence between Rome and the provinces! But, right from the beginning, this Congregation voted provisionally to suspend the application of this paragraph, putting off until later a re-examination of secrecy and a ruling on the very substance of the problem. Hence, we have had a few days of freedom, but a conditional freedom: we had to wait until after the *Newsletter* came out and to observe a whole series of precautions.

After the General's election, the question came back for consideration in two stages. First, a new text was proposed for paragraph 25: "What is done in the Congregation may not be communicated to others except in accordance with the norms laid down by the General and approved by the General Congregation." This text was approved by a huge majority. Then we received the famous norms, which took two weeks to arrive. The first text submitted contained at least one bit of mischief which annoyed all those who wanted to write to their provinces. It said that the electors had to wait for the *Newsletter*, and that if they wrote before the *Newsletter* went out and spoke about Congregation matters, they had to submit their letters to censorship by the Information Office. In practice, that came down to saying that you could not write before the *Newsletter* went out. Some pressure developed to modify this text, and at length the objectionable part was dropped from the final wording, which stipulated only that the electors had to abide by the general norms set down for the publication of the *Newsletters* (e.g., not giving the numbers in the results of the vot-

ing nor the names of persons without their permission, etc.). This final text submitted to the Congregation was adopted by an almost unanimous vote, which gives a good indication of the development of the Congregation's thinking. Moreover, just to show the road traveled, here is the first sentence of the last paragraph: "Curandum est ut iustae expectationi NN. in nuntiis praebendis satisfiat. . . ." In short, the Congregation encourages us to satisfy the just expectations of Jesuits. This is what I am doing. There is no longer any question of punishments.

Discussing the substantials of the Institute

[WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1966) 21-22.]

Left, Right

Someone wrote to me from Canada and asked me if the Congregation is of the Left or of the Right and which tendency is the moving force. I confess that after carefully watching what is taking place here, I have not yet found an answer to a question like this. In general, the delegates seemed to be moved by a tremendous good will and a sincere desire to carry out their work, even if that requires many changes. Are they of the Right? Are they of the Left? It's almost impossible to say. If it is absolutely necessary for me to use these expressions, I would say that the vast majority seems to me to be of the Center Left. . . . By that I mean that this majority, insofar as it is at the center, is ready to make the necessary changes, that it remains receptive, that it is not locked in an unyielding and irreversible position. Insofar as it is of the Left, this majority wants these changes and even pushes in this direction, as the first two votes, on secrecy and on the substantials, testify. Undoubtedly, there are some people who dread the changes and who are even inclined to think of them as sacrileges, but this is a very small minority. You have to realize that for some people the slightest change creates a problem and poses a case of conscience.

June 22, 1965

Plans for future tertians

. . . It is necessary, he added, to keep the tertians fully occupied and not allow the time to be wasted. And then he explained his system to me: the long retreat, then preparation for preaching, then two weeks of preaching, then return to the tertianship for a critical analysis of the ministries just carried out, then a course on the Institute, then preaching again and a return to the tertianship for more analysis of what has been done, and so on, until the end of the third probation. For him, seven months, or at most eight, would be sufficient. He finds that ten months is too long, but he is opposed to plans for three or five months.

Authentic Exercises

I informed a tertian instructor that a study session on the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius was being held in Canada at the present time and that a great number of Jesuits were taking part in it. As soon as he responded, I realized that I had hit a vein and that on this subject he can go on and on. If you succeed, he said to me, in reinteresting your fathers in the Exercises of St. Ignatius, tell yourselves then that nothing has been lost and that you can hope for anything. On this point, we have been at death's door in France, and the game isn't quite won, but we are improving. Besides, the situation isn't any better in other countries. I went to give the Exercises in England. I gave them in my own way, which I consider to be faithful to St. Ignatius. Now some time after my stay in England, I received a letter from an English master of novices. It said: you came to our house, and, according to reports, you gave the Exercises literally; now everybody talks about it as a revelation, as a great success. How do you do it? I can no longer give the Exercises to my novices. It doesn't go over anymore.

I replied that he should be faithful to what St. Ignatius asks for and not give many spiritual conferences, which can do some good but which are not the Exercises. I also told him that I was a tertian instructor and that he could ask my tertians, who were satisfied with the way I give the Exercises. I never got an answer to my letter. . . .

The letter and the spirit

I still have room to come back to a question which I began to treat in my last letter, but in a way which I now think is unsatisfactory. I am talking about the question of the Left and the Right at the Congregation. After reflection, it seems to me that these terms are very poor expressions for the situation at the Congregation.

The question should be posed rather on the level of fidelity to St. Ignatius and to his *Constitutions*. Everyone basically wants to be faithful to St. Ignatius—those who want changes as well as those who don't—but there is one group which places its fidelity in the *letter* of St. Ignatius and another which places it in his *spirit*. I think this is really where the conflict lies, on this double level, between the *literalists* and the "*spiritualists*."

The defenders of the letter seem to me to be seeking *security* first and foremost. They want to be faithful to the letter, for this is the only attitude which assures them of security of soul and peace of conscience. As soon as a proposal appears to them to venture outside the paths already marked out by the letter, they become anxious for the future of the Society and a problem of conscience develops. Thus, for example, as

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

soon as the mode of government in the Society comes up for discussion, they will repeat untiringly: the Society enjoys a mode of government which is the envy of other religious congregations. It is a coherent and balanced system which stands as a whole. To meddle with it at any one point is to shake the whole structure which St. Ignatius built up so laboriously. The same reasoning goes for poverty: even if the circumstances have changed, it is necessary to be faithful to the letter of the vow as interpreted by St. Ignatius. If necessary, let us ask for dispensations, but let's not change anything.

To that the "spiritualists" object that what counts, the only thing required and necessary, is fidelity to the spirit of the *Constitutions* and of St. Ignatius. If he came back, he would be the first to undertake the changes which had become necessary. We must go beyond the limits of the security which the letter obtains and run the risk of freedom. What good is it, they would say, to be faithful to the letter in the matter of poverty, when we have been doing something else in practice for fifty years? What good is it to hold on to beautiful declarations which nobody observes anymore? Let us make our law agree with the facts. . . .

June 13, 1965

In Poland

The conferences still go on after supper. The Provincial of Poland came to explain to us the situation of the Society in his country. The only thing the Jesuits can do freely is preach, but only in churches; they no longer possess any schools or retreat houses. All they have are residences with a chapel. The Society lost half its manpower during the war, and most of its houses were destroyed. Nevertheless, the Jesuits have their pastoral ministry to keep them active, and in spite of it all they have confidence in the future.

In the United States

Last night it was the turn of the Americans to speak to us about their high schools and colleges. Fr. Reinert, rector of St. Louis University, spoke in English, and Fr. O'Keefe, rector of Fordham, spoke in French. . . . At St. Louis the budget for a year is \$17,500,000, half of which comes from the student body, a quarter from grants for special research projects, and the final quarter from gifts. St. Louis is intimately associated with the city, especially in the social and intellectual realms; almost all the religious communities have residences there, and their members take courses at the University, so that the Jesuits are instructing and forming almost all the religious clergy. Cardinal Ritter of St.

Louis has said, "If the Jesuits should ever abandon their teaching at St. Louis University, it would be an irreparable disaster for the Church." Fr. Reinert told us that he spends half his time occupied with money questions, seeing benefactors, alumni, business companies, foundations, etc. In conclusion, he said: "We are literally beggars"—a sentence which greatly amused the audience, but still achieved its purpose.

When the Romans wax teilhardian . . .

The other evening we went for a walk in St. Peter's Square (it was about 9:30) when we met the father working in the French section of the Vatican Radio as he was leaving his place of work. He took us inside and we visited the gardens, and then he started chatting about the Congregation:

"As far as I'm concerned—as one in charge of news releases—I must confess that you are disappointing me; there is nothing important for me to announce. Do you know what is making the rounds now in the Vatican? 'The Jesuits from now on have a General *ad tempus* and a General Congregation *ad vitam*.'"

The statement of Father General about Teilhard de Chardin was of great interest to him. He wanted to know who had helped the General prepare the statement and how it had been received. We asked him: "What are they saying about it in the Vatican?" "Not a thing; they are too clever for that!"

Yet the statement regarding Teilhard had made waves and people wanted to know who was behind the General's remarks. As for myself, I started reading the work of Fr. Smulders, *La vision de Teilhard de Chardin*, which the General had referred to in his press conference. At coffee I met a father named Smulders and asked him if he knew the author of the book.

"I'm the author," he told me.

"How did you get the idea of writing about Teilhard?" I asked him.

"I teach theology in our scholasticate and give the course *De Deo Creante*; these days no self-respecting professor can theologize in abstraction from Teilhard. I gave out some notes to my students, then I wrote an article for a Dutch journal which has since been translated into French; I was then asked to rework and amplify the article and it became the book which you have, now in its third edition."

"You give an example which all theology professors could follow with profit," I replied.

The book is well done; you can sense in it a theologian who does not get carried away, but who, when necessary, can put things into focus.

Debate on the Assistants: Father General's intervention

If I were a journalist attached to one of these big-circulation dailies which live on sensationalism and on gratifying their readers, I would give an eight-column headline to the report I am sending you: SENSATIONAL TURN OF EVENTS AT THE JESUIT CONGREGATION: DRAMATIC AND DECISIVE INTERVENTION BY THE GENERAL. But I am just the occasional correspondent for a sorry-looking provincial bulletin with a press run of only 175 copies, abhorring the sensational, and whose editorial staff and sources of information, it seems to me, are being steadily reduced to a unity. Even if the director of this bulletin has just conferred upon me the pompous title of "envoyé spécial," I should still preserve the balance which befits such a venerable journal and quite simply recount the event which has taken place.

For two weeks we were having a full-scale "talkathon" on the question of the Assistants. On June 23 the ordeal reached its paroxysm. At the beginning of each session the General has the habit of telling us the precise number of those who have previously handed in their requests to speak. On opening the session this Wednesday, however, he announced merely: "Sunt plures oratores! (there are more speakers)" What did this *plures* mean? At the end of two hours, we had been delivered over to the twentieth speaker, and it was getting on our nerves. . . . The General announced a twenty-minute break and added: "Sunt adhuc quattuordecim oratores (There are still fourteen speakers)." Protests came from all sides, groups formed, and people were saying: "This has to stop; it doesn't make sense." But how?

The General took the floor and directly intervened in the discussion. This is roughly what he said:

For a long time I have hesitated to intervene, for this is a matter which touches the person of the General, and I wanted to allow the fathers complete freedom to express their opinions. But many have asked me to give my own opinion, and I give it in all humility in order to set up the kind of dialogue which has often been mentioned, the dialogue between the inferior (myself) and the superiors (you gathered together in Congregation). Before all else, I want to declare that, whatever the Congregation may decide, I will accept it willingly, as coming from the Lord himself. Give me four, eight, or eleven Assistants or Consultors, elect them yourselves, and I will accept it entirely. *Voluntas Congregationis, mei superioris, erit pro me voluntas Dei* (The will of the Congregation, my superior, will be for me the will of God). But this is a new experiment that we are going to try, and it must be at one and the same time faithful to the *Constitutions* and sufficiently flexible or elastic in order not to obstruct the action of the General. Having said that, I come to my proposal:

1) I favor the election by the Congregation of four Assistants "qui providentiam Societatis erga Generalem exerceant, simulque sint Consultores Praepositi Generalis *sensu canonico*, et *sensu canonico tantum* (who will exercise the care of the Society regarding the General, and who will also be Consultors of the General in the canonical sense, and only in the canonical sense)";

2) in addition to these four General Assistants, there will be Regional Assistants chosen by the General, and there will be eight, eleven, or fifteen of them, if necessary;

3) in addition, there will be special Consultants (*Consultores periti*) named by the General, according to need;

4) finally, even if the General makes final decisions, he needs consultors of great ability around him; therefore, there will be General Consultors (*Consultores Generales*) named by the General, and these can be chosen from among the elected Assistants or the Regional Assistants or the *periti*, etc.

This was the General's proposal. He presented it with such humility that he won everyone's sympathy and with such firmness that he drew all those who were reluctant to his side. Once he had made his proposal, the General said: It would not be fitting for me to remain in the *aula* while you discuss this proposal. Therefore, I will leave, and I ask Fr. Swain to preside over the debate. Fr. Swain went up to the platform and said: By his intervention Father General has closed the debate on the Assistants. The only thing left to discuss is his proposal.

First results: the Assistants

During the morning they passed out to us a document containing the principal questions which would be put to the Congregation in the course of ten votes. It is useless to go over these votes one by one. In brief, the General's whole plan has been adopted, but not without opposition on some points. . . .

One point in particular stirred up endless discussions and disputes: the limitation of the Assistants' term. The Congregation had voted for this limitation by a large majority, but they discovered that this would be a change in the *Constitutions*, which requires a two-thirds majority to be valid. The majority given by the Congregation was only a few votes short of two-thirds. The first vote has nonetheless been upheld, and the four Assistants, once elected, will spend a good part of their lives in Rome. Their election is to take place next Tuesday, June 29.

June 27-28, 1965

Things go better . . .

Yesterday afternoon, a Saturday, on my way to the 4:30 collation, I came across a whole group of Americans surrounding a mysterious object which I could not see and which seemed to be monopolizing

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

their attention. I approached. One American said to me: "Got a nickel?" Another said: "Have your dime ready." Finally I edged into the front of the group, and what did I see? A soda-vending machine like the one in the basement of the Bellarmino, except the bright letters on the front read "PEPSI-COLA." In fact, the machine is full of Pepsi, and there is no need to put a nickel or dime in to get a bottle. All you have to do is pull the lever and take one. In order to understand the joy which broke out everywhere, you should know that the temperature in Rome for the last three days was over 90° in the daytime, even 91° and 92°. The Pepsi merrily gurgled out of the bottle and into the throats of the delegates, for each one drinks at least one bottle. Besides being refreshing, the soda also loosens tongues. Someone near me said: "It's a gift to Father General. Considering the power of the Jesuits, the Pepsi-Cola Company thought it was 'good publicity.'" Another added: "Wait until the Coca-Cola Company learns that, and we'll get a Coke machine, too." A third man tapped him: "Better than that, Coca-Cola is prepared to defray the entire cost of the Congregation if it is willing to adopt a decree recommending Coke in all the houses of the Society!"

To be concluded

TWO DECISIONS

*"The reasons were the same;
it was I who changed."*

DANIEL J. MCCARTHY, S.J.

I WISH THERE WERE a concise ten-word sentence by which I could explain why I decided to leave the Jesuits and the priesthood. It would be convenient if I could use the popular, vindictive approach by pointing out that it was the shortcomings of the Jesuit order and the unreasonable demands of the priesthood that led me to this decision. Convenient but contrary to fact.

I left the priesthood in a manner analogous to the way that a doctor might leave his practice of medicine to enter the field of finance or banking, or that a teacher might enter business. In each instance the man follows a way of life that involves a different dedication and sacrifice. It would be strained, however, to make such a move equivalent to a man's total abandonment of moral principle. If there is an element that is disgraceful or shameful in a priest's application for a change of state, it is beyond the reach of my intelligence.

Without family or friends

This was the loneliest decision of my life. Every man is alone in making his decisions, but a priest has this loneliness compounded for him while he formulates his decision to leave the priesthood. Ideally a layman has the support of his wife and

family in making personal decisions. In other decisions a priest has the support of his parents, brothers and sisters. If he does not have this support his loneliness is all the more unbearable. He would like to justify his loneliness by accusing his family of a lack of allegiance, but deep down he can only sympathize with them. They are acting according to their own emotional structures, their religious values, and their common family background. The priest could even find it easier to justify his loneliness if he were convinced of the correctness of his decision. Unfortunately, at this stage he is sure of little, and least of all that he is perfectly right in this choice.

I never had the slightest hesitation about the love of my family. In spite of their best intentions, however, they were my biggest concern and my greatest burden. I knew that in leaving the priesthood I would be very difficult to explain to nieces, cousins, etc. Consequently, I was reconciled to the inevitable prospect that I would be forced to sever my close relationship with the family.

Their approach was the frontal attack, to force me to change my mind. I have never had my personal failings pointed out so clearly. This approach moved me coldly to write them off, coldly to withdraw into my loneliness. I was aware that their motive was a deep love for me. My own love reciprocated with a desire simply to remove myself from their lives, to leave and never to return.

On the day that I left the priesthood, they reacted very well. They each manifested a warm sense of support and understanding. They had come a great distance in accepting my decision by then. Although their belated understanding did not help me in making this decision, it was of great help to me later in making my second decision, the decision to return. Had they been reluctant to accept my ex-priest status at that time, I would have had one more obstacle to overcome before I could come back.

My priest advisor, a man of shrewd insights into human nature, was most helpful in showing me how to accept my family's unsympathetic reaction. If I said that I wanted understanding, he insisted, then I must see that this is precisely what they wanted. I began to see that it was not that they did not *want* to understand, it was more that they *could* not. There were the simple black-and-white moral values typical of Irish heritage, a fear of conceding to "weakness"

and the unrealistically exalted concept of the priesthood. They wanted to understand and could not. This I had to understand.

This kindly and sympathetic priest advisor challenged me on this very point of loneliness. He insisted that once I was on my own, I would not be able to sustain the life of a bachelor layman. I would eventually be led to a solution compromising to my vow of celibacy. For myself, I saw this future problem of loneliness as insignificant. I had already endured an intense loneliness from the time I had first broached the subject of leaving. Even New York City, fabled for its loneliness, could hardly isolate me any further.

Emotional confusion

The workings of Divine Providence were constantly indicated throughout this entire experience, but the foremost of its workings was the availability of this priest advisor. An atmosphere of friendship is necessary if even the minimal level of intimate self-revelation is to be possible. I had worked, relaxed and conversed with this priest for six years. During this time I had poured out to him my most personal thoughts and ideals. He was unstinting in the time that he gave me, without hesitation or complaint. Unknowingly, I needed desperately to talk to someone, if for no other reason than as a foil for self-understanding.

Every priest striving toward a decision in this matter will have his own reasons. My reasons have significance not so much as one priest's motive for acting, but as symptomatic of the frustration and fear that every priest considering this choice experiences. There is a certain inexactness that I feel in listing my reasons because I feel that there is "something else." The something else, of course, is the emotional confusion. It is not my intent to analyze this confusion; I am not equipped to do this. I can only try to describe it as a background to the reasons as I list them.

My esteem of the priesthood and of the Jesuits was and is the highest. At the time of this decision I felt that I had lost the inner desire to belong to them and that I had lost this desire irrevocably. I was aware, at the same time, that in losing this desire I had lost something of inestimable value. I saw no way to recapture this desire. In addition I recalled something that I had read in a survey of Jesuit scholastics. They had been asked to list the external factors that contributed to the strength of their Jesuit vocations, and to list

also those factors that weakened this resolve. A factor that was repeated consistently in the latter category was the bad example of a discontented priest. It was in view of my own discontent and the possibility of this discontent acting as a deterrent to others that I saw it as God's will that I leave the Jesuits and the priesthood.

Matters that should have interested a priest had begun to affect me less and less. I was not affected at all by a concern for souls; retreat and confession work tended to make me less interested in the souls of others. In this way I would not be hurt when I failed to convince others of something that they obviously did not want to be convinced of. To protect myself from failure I had to develop an attitude of not caring. I reacted similarly toward the teaching of high school theology. Did I make any impression at all upon the lives of the students I taught? It seemed that students from good homes with conscientious parents would lead good lives, whereas those without this benefit would lead troublesome lives—irrespective of what I did or did not do. I felt that I did not have the faith of a priest, to plant and water so that someone else could later reap.

I chafed under every restriction of religious life. Common life, as it is called, rubbed me the wrong way. Common life means that no automobile is available because someone else is using it; the typewriter or record player is inaccessible for the same reason. Common life involves the discipline of saying Mass at a certain time, attending meals at a certain time, saying certain prayers at a certain time. At one point I counteracted these restrictions by getting my own car (with rather vague approval), my own record player, radio and typewriter (with no approval). I seldom attended community meals. I arose when I wanted, retired when I wanted. I played loosely with the restrictions of my vow of poverty. Remarkably, I was not bothered by my lack of proper approval, but only by my hypocrisy in not living up to the demands of the life that I professed. If it was freedom that I wanted, then I should look for it outside of the group and not make a mockery of the group by pursuing it within.

I tended to exaggerate the weaknesses of community poverty. I had a good background in accounting and finance. In my darker moments I considered religious as outstandingly naive in matters of finance. (Ironically, Romano Guardini in *The Lord* attributes

Judas' downfall to this overzealous concern with financial efficiency!) I thought that I would find it impossible to be obedient to a superior who was financially incompetent. The manifestation of emotion lies in the fact that I placed such life-death emphasis upon this fault.

The vow of chastity (celibacy) offers difficulties that are, theoretically, more easily counteracted within the structure of the religious life than outside. I felt, however, that I could better overcome these difficulties without the restrictions of religious life. I could protect this obligation more easily if, for example, I could work out my own vacations and recreations. Jesuit vacations were almost always the group type in which we all went off to some run-down cottage on some out of the way lake, and there obediently enjoyed ourselves. I really did not know what I would like as a vacation, but there were many types that I would like to try. One has only to read the travel brochures to see that here lies the key if not to eternal happiness, at least to the next best thing. Certainly in this way I would be able to escape the emotional depression.

A lost sense of humor

I wanted simply to save my own soul by living my own life in my own way. I was being realistic, I felt, in facing this very selfish attitude. I was determined not to let myself become a dried up, selfish priest, nor, on the contrary, a free-and-easy, corner-cutting priest. Either extreme implied a basic contradiction in ideals. I thought too much of the priesthood to have it misrepresented either way. I envied generous priests who thought only of others, and I wanted to be like them. But I knew that I was not generous, that I was quite selfish. A selfish priest is set for constant frustration.

So much for the thought processes leading to the decision to leave the Jesuits and the priesthood. I will describe the events that served as a backdrop for this thought. Every man going through this or a similar crisis in his life will have a kindred set of circumstances. Detail is irrelevant, and so I will avoid detail. I was working much harder than I had in some time. The work was complicated by some rather trying problems that were my responsibility to solve. In addition I tried to perform most of my religious duties. The superior brought it to my attention on several occasions that I was somewhat out of order in missing a short community gathering. I

took offense that the superior seemed to show little interest *why* I was absent but only that I was absent. On his part he must have felt that if I had a reason, I would, in the manner of a mature adult, convey it to him. The emotional aspects of the situation become evident in the feelings of deep resentment and persecution that I managed to derive from this trivial incident. I had lost my sense of humor; I was taking myself too seriously.

By year's end the emotional unrest of the entire experience had begun to crest. I asked to be removed from my administrative post and I explained to my superiors that I was giving serious thought to the prospect of leaving the Jesuits. After a semester of teaching I was, again at my request, put into youth retreat work. All agreed that this would be a good opportunity for me to get away from the circumstances in which I had become depressed, and it offered the prospect of work that was thoroughly priestly. The retreat house adjoined the seminary in which the men are trained for the first four years of their Jesuit life. At the seminary I saw a concern for the "rules" that was more offensive than what I had just left. I was annoyed too, by a concern for poverty that bordered on the fanatic. It was not long before I found that youth retreat work was so repetitive week after week my little creative urge cried out for relief. After six months of this work I found that I was to be assigned to it for another year. Any thoughts that I had been ruminating about leaving the Jesuits and the priesthood now assumed a very practical urgency. I took a month to give careful thought to the entire problem and to choose the words by which I would express my request to leave the Jesuits. I then sent on this request to the Provincial noting that I would like to act upon it as soon as possible.

Both the Provincial and my advisor prevailed upon me to consult a psychiatrist. They argued that if at some time in the future I had some regrets on this decision, I could at least take solace that I had done everything possible to solve the problem within the Jesuits. At first this suggestion to consult a psychiatrist irritated me. So also did such expressions as "helping you," "your problem," and "your difficulty." I was not ready to admit that I needed help or that I had a problem or difficulty. I analyzed the situation this way. My decision to leave the Jesuits would pose itself as a threat to the values

of the other Jesuits. They had to destroy me, albeit subconsciously, to be able to salvage their own values. I saw grim humor in the fact that I was the one who was told to consult the psychiatrist. Yet, I saw nothing to lose. It would help calm the family if I saw a psychiatrist; I might even learn something about myself.

Another indication of Providence was in this psychiatrist. He was a Catholic, although this was unnecessary to our professional relationship. Almost to my surprise I derived from our conferences a greater conviction that I should leave the Jesuits and the priesthood. At one point I asked him to voice his own opinion. He demurred but I pressed him. He said that I was in a depression from which I would recover and that the entire experience would make me a better, more sympathetic and effective priest. I felt that this was a nice, academic answer. I was angry that he had answered this way. He had aligned himself "with everyone else." Once more I was alone, but there were advantages to being alone. I was forced again to challenge the basis of my opinions. I decided that this emotional depression could go on for the rest of my Jesuit life. No one could assure me that it would not. I must leave the Jesuits and the priesthood.

A very elusive commodity

My priest advisor put me in contact with a relative of his in charge of the New York office of a reputable insurance firm. My intentions in seeing him were only to solicit his advice and to use his expertise in personnel placement. I went to New York to consult him and to check out other employment prospects. He put me through countless personality and I.Q. tests. With some reservations the tests indicated that I would make a very good prospect in the insurance business both as a salesman and as a sales-manager. Before this I had little idea whether I could sell pencils on a street corner. His company gave me a tempting offer and I decided not to investigate the other employment possibilities.

I returned to my home town to instigate the procedures whereby I could depart from the Jesuits and the priesthood. One month later I arrived in New York as a layman. Six weeks after this I left New York and returned to the Jesuits and to the priesthood. The reasons for leaving the Jesuits and the reasons for returning were

exactly the same. It was I who changed. Knowledge changes, and I had acquired a great deal of knowledge in six weeks.

The potential of this insurance position was genuine. It had every promise of success about it. A number of men, many of whom had no previous selling experience, had earned salaries in the neighborhood of \$20,000 in their first year. The personality tests indicated that I had everything in my favor for similar success. It was not for lack of success that I came back to the Jesuits. I could succeed well. I knew that in that very success I would be looking for something that I could not find.

I left the priesthood because I thought that I had lost interest in priestly work, and, in so doing, lost all challenge. I was sure I could find this challenge in New York with the insurance business. We were instructed that our first task as salesman was to "create the need," to make the prospect aware that it was he who needed the insurance. The challenge was more in getting the subject to sit down with me. Once I succeeded in this, I was able to overwhelm him with an array of charts and testimonials that such percentage of men were disabled for so many days; that any plan besides mine was deficient for such reasons. In addition we ourselves were shown charts illustrating the number of phone calls a salesman had to make to arrange one appointment; the number of appointments needed to complete one presentation; the number of presentations for one sale, and so forth. There rolled from my memory the expression from Luke: "The children of the world are shrewder than the children of light." One instructor pointed out that no one wants to buy insurance, he must be sold. How can anyone want to buy a product "he cannot see, does not need when he buys it, and hopes he will never use"?

In the challenge of insurance, I caught a fleeting reflection of the challenge of the priest's work. Few projects could offer more challenge than the effort of bringing the message of Jesus Christ to a people deadened by a repetitious, unimaginative, and needlessly limited idea of this message. Negatively, was it ever easy to show a man immured in a lifelong practice of graft or convinced in his resolve to enter into another marriage that it is better to follow the invitation of Jesus Christ? To formulate the question is to answer it. Too much challenge might induce me to run from the

Jesuits, but I could never say that there was not enough. If I wanted challenge, I must return to the Jesuits.

I was looking for money. With money I could buy relaxation, "the things that I have always wanted," and most of all, *freedom*. Relaxation is a very elusive commodity. I found quickly that it cannot be purchased. The hours or days of a man's relaxation are not severed from every other moment of his life. I found that the more "successful" a man was (the more money, power and prestige he had) the more difficult he found it to search out this mercurial item called relaxation.

As to "the things I have always wanted," I found somewhat surprisingly that there was nothing I really wanted. In New York I was armed with money and opportunity, but there was nothing I wanted that I did not already have. Jesuit training had left my tastes hopelessly jejune. Ancient Horace saw how bootless it was to argue about taste.

Another viewpoint

I had considerable opportunity for self-assertion in New York. I was able, for the first time in my adult life, to make all of my own decisions: what to do for a living, where to live, what and when to eat. It should not seem strange that I should be sensitive about such insignificant details of daily life. Everyone knows a caged feeling, a fear of being "boxed in." The bars of the cage are the daily trivia. On occasion a man wants to break out of these bars. In the religious life these trivia have been regulated in a formal manner; in a layman's life they are regulated not as formally, perhaps, but certainly just as effectively. With my new freedom and its capacity for self-expression there was still no escape from this depression. The awareness first began to penetrate that my difficulty did not lie in either obedience or in self-assertion, but in the depression itself. It was almost unnerving finally to admit this to myself.

I wanted recognition. I resented the fact that my long hours of work and imaginative improvements had gone almost unrecognized. I hoped to find this recognition in salary. I could disregard the myopic vision of any superiors, clerical or lay, so long as I was able to make a good salary by ability alone. It soon became clear that good commissions are not dependent entirely upon a man's ability.

Some of the best paid men got commissions only because of "leads" their superior had given them.

Not only did my new life lack the conditions I was searching for, but it had additional shortcomings. There was a dearth of life goals. What is this all about, this daily pouring out of self? Many good men had obscure, confused motives covering a tangle of money, family and retirement. Many others shared with one man I knew the prodigiously clear goal of money. He did not follow this goal in a decadent manner, but when he pronounced the word "money," he said it with all the reverence and unction that my mother uses when she says "Mary, Mother of God." I looked down on the confused motivation; I cannot understand the strong motivation of money or pleasure, ephemeral as it is.

In my choice to work for the insurance company there is another indication of Providence. I was able to negotiate from the advantage of a good background in accounting and finance and some experience in public relations and fund-raising. As a priest I have always had an openness in speech and thought. As a salesman I was instructed to avoid answering questions directly over the phone, never to tell a prospect exactly what I was selling until I had arrived at this very point in my presentation. I was never to use the word *insurance*. The word had too many antagonistic connotations. This approach went against all of my priestly instincts. I cannot circumvent a listener's questions with indirect uncommitted answers. I cannot say something other than what I intend to say.

The product that I sell has to have a good value. The insurance company had an excellent product. Some of its policies were the best in the field by any basis of comparison. I wanted to be filled with enthusiasm for this product. I almost thought I was, but I was not. I was accustomed to a product of eternal values. I could not become concerned, deeply concerned, about a few years' security after selling eternal security. Jesus Christ is and was the reason for everything that I have ever done.

The second decision

I had originally thought that many should leave the Jesuits. There were circumstances to justify their reluctance to make this step. They could earn a living, only in education, and education, for some, was the source of their inadequacy. There are some Jesuits

who are a bit lazy, some who are misplaced malcontents. I could no longer be upset by these Jesuits. Their number was too small, their affliction too mild. Even more, I came to realize how much courage a man demonstrates when he works at something for which he is not best suited. Many laymen pour out their hearts on jobs they do not like but which they endure because they need the income for their families. I recalled priests who hated confessional work but who were exceptionally capable confessors, the men who were revolted at the repetitious demands of teaching but who were outstanding teachers. These men were outstanding in spite of their involuntary attitudes because they were courageous. They did not set up a semi-irrational criterion of liking or disliking as the basis of effort. It could just be that there was need for more such men.

There were two hardships I anticipated in leaving the Jesuits. I would no longer be able to celebrate Mass and I would be leaving some very close companions. I did not know how I would react toward the Mass once I was arranging my own schedule. It was a surprise to me that I attended Mass almost every day. I had no feelings of guilt if I missed attending. I was not aware of any feeling of security that I derived from attending Mass. The reason, simply, is that the Mass is one of the most important religious values of my life. I missed intelligent, erudite companionship. Given time, I would have formed such companionship with my business associates. Companionship has a deeper significance than a partnership in discussions. It includes areas of life—goals and ideals. I began to realize just how close the bonds of friendship were with my fellow Jesuits because we shared not only common intellectual interests but common motivation. I am not an intellectual nor erudite, but I enjoy companions who are.

Once I had convinced myself that I should return, I had reached only a preliminary stage. There were emotional obstacles against putting such a resolve into action. How difficult was it going to be to return? Would I be surrendering my self-respect in returning? Would I be looked upon as a two-headed monster, a three-legged horse for the rest of my Jesuit life? I felt like the layman who hears vague stories of a priest who is consigned to a Trappist monastery to make "atonement" for his sins.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

A matter of pride and grace

By the grace of God I made the decision to return, whatever the consequences. Far from undergoing the slightest humiliation I was treated with utmost respect. To leave the Jesuits I had to write several documents in my own hand; to return there was nothing to write, nothing to sign. There was no back-slapping, no "three cheers," no attitude of receiving the prodigal son. There was a deep communication of understanding, love and a brotherly gladness to have me home.

It will always be questionable whether I did the right thing in leaving the Jesuits. I felt that it was good for me to get away and to think the matter out on my own. It could just be that there was another way to have derived the awarenesses that I did. If there was, I do not yet know what it could be.

There was one difficulty in returning. Many had insisted that I would come back. I had protested the finality of my move. In returning I would be admitting that I was wrong. It was hard to come back. I can give all the reasons in the world why it was more reasonable to do so, how easy everyone made it—but it was hard all the same. It is a matter of pride and only grace can overcome pride. When I left, I was convinced that it was forever. I was wrong.

God is unknowable to us, the human mind but vaguely knowable. Can we be expected to understand the inter-workings of the inscrutable Divine with the inscrutable human mind. I have gone through an experience that involved such inter-workings. From this I have derived a clear certitude. God will accomplish His will in the manner He chooses. He will not be held in by our convenient categories.

A MAN WITHOUT A JOB?

*the priest must find a new
social significance*

MARC ORAISON

IT SEEMS THAT DURING THE PAST thirty years some aspects of the conception of the priest's status in society formed before that time have been brought clearly into question. We have here, certainly, an extremely complex and delicate problem; but it would be vain to pretend it has not been raised.

It is not the priesthood as such that has been brought into question, but the manner in which it is lived in the concrete: this seems to many not to fit in with the realities and rhythm of modern social existence. Evidence is emerging from all sides that this sort of life often locks the priest in a closed universe and cuts him off from the greater part of the world of men around him; stress is placed on the difficulties, both material and moral, that he often has in living. There is no question that these observations can be supported, but they do not for all that justify abusive generalization; the particular conditions of a Basque curate are clearly not the same as those of a curate in a Paris neighborhood. But there is unquestionably a feeling of discomfort, and in some cases—all too numerous—this contributes to certain failures, which people are rather too inclined to blame on vested interests.

Translated by Robert C. Collins, S.J., from *Christus* 12 (1965) 462-75.

In this short study, I would like to touch on only one aspect of the problem: the condition of today's priest with respect to his human situation, leaving aside the question of celibacy, which calls for a special and different consideration.

Various factors in human balance

Every human being, in order to enter as fully as possible into his concrete existential situation, needs what can be called a minimal assurance about his personal self-awareness, i.e., about his "value-before-others." This is an unspecified need which in some way conditions the entire emotional development and its outcome. By the word *value* we mean here existential value, which is altogether fundamental, and not the successful development of some particular aptitude. Clinical experience indeed often shows us patients who are superior in one branch of activity and are recognized as such, but who suffer deeply in their relational life in general from a neurotic lack of assurance about their "right to exist autonomously."

A first aspect of this necessary minimum balance consists in a certain interior autonomy with respect to parental images. To be sure, the choice of a professional career, of a "vocation" in the broad sense, is always profoundly influenced by childhood relationships. The son of a doctor will be a doctor or a non-doctor; and the image parents have of their son, even before his birth, conditions to a great extent the development of this son and his final orientation. But it is necessary that this conditioning be a point of departure, so to speak, and not a prison; otherwise, he will not live his professional activity as really his own.

As for the priesthood, it seems undeniable that in practice the maternal image has more influence on the subject than the paternal. This raises further very complex and delicate problems: one often sees patients very uncomfortable in their existence because, as the expression goes, it is "their mother who has the vocation."

A second aspect of this balance, and a corollary to the first, is found at the level of relations with authority. To be adequately in harmony with himself, a man must be able to obey the orders or directives that his leader gives him without thereby being diminished in the perception he has of his own existential value.¹ In other

¹ One always has a boss, even if he isn't officially listed as such. An artist's client, for example, is in a certain sense his boss.

words, a normal and satisfying relation to authority thrives on the mode of freely granted approval, while the mode of "submission" always runs the risk of prolonging infantile dependence or bursting into revolt.

In the current concrete circumstances of the priestly ministry, the relationship to authority is very often badly structured. There are symbolic factors involved which are sometimes very questionable. Moreover, the properly supernatural level of action of the minister is often not properly distinguished from a "sense of the sacred" which is more or less magical; and this causes rather deep wounds to the indispensable hierarchical organization.

A third aspect of the balance is the normal feeling of having influence, which connotes the vital experience of having one's own value verified by the establishment of a controllable result of one's action. It is as necessary for life as food. Usually the verifiable result of personal activity is simultaneously a work accomplished—not necessarily material, of course—and, for the adult, the gaining of his livelihood. This involves the recognition by others of the quality of the action, which is first acknowledged in itself, and then paid for. Whatever the job may be, if it has an established social significance it has in itself this value of verifying the fact of personal influence. But this is not enough; for the feeling of influence to reach its usual fullness it is necessary for income to make tangible, in a way, the relation to others in which the job consists. Money earned expresses and symbolizes the exchange that has been accomplished, the recognition by the other of the value of one's activity; moreover, the one who receives it gains through it a growth in his autonomy and interior liberty. He no longer has the feeling of depending, but of taking part.

To be sure, balance is something that must constantly be reestablished. Dependence may be unconsciously sought for; desires for power or possession are always ready to burst forth. There is no doubt that there is much ambiguity about the idea of poverty: it can mean, to use the common expression, "to sponge on" someone or a community. On the other hand, the fear of losing, the fear of going without, can imperceptibly lead to the possessive accumulation of things, or, by emotional compensation, to sometimes very profound and strangely structured frustrations. Does not the virtue of poverty

consist in the attitude of the mature man who *disposes* of his activity and his income in and for the sake of interpersonal relations, with the knowledge that temporal values are perishable but nonetheless positive at their own level?

In the contemporary structure and exercise of the priestly ministry, there is no doubt that this problem of occupation and money is crucial. Before reflecting more at length on this, it will be of some use to point out that this setting up of a balance by job and money is inseparable from other aspects of a favorable personality development—most specifically, the possibility for the subject to establish sexual relationships spontaneously. This means that in all the varied situations of life a man reacts in a way that “admits there is such a thing as woman in the world,” that he does not, in the face of this fact, feel threatened with inferiority or overcompensate for this threat by an attitude of domination. It is precisely to the degree that a man has attained this emotional maturity that he can get along without sexual relations, if he considers this to be necessary for the activity he has chosen.

Our time is unquestionably characterized by the fact that western civilization, predominantly masculine up until now, is tending to become a civilization of the couple, where the woman in finding her place, a place which is both special to her and of equal value precisely because of her distinctiveness as feminine.

In secular terms, the priestly ministry is organized as a structured celibate group. This is not the place to analyze the reasons for this, or to sift some of them out eventually, but it should be very clear that this strictly unisexual character is a complex problem related to the insertion of the priest as such into the contemporary social context. Although these problems are distinct, they impinge very strongly on the one which occupies us here: a job and money.

Different forms of insertion in the world

It is in this very broad framework that the contemporary question of the insertion of the priest in the human world arises, for the historic conditions of this insertion have changed considerably over the course of centuries.

St. Paul worked, and worked for his living. He declares quite explicitly that he did this so as not to be a burden to the church he founded. At the other end of history, we have seen Roman authori-

ties in 1958 condemn the work of priests, or more exactly certain aspects of this work; and this interdict was based on an argument which rang false, for instead of bringing out the risks (which had not been clearly seen) involved in the very particular problem of the priest-workers, it seemed to call into question the very idea of the work of a priest as an occupation.

Now at the beginning of the Church's history, the authorities occasionally reminded priests that they should work like other people and have a job, so as not to be parasites. As a matter of fact, in our own time, there are a number of priests who are professors of mathematics or Greek, or organizers of commercial enterprises (pilgrimages, publishing, etc); and this bothers no one because it is not considered a job but as "marginal" activity, even if it takes up three-quarters of the priest's time. As for money, that is not spoken of, and its circulation or use are not public.

In this curious state of affairs, it is not surprising that many priests in the ministry these days feel themselves to be in a bad situation and complain that they have to live by "expedients." Perhaps it is necessary, then, to reflect a little on the history of the priesthood.

At its very beginning, the Christian priesthood, following the example of our Lord, was directly opposed to levitical clericalism, that is to say to the priestly class of professionals in the cult and the Law, not as a new class but as a reality beyond the notion of class.

But rather quickly it became organized in a similar manner. And in the western world at least, a new caste was established, strongly structured around the priesthood and the cult. This is an infinitely complex phenomenon, but one which we definitely must take into account. Under the influence of historical factors, thinkers like St. Augustine, and popes like Gregory VII, there came into being under the name of clergy a social force of considerable importance, which was both inevitable and necessary. Barbarian invasions, the disorganization of the Roman empire, the confusion of a struggling world, the ignorance of the masses—all this required a regrouping around a "strong point." And the only one available was the western Church, whose head, the bishop of Rome, quickly came to think of himself as heir to the emperors.

For a long time the Church was the only firm structure, and there was complete intermixture of the temporal and spiritual power. Those who participated in its government and its hierarchized functions were the "clerics," that is, those who could at least read; the rest were "lay," that is, those who did not know how to read. This is the sole origin of these two words—and one can see, we may say in passing, that in the twentieth century they no longer have any meaning (although we do still speak of a notary's "clerk").

Gradually the area of military power came to belong to another structure, the nobility. Then, starting at the end of the Middle Ages, a very slow movement got under way which would structure political and administrative power independently of Church structures. The famous incident of Boniface VIII and William of Nogaret provides the symbolic beginning of this. But on the eve of the French revolution, when the king convoked the general estates, there were three great orders which represented the nation: the nobility, the clergy, and—the remainder had as yet no name; they called it the third estate, the "third force."

Soon something began to move; a break was being made. This "third force" was no longer a heterogeneous mixture of minorities and uneducated people. It was no longer willing to let itself be dominated; it intended to take part in the nation's affairs on an equal footing. A bloody struggle was inevitable; and royalty, nobility, and clergy paid the price for it to the extent that they failed to understand it.

The laity no longer exists

But not everything has even yet been straightened out. Though the nobility declined more and more during the nineteenth century to a purely symbolic role, ecclesiastical structures persisted. Napoleon restored them for a clearly political purpose—something which did not help matters. It took, on the level of the western Church as a whole, the suppression of the Papal States in 1870 and in France the separation of Church and state at the beginning of our own century to make progress irreversible. The desire for temporal control, the "temptation to power," were finally out of the reach of the priests. But the passionate and violent reactions provoked by these two events show how deep was the confusion between the temporal role of the clergy, with its roots in the past, and the priest's apostolic

mission. This "temptation to rule," moreover, reveals itself on every occasion. Was there not a subtle and unconscious "clericalism of the left," as they call it, in the priest-worker movement, which would explain the fact that some individuals were led astray by Marxism? And do not certain Catholic Action chaplains have the tendency, without recognizing it, to set themselves up as "clerics" who are the directors of the "laity"?² The dialectic which tends to re-establish a levitic type of caste has not been resolved and constitutes a permanent danger.

"All this leads to the simple conclusion that for a young man in 1750, 1830, and even 1900, to "enter the clergy" had some meaning as a well-established social qualification. For the young man of 1965, it no longer has any practical meaning (except in certain rural areas which have remained "traditional," or for certain families from closed environments, becoming fewer and fewer, that live in nostalgia for a bygone age). In the last century, to be an "ecclesiastic" was to have status, a word which expresses very well the psychological significance of the job. One entered a bureaucracy and made his career there. In our days this illusion has been dispelled; to be an "ecclesiastic" no longer is a job giving status. Or if there is still some belief in this, it is in a closed, very restricted world, which tends unconsciously to reconstruct perpetually, in residual islands more or less completely cut off from the real world of people, the structures of a society of another time. This does not often pass without mockery.

Such, it seems, is one of the fundamental aspects of the contemporary feeling of discomfort. The world has changed. Western civilization is tending to change to a structure in which every adult is recognized as such. Progress in knowledge and culture have been considerable. A young person who wins his diploma knows infinitely more things than the greatest of the sixteenth century savants. But the Church, in its structural expression of itself, has hardly changed at all until John XXIII. The history and meaning of wearing the soutane, to take only one highly symbolic detail, would be interesting to study from this point of view. There are still to be found,

² In my opinion, it is impossible to ignore the psychological fact that a man who does not "run" a family, easily tends, if he is not careful, to "run" something else as compensation. Some elements of an insertion into a society other than that of the priesthood could help avoid this attitude.

more often than one would think, ecclesiastics who are *unable* to renounce the constant wearing of a costume which is as distinctive as can be without losing the sense of their own existence; yet a military officer or lawyer in contemporary garb still feels that he is a military officer or lawyer.

The laity, in the original sense of the term, no longer exists. Every one is a cleric, that is, knows how to read, at least. Real illiterates are rarer and rarer, and even those who cannot read newspapers listen to the radio, and, in the last ten years, watch television.

In modern society, the priest can no longer be the cleric, that is, have a monopoly on culture and knowledge. Moreover, it is often the case that he has been kept at a cultural level which, while it was perhaps superior in the nineteenth century, appears in our time as old-fashioned; this is particularly evident in the area of philosophy, for example.

Would it be out of place, then, to pose clearly the following question: since being a clergyman is no longer a staturesd position in our modern world, and since the priesthood has been returned to its true and full function of expressing the mystery of Christ, should not the modern priest, in order to be fully a man and hence fully a priest, have a job like other men by which he would live no longer by "expedients" or alms but according to a personal budget—as did St. Paul?

Insertion in the world possible today

In the world of another age, the cleric filled a positive social function which contributed to build up and keep alive the human community organized according to a certain arrangement. And this function—which corresponds to the notion of job in the broad sense—was not separated from the competence which the clergy could have as promoter of the word of God. To give only one example, education could be conducted only by clerics, or under their guidance, for the very simple reason that there was no one else to do it. And it is the very advancement of culture, which is the secular accomplishment of clerics or religious, that has in a way reversed the situation. From now on, clerics as a group—secular or religious—no longer fulfill social functions at the level of city organization. It is the former "laity" who watch over its various aspects. And this is done in such a way that the modern priest is recognized to have

no other competence than as promoter of the word of God and the sacraments. On the level of his own reality and insertion in the world as a man, he finds himself all the more diminished since he has most often been conditioned to a certain image of the cleric which no longer has any meaning in the real context of the contemporary world.

He must therefore find a new social significance, a new human competence, which will permit him to be a man among men, to be recognized as such, in order to be able to make himself heard as a promoter of the Word. Moreover, this is a part of his priesthood itself: the priest of Christ is not an esoteric magician, but a recognizable witness to the Incarnation of the Word. It is part of his vocation to participate actively in the human and social life of the time. If to be a cleric is no longer a job, he must, if he is to be fully a priest, have some job which has human value and permits him to make this personal contribution to the concrete existence of the world in which he lives and to which he is especially commissioned to bring the Word of salvation.

We must not try to ignore the fact that this poses delicate problems. Certain jobs are incompatible with the priestly ministry for practical reasons. One can hardly picture an overburdened surgeon having the necessary time. But some other specialist? A worker in business? A craftsman? This leads us to reflect along lines which, if they are not now practical, are at least capable of becoming so. And we must not deny that these reflections could lead to conclusions calling for considerable changes.

If we admit in principle that the priest of today should be freed from his illusory situation as "cleric" or "ecclesiastic," how is it going to be possible to choose and promote a human situation which will not only be compatible with his priestly ministry, but even assure the necessary human supports for its exercise? In other words, what are the criteria for the choice of a job for the future priest?

First of all, it would be completely wrong to generalize, or rather, more precisely, to impose uniformity. For there are very diverse styles of priestly ministry. The lecturer or specialized preacher who devotes himself, for example, to translating and disseminating the progress of exegetical study for the service of a better understanding of the Word of God, is in that very way doing his job as exegete

and popularizer. But what about a curate in a slum or in a large city parish, who has a very different role? On reflection, moreover, it appears that the former does not need to be a priest to play his part in the spreading of the Word; while the special role of the latter consists precisely in being a priest.

It has traditionally belonged to the priest to offer the Holy Sacrifice, to preach, and to preside at prayer. These are the only *specifically* sacerdotal functions: sacramental life, preaching, religious expression. It is in no way, in itself, priestly to organize neighborhood social services or vacation camps, nor to handle the business aspects of a marriage or funeral ceremony. Would it be too much to envision and hope for an organization of Christian communities radically different from what we have known up to now, an organization which would set free to the greatest possible degree what is specific and supernatural in the role of the priest? This could not come about, of course, without paying the price of considerable progressive reform.

Let us suppose, as a working hypothesis, that this has been accomplished. How can the twenty-first century man who wants to be a priest—or who is at least willing to be one—structure his existence from the point of view that we are studying: job and money?

The priest and professional

We can immediately point out four central themes in our search for the norms for this. First of all, it would be necessary to study, together with the subject, his aptitudes and tastes, and take them into account as far as possible. To begin with, a good methodical professional orientation, in the most modern sense of this term, will be necessary. It is indispensable that the future priest find in the exercise of his job the minimum of affective satisfaction, of human self-realization, that the clerical condition would not be able to bring him.

Second, it would be necessary to take into account, according to the concrete situation as it appeared under examination, the real possibilities for exercising the sacerdotal ministry within the framework of existence in which the job would actually be lived. There is the whole problem of the length of the work and its time schedule; that is, the problem of time. But it is also the problem of liberty of spirit; the job should not be too absorbing—though we must not for-

get that the capacity for totally changing one's attention and activities is extremely variable from one person to another. At first glance, for example, I imagine the job of an engineer would be less absorbing, in many cases, than the position of director of a great business enterprise.

In the third place, we must reflect on a fundamental point, one which is often omitted in such discussion: the possibilities in the job for spiritual enrichment of the one who practices it. To be sure, as they say, "there is no such thing as a dull job"; which means that one can draw unsuspected spiritual riches from an activity which is apparently of no account. But one may still think that certain jobs would be more likely than others to nourish the interior life of those who practice it with a view to the sacerdotal ministry. Examples of these might be all the professions bearing on man directly: for instance, teaching, human relations, certain aspects of modern business, certain branches of medicine, scientific professions, whether research or applied—in short, all the activities which of themselves directly confront those who practice them with the mystery of the created world and the human drama. For the man of God who is a priest, it is necessary to participate as much as possible in this dynamic tension of the universe, which, according to the saying of St. Paul, "suffers the pains of childbirth"; to be concerned personally as a human subject, in this dynamic tension. His preaching of salvation and his celebration of the Eucharistic mystery would then have for him a vitally experienced meaning, and not simply an intellectual and theological significance.

Manual jobs present other problems. The present stage of evolution of modern society gives a place of first importance to the world of work. But this is a question too vast and too specialized to go into here. Let us say only that we cannot see why, in the world we live in today, the occupation of worker would not be a source of high spirituality for, ultimately, the same reasons as the other occupations.

Finally, it would be necessary to take into account certain practical factors, which are extremely variable according to the surroundings, persons, regions, social situations. How is one to settle on the residence and style of life according to the combined requirements of the job and a *truly* sacerdotal ministry? To give one

example in the concrete: it is evident that a social worker could live and guarantee his permanence as a priest only in a context radically cut off from his place of work. Otherwise he would be irresistibly limited to the dimensions of the job.

This is hardly an exhaustive treatment. But these few reflections will, I think, enable us to orient our efforts according to a resolutely realistic outlook.

Obviously, we cannot pretend to be unaware of the fact that the perspectives opened up here bring with them immediately the enormous question of the hierarchical and practical organization of the priestly ministry in a given territory. A fundamental "bureaucracy" and coherent structure is necessary. But must we not rethink it along entirely new lines, so it will not be any longer "clerical" and yet will guarantee this needed coherence?

And, since these things are all interconnected, this also brings up the basic question of the formation for the priesthood. Will it not lead to "declericalization" and to postponing ordination, which would then become as it were the supreme consecration of a man who is otherwise as fully mature as possible? This is a real reversal of outlook, but one whose necessity is already making itself felt among the younger generations. During a conference to seminarians twenty years ago, Gustave Thibon said: "In times past the priest could be satisfied to be a channel; in modern times he must be a spring."

Worse than hostile

I recall having met, several years ago in a rural and, very, as they say, "de-Christianized" tourist area, the pastor of a large village where I was camping with some friends. After morning Mass we had a rather long conversation which troubled me deeply. During the several years he had been there, we were practically the first human beings to pass through the rectory door. Often in the summer time tourists assisted at the Sunday Mass. But apart from that he saw no one. And yet the people of the village were not hostile. Not at all. But they did not see him. Not that they pretended to ignore him; it was much more serious than that. In all good faith, for these people, who lived a rather hard life, this man did not exist. They hadn't become aware of his existence. For the pastor the situation was worse than hostility; when people tell you lies or

pick quarrels with you, at least you know that you exist for them. Literally in misery, this poor middle-aged man made some money by selling to tourists passing through a folding map of the region and a perpetual calendar he had invented. It seemed clear that if he had worked at a job among his people—butcher, veterinary, or farmer—the situation would have been very different. And knowing him as a man, the villagers would one day have discovered him as a priest.

Examples like this make us realize to what degree even the rural world of our time no longer resembles the world of the “old days.” Ecclesiastical structures have been seriously brought into question: being a cleric is no longer a position or a profession or a job.

How in time to come can we work out the necessary hierarchical structures of the priestly ministry to accord with these changes? Could we not speak of worker-priests, locksmith-priests, professor-priests, employee-priests? . . . Thus would the clerical prison be broken and the Church would appear with a living face.

This immense work will belong, let us hope, to the coming decades.

THE CONCERT:

Oratorio for a Season of Wrath

1

She gave him milk and incidental comfort,
a mat for his wintered bones, a cloak
to hide him from the night. He slept.
She came to him across the tawny carpet
and drove a tent stake through his brow,
straight through until it rooted in the ground.
So perished Sisera at a woman's hand.

Nothing much has changed; the reedy fiber
of survival springs armed warriors out of stones.

I read the other day about a woman clothed
in virtue and a football helmet—
naked as truth, in a football helmet—
alone, she thought, in splendor at her laundry.
A muffled cough: alas, the gas man cometh,
(elders concealed to read Susannah's meter?)
he shuffled, blushed, summoned the word of prayer:
'Geez, lady, I sure hope your team wins.'
Violence is everywhere, survival knows its code.

In South Hadley there are never suicides
and only rarely murders. Small New England towns
preserve identity, define the subtle landscape
of the mind, discard irrelevance of blood.
Weather is expected to be poor where love
dies from unconcern. Yet anger pulses in the trees
like music, houses and the tired clutter
of the long stone walls conceal their violence,
their overcivilized façades. No suicides
and only rarely murders; death is by innocence.

The civil heart rejoices in its sinew, anger.
 Without this sustenance, no longing and no subtle
 aphrodisiac of scorn. A woman clothed in wonder
 at her laundry wields an eye of weapon terrible
 as swords. Survival by counterpoise: armed
 warriors and the broken flowers of her hand.

2

Galaxies are big. Ours for instance,
 one hundred thousand years for light
 to pass across, ten thousand to pass through.
 That big. They now and then explode.

Paradigm for lesser worlds (South Hadley,
 any small New England town, a single mind);
 whole galaxies have disappeared forever.

Lesson: the local curvature of space,
 dependent on the mass of matter skulking
 in the area, can ultimately close around itself—
 isolate as any nervous breakdown—
 provided that its density is high enough.
 It sometimes is, and then
 $2GM/c^2$ —matter disappeared from view.
 With a bang. Energy enclosed portends
 spectacular explosions. Class dismissed.

There is a law perhaps that helps explain
 why dissolution keeps the chamber of the heart,
 why persons most themselves set sparks
 to a tinder world and constellations disappear.
 One hundred thousand years have kept their silence.

3

We met a little beagle
 and we beat his insides out
 with one great clout
 on his beagle skull.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

4

In our cellar where my father paints
his witness to an ordered world—

my mother paints her private revelations
where trees shed night with a long sigh
and roosters summon dawn unseasonably white—

there is a respite from the law of things.
No television and no tent stake through the brow.
Only bicycles and hunting clothes and books.

(Recall though how Aunt Anne survived
the pressure cooker by a narrow margin;
how then escape the cellar boiler?)

5

But I, alas, whom love forgets
have sat beneath this willow tree
where in my heart sad time begets
maggots.

She sobbed a little and smoothed her hair;
examining her crimson nails, she sighed
and crushed an orchid on the morning air
as her dream died. Thus more maggots.

Cursed from its cradle, earth
has always tended to December:
antinomy and paradox and maggots
breeding in the ripened flesh.
Breughel knew. His cosmos playing
hopscotch in a village square,
hoops rolled against a wand of madness,
peasants dancing to unjointed music
of the spheres. Rejoicing follows
knowledge and forgetting.

I remember being human once.
It was, yes, April and the window
seemed to promise only Easters,
only resurrections from a painless
death. That was before I made
the offer. I remember it. A moment
caught between two silences.

Another start, another formulation
of survival. Even flowers violate
the rock and how shall I, tasking
of your nine month patience, not lance
the inner womb and force my birth?

Well enough to sing at summer matins
'I don't care if it rains or freezes
Long as I got my plastic Jesus
Sittin' on the ol' dash board';
there strikes an hour when innocence
reels drunken with the serpent's milk
and then the tongue will out and speak
the unforgivable. Love and destruction.

Everyone hates me, he complained,
my parents, the Ford Foundation, the dog
around the corner. Everyone. And I
loved him, black and beautiful
and full of pity for himself that he was
black and beautiful. He hated me
for loving what he could not love.

Survival is a death. Ask Lazarus.
Each casual day a tent stake
through the temple roots us firmer
to the earth, the windowfly becomes
our selves, its green head ground
to metaphoric dust. We tend
as always to become what we attack.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

6

Forget. Forget. Put out your Pentecostal
fires and welcome back the long night
of our race. Milk and comfort are a way
to grasp survival. Racked on the dry wheel
of your affections, every pleasure tasted,
thirst alone will slake your thickened soul;
that cancer at your heart will finally win.

May all your enemies perish thus, O Lord.
Take them by the heels and dash their brains
against the wall. We are composed for prayer.

JOHN L'HEUREUX, S.J.

© John L'Heureux, S.J., 1967

ADDRESS AT FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

PEDRO ARRUPÉ, S.J.

I MUST FIRST OF ALL THANK Fr. McLaughlin for the warm kindness of his introductory remarks. It is, I assure you, my distinct pleasure to be with you at Fordham once again, after the passage of, alas, too many years. But I should add that the cordiality of your greeting leaves me somewhat breathless. After having at least cooperated in the decision which unceremoniously robbed you of two such splendid men as your former president and rector, Fr. Vincent O'Keefe, and your distinguished professor of ethics, Fr. Andrew Varga, I half expected quite another sort of welcome from you!

In the same vein, I confess I was not entirely consoled at the historical coincidence which one of your Jesuit historians pointed out to me: that we celebrate, in 1966, the four hundredth anniversary of the arrival on American shores of the first Jesuit to land here. His name, too, was Pedro, Fr. Pedro Martinez, but the natives seem to have been considerably less kind to him than you have been to me. They lost little time before proceeding to strangle and club him to death!

But we celebrate another anniversary today: our theme is a glad one, "Fordham: The University in the American Experience." That

This address by Father General was delivered at Fordham University's 125th Anniversary Convocation on April 5, 1966. All quotations are from two documents of Vatican Council II: *The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* and *The Declaration on Religious Freedom*.—Ed.

theme, I suggest, is remarkably appropriate for an American, Catholic, and Jesuit university, in an epoch which will probably go down in history as "the age of Vatican II."

For, comparing that Council with its predecessors in history, it is striking how clearly it manifests the Church's own care to scrutinize, attentively and sympathetically, how contemporary man "experiences" his world, and his own meaning in that world. Never before does she seem to have made so determined and protracted an effort to "recognize and understand the world in which we live."

That world, the Council notes repeatedly, is boiling with the dynamism of change. Psychology, history, anthropology, the whole array of sciences so invite contemporary man to "see things in their mutable and evolutionary aspects," that mankind in general has gradually passed from "a static concept of reality to a more dynamic, evolutionary one." We can, in our time, quite literally speak of having entered "a new age of human history" in which industrialization, urbanization, and a host of other factors are day by day creating a "mass culture" bringing in its wake "new ways of thinking and acting."

The Church acknowledges the deep-seated problems which inevitably attend such radical changes. But significantly, she prefers to dwell on the positive features of our changing world. Not only has man's experience been altered in the past few centuries, but that alteration represents in many ways a significant advance, a "growing awareness."

The special focus of modern man's awareness has been the dignity of the human person, but it has taken time, indeed "centuries of experience," for human reason fully to acknowledge the exigencies of human dignity. Here too, the history of modern man represents a "growing discovery" of the rights which flow from his personal dignity, accompanied by a "growing consciousness of the personal responsibility that every man has." The Church rejoices at this "mounting increase in the sense of autonomy as well as of responsibility." She judges it to be "of paramount importance for the spiritual and moral maturity of the human race" that day by day more and more "men and women are conscious that they themselves are authors and artisans of the culture of their community."

Ours, then, is a changing world; a time when man's consciousness

of his dignity and freedom is constantly maturing; a time when man feels increasingly responsible for the progress of his world.

But, why, one might ask, this sustained effort of attention to the world of modern man's experience? Obviously, the Church in Council is anxious to revitalize the dialogue between herself and the world—but on what terms? Is she searching merely for a new language, a new way of communicating ancient, timeless truths to men of these latter days? She defines her perennial task as that of "scrutinizing the 'signs of the times' and of interpreting them in the light of the Gospel." But the care she brings to her study of the modern world suggests that this relationship may be reversible. Could it be that the "signs" of each succeeding time in history may cast new light upon the Gospel message itself? Do the various faces of the changing world reveal, in some measure, the changing face of Christ? Do they stimulate the Church to draw out of her ancient treasure "things both old and new"?

This is precisely what the Church is saying when she proclaims herself "truly linked with mankind and its history by the deepest of bonds." She does not merely stand off and contemplate the march of history, she puts herself squarely inside the historical picture.

Quite literally, she "goes forward together with humanity and experiences the same earthly lot as the world does." She needs the "ripening which comes with the experience of the centuries." She is "enriched by the development of human social life." She profits from "the experience of past ages, the progress of the sciences, and the treasures hidden in the various forms of culture" from every quarter of the globe and from every period of history.

Change, dynamism, history: these are not merely features of the world about her, they are the inner tissue of the Church's own reality. Enmeshed in solidarity with a historically progressing mankind, she points to the fact that the very message of salvation which God speaks to her is "spoken according to the culture proper to each epoch," that she must accordingly use the discoveries of various cultures and the diverse philosophies they generate, not only to express, but even to examine, to understand ever more fully the Word God speaks to her, to penetrate ever more deeply into the riches of the constitution given her by Christ.

This is ultimately why she insists that the entire people of God

remain alert, "to hear, distinguish, and interpret the many voices of our age"—voices, not only of pastors and theologians, but of "men of every rank and condition," of "those who live in the world" and specialize in various fields of human learning and activity, even of "those who oppose and persecute" the Church. Not only does she urge her children to judge those voices in the light of the Gospel, she suggests that they take the opposite tack as well, and strive to discern what those voices can contribute to the deeper penetration, fuller understanding, and more vital presentation of Christ's word to the world.

What the Second Vatican Council clearly implies, therefore, is that the Church not only passes judgment on, but *learns from* the "signs of the times." Those signs aid her to discern more fully the riches of the Gospel in whose very light she passes judgment. She learns not only *about* human history, but *from* it; and from it she learns in significant measure what she interiorly is, what her nature, what her mission is.

But all of this is founded on a mighty act of faith in the secular, human world as the arena of God's unceasing activity. The same belief that once led St. Ignatius to "seek God in all things," inspires the Church anew to "decipher authentic signs of God's presence and purpose in the happenings, needs and desires" of the "men of our age." This means that she sees the world as God's world, bathed in the light of Christ, who even before the Incarnation, "was already in the world as the 'light which enlightens every man.'" She sees mankind in its totality as "constantly worked upon by the Spirit" Who "fills the earth" at the same time as He leads the People of God.

This is why she can affirm that believers, of every age and stamp, forever hear God's voice "in the discourse of creatures," that unbelievers, when they labor "with a humble and steady mind" to "penetrate the secrets of reality" are led "by the hand of God."

This vision of the world assures the Church that the Spirit who "directs the unfolding of time and renews the face of the earth" charges the word of believer and unbeliever, the discoveries of human culture, indeed, the entire scroll of secular history, with power to illumine "God's design for man's total vocation."

This, then is the vision, which assures her she can learn from the world.

The faith underlying that vision is an ancient one. Nevertheless, the Second Vatican Council's affirmation of that faith is fresh with the spirit of renewal. The Church admits quite openly that not too long ago views like evolution, values like religious liberty, hopes like that of building a better world for man to dwell in stirred more suspicion than responsiveness in believers and theologians alike. Those who took such views and values seriously often felt obliged to turn their backs on a Christianity which seemed hostile to them. We believers must admit our share of responsibility for the "critical reaction to religious beliefs" which often accounts for "the birth of atheism" in the hearts of our fellow-men.

But such hostilities are, hopefully, in the past. Instead of bewailing the difficulties involved in reconciling the truths of faith and the progressive discoveries of science, the Church reminds us now that such difficulties can "stimulate the mind to a deeper and more accurate understanding of the faith" itself. Instead of harping on the "unfortunate results" of cultural currents which so easily can turn into atheistic channels, she prefers to warn us that such results "do not necessarily follow from the culture of today, nor should they lead us into the temptation of not acknowledging its positive values."

However frequently in the past the values of human dignity, freedom, and autonomy may have been deprecated as *merely* secular, *merely* natural values, the Church proclaims "by virtue of the Gospel committed to her" that these are "values proper to the human spirit," that they "stem from endowments conferred by God on man," that they have "roots in divine revelation" and hence deserve more conscientious respect from Christians than from others.

Hence she urges her children to collaborate with the "dynamic movements of today" which foster those human values and strive to build an earth where they can find home and native air. The Church would have her children share "those noble longings" which inspire "the human family to make its life more human," and "render the whole earth submissive to this goal." We must show in acts that the religious character of the Christian's mission makes him not less, but more, indeed, "supremely human."

Our lives must witness that Christianity does not reproach man his ambition to "build the earth" as though he were setting himself as a "kind of rival to the Creator." On the contrary, the "triumphs of

the human race" are a telling "sign of God's grace and the flowering of His own mysterious design." The Church sees man's rightful autonomy not as derogated, but actually "re-established—and strengthened" by the original divine commission to "subdue the earth, develop himself" and make the earth a "dwelling worthy of the whole human family."

Human dignity, human freedom, and the noble task of building the earth: the time has passed when Catholics might speak of these as merely human, merely secular ideals. The Church has made her attitude unambiguously clear: they are authentically Christian values.

But in taking this stand, the Church has also proven her capacity to learn: she has learned from modern and contemporary man's experience.

But more particularly, she has learned from that school to which the contemporary world owes so much: the American experience.

For without the American democratic experiment, dedicated to the proposition that "all men are created equal" and "endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," how much longer would it have taken the world and the Church to recognize how sacred and central these rights must be, not only to the developed human sense, but to the Christian sense as well? Without the American experience of religious pluralism, how much longer would we have had to wait for the recent Council's *Constitution on Religious Liberty*?

That document is highly regarded. With a fraternal pride I know you will not hold against me, I salute with you the role of that patient, strong, and courageous thinker we have with us here today, Fr. John Courtney Murray. It really represents the peculiar contribution of the entire American people; it puts the seal on a central strand of experience itself.

But what is true of the Church's renewed affirmation of religious liberty and human dignity, is true as well, *mutatis mutandis*, of her rededication to the task of "building the earth" into a better home for man. For this creative dynamism has been, since the frontier days, the very tissue of America's unique national adventure. From this pioneer people the entire world has learned to take that task seriously, envisage its possibilities imaginatively, attack it ingen-

iously, so that each succeeding generation may hope to leave the material world which God created "very good," an even better place than they found it at their coming.

From the modern world, and from the American experience, the Church has, I repeat, learned. She will, and, as must Fordham University, continue to learn from that experience—to learn from it, but also to contribute to its healthy development.

I cannot here envision the task of sketching the lines your learning, and your contribution, must follow. Even the Church in Council claims at times to set forth only "certain general principles" drawn from the word of God "without always having at hand the solution to particular problems." At points she feels obliged to leave her program "but a general one . . . and deliberately so, given the immense variety of situations and forms of human culture" and the "constant state of development" which enmeshes the questions she is dealing with.

I can but share the modesty of the Church's attitude.

But you will indulge me if, taking my stand once again on the pronouncements of the Second Vatican Council, I propose certain "atmospheric conditions" which must prevail if your historic mission as a university—American, Catholic, and Jesuit—is to be fruitful.

The first of those conditions I can express in a single word: dialogue. The Church of the Second Vatican Council unambiguously represents herself as "stand[ing] forth as a sign of that brotherhood which [not only] allows honest dialogue" [but] "gives it vigor." Her mission requires that "we foster within the Church herself mutual esteem, reverence and harmony, through the recognition of lawful diversity"—consequently, she urges all, pastors and faithful alike, to "engage in dialogue with ever abounding fruitfulness, resolving differences not by mutual recrimination, not by thunderous anathemas hurled back and forth," but by "enlighten[ing] each other through honest discussion, preserving mutual charity."

But this same "respect and love ought to be extended" to those outside the family of the faith. Her "desire for dialogue . . . excludes no one," embraces "those who cultivate outstanding qualities of the human spirit." It even includes "those who oppress the Church and harass her in manifold ways." Both "believers and unbelievers alike" are dedicated to the "rightful betterment of the world"—and she

sees that this end "cannot be realized . . . apart from sincere and prudent dialogue."

Where better than in the halls of the university can such dialogue be fruitfully, responsibly pursued?

Where better can her theologians "collaborate with men versed in the other sciences through a sharing of their resources and points of view"? What better place for them to develop the skillful "use . . . not only of theological principles, but also of the findings of the secular sciences"?

Where better can her priests pursue the "unremitting study" to "fit [them] to do their part in establishing dialogue with the world and with men of all shades of opinion"?

What more suitable place than the university for the wider body of the faithful to learn to "understand perfectly" the "way of thinking and judging" shared by "other men of their time"; "to blend new sciences and theories and the understanding of the most recent discoveries with Christian morality and with the teaching of Christian doctrine"? Where else can her laymen learn to "act as citizens of the world," equip themselves with the "genuine expertise in their various fields" that will enable them to "take on [their] own distinctive role" and "gladly work with men seeking the same goals"?

Genuine dialogue, however, calls for the second atmospheric condition: scientific probity. This includes a respect for "the rightful independence," the "legitimate autonomy of human culture and especially of the sciences." It implies a recognition that each of the "human arts and disciplines" may and must "use its own principles and its proper method, each in its own domain." The Catholic university may well examine itself: has it always been as confident as the Church that "methodical investigation within every branch of human learning, [when] carried out in a genuinely scientific manner and in accord with moral norms, . . . never truly conflicts with faith"? Does the Catholic university really share her robust belief that the "earthly matters" which science investigates, and "the concerns of faith" all Catholics hold dear, really "derive from the same God"—that the findings of the various scientific disciplines point to the same "marvelous wisdom which was with God from all eternity,"—and became Incarnate in the Jesus of Nazareth, who speaks to us still through the continuing Incarnation which is His Church? That

confidence is an ancient one; it has always grounded the Church's unflagging esteem for faith's perennial task of seeking understanding. But never before has the Church more boldly summoned the university to renew, deepen, and act upon that ancient faith. I hope that Fordham will take the lead in answering that summons.

But if "the inquiry [after truth] is to be free, carried out with the aid of teaching or instruction," the "dignity of the human person" requires that each of us consent tactfully to "assist one another in the quest for truth." This supposes a third condition of the university atmosphere, freedom: the acceptance on the part of all that "within the limits of morality and the common utility, man can freely search for the truth, express his opinion and publish it." The Church in Council makes it peremptorily clear that "all the faithful, whether clerics or laity, possess a lawful freedom of inquiry, freedom of thought and of expressing their mind with humility and fortitude in those matters on which they enjoy competence." It goes without saying that the special locus for such freedom of inquiry has always been, and must continue to be, the university.

For the Christian university's perennial task has been to insure the awareness, the talent, and the instruments whereby the body corporate of Christianity must do its thinking, bring its faith to self-reflective understanding, and devise appropriate lines of action in and upon both Church and world. The Catholic university represents, accordingly, a most appropriate organ for the Church's perennial function of self-study and reflection. The university must be free to analyze, therefore; and analyze not only false and ungrounded attacks upon the faith, but formulations, defenses and practical orientations which, in a phrase St. Thomas used centuries ago, only bring the faith into derision. This critical function she must exercise competently, responsibly, but frankly and honestly as well.

Such freedom to study and to analyze, she requires as a university. Where such freedom fails to flower, invaluable sectors of human experience are inevitably cut away, and the dialogue the Church must continually carry on with the changing world of human culture is seriously crippled. Then the university in question is no longer worthy to be called a university. Nor is it any more worthy to be called a Catholic university.

Only when grounded on the Church's robust faith in the unity of

truth, only when functioning in an atmosphere of dialogue, probity, and freedom—only then can Fordham as a Catholic university hope to form Christians of the stamp the Church requires: “men who, on the one hand will respect the moral order and be obedient to lawful authority, and, on the other hand, will be lovers of true freedom—men who will come to decisions on their own judgment and in the light of truth; govern their activities with a sense of responsibility, and strive after what is true and right, willing always to join with others in cooperative effort.”

Only when her faculty, her students, and alumni are men of this stamp, can Fordham feel confident she has lived up to her mission: the mission of sending forth witnesses to the Church as the truly “universal sacrament of salvation.” In their attitudes and in their lives they must show forth the Church’s heartfelt sympathy with “the joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted.”

Only such witness can invite the world again to believe that the Christian hope for mankind is one with all that is deepest, truest, in what once was called the American Dream, but now has become the dream of mankind itself.

In a very special way, I rejoice with you that Fordham has fully shared that American Dream. But I rejoice and am proud that Fordham has done more than merely share it. During the past 125 years, she has always opened her doors to the poor, the underprivileged, the children of immigrants, the “huddled masses, yearning to breathe free.” In a very real sense, Fordham has contributed toward making the American Dream a reality.

God grant that as she steps out on this new era of her history, Fordham may never lose contact with that past, but deepen and broaden her contribution till her effect is felt and the light of her witness shines to the ends of the earth.

TURNING FORTY

growing old gracefully

PATRICK J. MCGEEVER, S.J.

STATISTICALLY SPEAKING, the Maryland Province is about to turn 40. This means that with the publication of the 1967 Province Catalogue the average Maryland Jesuit, from the greenest novice all the way up to Fr. McGeehee and Bro. Ramspacher, will be 40 (perhaps 41) for the first time in province history.

An organization, of course, does not necessarily grow a year older with the passage of 12 calendar months. It may even grow younger, if the older members die early and if young men enter the organization in large numbers.

But the aging of the Maryland Province may be predicted with considerable assurance, due to (1) the increasing longevity of older Jesuits, (2) the drop in the number of incoming novices, and (3) the steady trickle of younger Jesuits out of the order. The result has been that recently the Province's average age has been going up even faster than one year per each new catalogue (Table 1). Back in the halcyon days of 1950, the average age stood at 32 years, 4 months, and it was holding more or less steady at 35 in the early 1960's. Then the aging process gathered momentum. Since 1963, we have actually been growing about 13 months older with each new catalogue. With the next catalogue, therefore, we will have turned the 40 corner, perhaps never to return.

If this disturbing trend of the last few years were to continue altogether unabated, the Province would become 60 in 1985, would become eligible for Medicare in 1990, and would be found dead or doddering on the threshold of the 21st century. If it is of any comfort, the rest of the American Assistancy is just as old and even slightly older (Table 2), and European provinces are considerably further along (Table 3).

But quite aside from grim necrological musings, the 40 milestone is an unsettling and perhaps dangerous age. The business executive takes to chasing the secretary around the desk, in a last-gasp effort to demonstrate his virility. Even the man of God while he will not, hopefully, give the secretary a run for her virtue, may want to re-assess how he has been investing his time and effort to date.

If the Maryland Province undertakes such a re-evaluation (and considerations quite independent of age assure us that it will), the most relevant set of statistics is on our overwhelming commitment to the educational apostolate. The American Assistancy is more deeply involved in running schools than any other assistancy, and the Maryland Province more so than any other American province (Table 4). While European provinces have from 10% to 25% of their total membership in Jesuit schools, the American provinces generally has around 40% of its members in such establishments. The Maryland Province heads the list with nearly 50% of our total membership and a whopping 70% of our priests in Jesuit-run schools. These figures do not include those in houses for Ours, or in schools in mission areas. That would raise the percentages even higher.

As our age level goes up, and our youthful manpower goes down, the advisability of maintaining these institutions will doubtless continue to be debated. While our universities and colleges continue to be schools of reasonably good quality, they are ceasing to be Jesuit-manned schools. They use up 40% of the Province's priests, yet the Georgetown teaching faculty is now less than 3% Jesuit, and the other colleges (excepting the youthful Wheeling) have faculties around 10% Jesuit. These Jesuit faculty members, because they are older than the rest of the faculty, find it increasingly difficult to exert decisive influence on the student body (cf. Fr. Thomas Fitzgerald's remarks at the 1964 Woodstock Institute on the Society of Jesus and Higher Education in America). The various schemes for

infiltrating our own colleges (a chicken in every pot, a Jesuit in every department) which might have seemed beneath our dignity 10 years ago, may well appear beyond our capabilities 10 years hence.

The high schools, while they are in better shape as regards the ratio of Jesuit faculty, and probably as regards quality, may also begin to feel the press of age before much longer. If the old belief is true that regents are the backbone of our high schools, these schools may go into something of a decline as there are fewer and fewer regents to go around.

To look at the other side of the coin for a moment, some of the rasher current proposals for tearing down the schools and starting from scratch look just a bit silly coming from a 40 year old who is not getting any younger. While it would be sad indeed if the Province began thinking like an old man, it would be even sadder if it stopped thinking at all. And a thinking 40 year old who is moving into new fields will do so only very carefully. Or as Fr. Mark Bauer put it, the organism that survives the evolutionary process must first of all make sure it will be around long enough to do the evolving. Surely the Province would be much wiser to use at least some of our schools as a basis for new operations, rather than merely scuttling the works.

One final set of statistics may be of some interest in the re-evaluation process, and that is a comparison of the apostolates pursued by Jesuits in America and in Europe. It is generally true that the older a province is, the less of its manpower it uses in running schools of its own. And since the European provinces are definitely our elders (see Table 3 and the 3rd column Table 4), it could be that they are doing now what we will be doing some years from now—granting, of course, that the needs of the Church in Europe are not identical with those of the Church in the United States.

A comparison of Jesuit establishments here and in Europe (Table 5), then, shows an interesting pattern of similarities and differences. The number of retreat houses is roughly proportional here and in European provinces, as is Jesuit education at the secondary level and below. In higher education, however, there are extremely few Jesuit universities in Europe at present. Even the figures in Table 5, category 8, refer, in Europe, to smaller institutes rather than to

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

broadly-based colleges or universities. Another area of very considerable difference is in parish work. There are far fewer Jesuit parishes in Europe than in the United States. The fields where the European Jesuits seem to be proportionately stronger are in propaganda work, sodality, catechetical centers, writing, and publishing. In addition, they are well established in some apostolates that are just beginning to be explored here: specialized or "technical" schools (especially in Spain), social action and research centers, and student residences and centers where Jesuits come into contact with college students who are not attending Jesuit schools. To characterize the differences on the whole: European Jesuits have aimed at getting maximum results from limited manpower, and making existing manpower last longer through strictly scholarly work, while American Jesuits have been able to call on large manpower resources to assure depth in their institutions. The time may be coming when diminishing manpower will force us in the direction of the European example, willy-nilly.

Exactly what American Jesuits will be doing, and how they will accomplish their goals, is of course very problematic. But it would appear that the time is past when we can attempt to do nearly everything, merely because it is expected of us. It would further appear that large-scale planning and coordination will be indispensable to the careful husbanding of our resources. Perhaps the Province cannot avoid growing older, but at least it can grow old gracefully.

TABLE 1

AGE GROUPINGS IN THE MARYLAND PROVINCE, 1960-1966							
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Below 21	9%	9%	7%	9%	7%	6%	5%
21-30	27	25	25	24	25	25	24
31-40	28	28	29	26	27	25	25
41-50	17	18	19	18	18	19	19
51-60	11	11	11	12	14	15	16
Over 60	8	9	9	11	9	10	11
Average	35 yrs. 9 mo.	35 yrs. 11 mo.	36 yrs. 5 mo.	36 yrs. 7 mo.	37 yrs. 6 mo.	38 yrs. 9 mo.	39 yrs. 10 mo.

Source: Maryland Province catalogues of the given years.

TABLE 2

AGE GROUPINGS IN THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY, 1966												
	Md.	N.Y.	Buff.	N.E.	Det.	Chi.	Wisc.	Mo.	N.O.	Cal.	Ore.	U.S.A.
Below 21	5%	6%	8%	4%	9%	8%	8%	6%	6%	9%	6%	7%
21-30	24	25	22	18	22	27	29	29	22	23	25	24
31-40	25	20	20	22	21	19	19	18	24	22	21	21
41-50	19	19	18	19	16	17	19	16	21	17	17	18
51-60	16	19	20	23	16	15	13	18	15	17	17	17
Over 60	11	11	12	14	16	14	12	13	12	12	13	13
Average (Year and month)	39,10	39,11	41,2	44,6	40,0	38,6	37,4	39,5	39,5	39,9	39,6	39,11

Source: 1966 catalogues of the United States provinces.

TABLE 3

AGE GROUPINGS IN SOME EUROPEAN PROVINCES			
	Paris*	England**	Rome***
Under 21:	0%	4%	1%
21-30:	16	15	10
31-40:	20	16	18
41-50:	25	21	23
51-60:	21	21	24
Over 60:	18	23	24
Average:	45 yrs, 6 mo.	48 yrs, 6 mo.	50 yrs, 8 mo.

* Paris Province Catalogue, 1965.

** English Province Catalogue, 1964.

*** Roman Province Catalogue, 1965.

TABLE 4

JESUIT PERSONNEL IN JESUIT SCHOOLS: U.S.A. AND EUROPE			
	% of all Jesuits in schools	% of Jesuit priests in schools	% of Jesuits who are scholastics
United States	41.1%	58.5%	35.3%
Maryland	47.8	69.7	34.7
Buffalo	45.2	65.9	37.1
California	44.1	64.1	36.1
Wisconsin	43.3	60.0	40.4
Chicago	41.6	62.9	33.2
New England	40.2	53.0	27.6
Detroit	39.5	57.4	34.9
Missouri	39.4	58.0	33.3
New York	38.9	58.2	33.9
New Orleans	37.4	49.1	35.1
Oregon	34.4	49.7	36.5
Benelux	32.2	31.0	27.6
England	26.2	33.9	22.0
Spain	24.3**	26.6	29.7
Ireland	23.9	29.0	27.5
France	15.4	17.9	18.1
Italy	12.3	16.5	14.6
Germany	10.5	10.3	22.3

Source: *Annuario Societatis Jesu*, 1964-65.

TABLE 5

JESUIT ESTABLISHMENTS IN EUROPE AND THE U.S.A.							
	Italy	Spain	France	Brit.	Benelux	Ger.	U.S.A.
1. Society administration	5	8	5	2	4	5	15
2. Houses of formation	25	38	10	12	16	8	43
3. Pastoral work	16	12	12	22	10	15	112
4. Propaganda	6	14	1	1	10	4	3
5. Retreat houses	13	23	11	8	9	8	31
6. Primary schools	11	46	14	22	13	—	49
7. Secondary schools	11	31	14	20	20	5	53
8. Higher studies	7	33	2	2	5	—	53
9. Seminaries	4	7	—	1	—	2	5
10. Technical schools	1	21	5	—	—	—	—
11. Student contacts	14	11	11	4	3	6	3
12. Social work	4	9	3	4	7	3	4
13. Writing and publishing	2	7	8	5	8	1	6
14. Residences	38	44	31	21	11	31	21

Meaning of categories: 1. Curiae, mission bureaus, infirmaries. 2. From the novitiate to the tertianship. 3. Parishes and mission stations. 4. Sodality, Sacred Heart and catechetical centers. 5. Parish primary schools and the lower years of the *collegio*. 6. High schools and the upper years of the *collegio*. 7. Colleges, universities, institutes of higher studies, scientific observatories, night schools, adult education, labor schools, etc. (One institution will be counted several times if it provides several of these services.) 8. Minor and major seminaries, not for Ours. 9. Trade and agricultural schools, mainly at the secondary level. 10. Student centers and residences, connected with non-Jesuit schools. 11. Social action and social research centers. 12. Writers' houses and editorial offices. 13. Permanent residences of Jesuits used for various apostolates.

Source: *Annuario Societatis Jesu*, 1964-65.

MODERN RULES FOR THINKING WITH THE CHURCH

adaptation of Ignatian norms

JUAN MASIA, S.J.

THE CRISIS CONFRONTED BY THE CHURCH in the 16th century constitutes the context of the Rules for Thinking with the Church that St. Ignatius wrote as an epilogue to his *Spiritual Exercises*. He faced what we would call today the problem of dialogue within the Church. One of the conditions for such dialogue is recognizing God in every person and in the mystery of the Church in spite of their human limitations.

There are some basic Ignatian insights which might help us to meet our crucial postconciliar challenges of dialogue. However, his way of expression, which is tied up with the historical context of the Reformation times, might sound strange to the modern ear. This is why I have tried to adapt the Rules for Thinking with the Church. Since I intended to write an adaptation of the original text, I have kept the external form of a set of rules, and, at some important points, quoted Ignatius' words. They are taken from both the prologue and the epilogue to the *Spiritual Exercises* [22, 352-70].

1. To begin with, the spirit of dialogue, not polemics, should permeate our life and consequently characterize any discussion. "Every good Christian is more ready to put a good interpretation on another's statement than to condemn it as false." The spirit of

dialogue demands that, before denying another's viewpoint, we make sure that we have understood it. If a statement seems to be false, "the one who made it should be asked how he understands it." If it is impossible for us to share another's opinion, we should at least show respect for his ideas and kindness toward him as a person.

2. If Christ is the center of our life, then what unites us is stronger than what divides us. Human and Christian maturity will enable friendships to co-exist with differences of opinion. The essentials that unite us must be especially stressed in times of change and adaptation. Our unity in essentials is more significant than our diversity in accidentals. If we "bite and devour one another" we will "be consumed by one another" (Gal. 5:15).

3. Both those who propose a new point of view and those who object to it should keep an extraordinary respect for truth, along with a sincere recognition of the limitations of their understanding. The mere fact that a doctrine is not traditional and that its truth is only probable does not allow us to reject it as though it were proved false. Likewise, nothing merely probable must ever be affirmed as absolutely certain.

4. Moreover, not only the validity of the other's viewpoint, but also his good will is to be presumed until evidence to the contrary is found. In any case, to agree is often difficult. All possibility of dialogue rests necessarily upon the Christian attitudes of humility and charity.

5. When expressing an opinion within the Church, we must also respect the personal reputation of those involved. Prudence will dictate whether or not a public manifestation of an opinion is called for in a given situation. Great respect for the cultural level of the audience will prevent us from causing misinterpretations, especially when dealing with controversial problems.

6. The possibility of being wrong never disappears. No one holds the totality of truth as God holds it. This is why we should consider no merely human person as absolutely right. But, on the other hand, even those who are mistaken may to some extent share the truth. This is why we should not condemn anyone's opinion.

7. The respect due to history should make us appreciate the contribution of past generations. Each of them, learning from and

correcting the preceding ones, approaches closer to the truth. "For as the centuries succeed one another, the Church constantly moves forward toward the fullness of divine truth until the words of God reach their complete fulfillment in her," (Vatican Council II, *Decree on Revelation*, No. 8).

8. We should endeavor to correct the defects of the past while realizing our own defects. Every defect is the exaggeration of a virtue. Certain aspects of the truth are overemphasized in every age. No generation can consider itself the last one of history. While correcting the overemphasis of our ancestors' virtues we must avoid the opposite errors. The result for the whole of mankind will be a better approach to the truth.

9. As far as possible, we should make sure that the spirit inspiring us is truly the Holy Spirit. His activity in us and His manifestation through the hierarchy are expressions of one single Spirit. For "in Christ our Lord, the bridegroom, and in His spouse the Church, only one Spirit holds sway, which governs and rules for the salvation" of men. But sometimes the Holy Spirit's suggestion to an individual person is considered with suspicion by the hierarchy. If it is a true inspiration, it will be recognized by its humble and patient attitude, accepting such troubles as a consequence of the mystery of the Incarnation prolonged in the Church. Humility, however, is not the equivalent of passivity. The individual should keep representing and asking for what seems to be more in accord with God's will.

10. Finally, we should think not only with the Church, but also in the Church, i.e., have a profound realization of our incorporation into the Mystical Body of Christ. Thus we will be "ready and prompt" to accept the consequences of the mystery of obedience in the Church. Obedience and authority are two aspects of one single mystery, namely, the mystery of docility to the Holy Spirit. Where such docility is not, there is neither true authority nor true obedience. In order that this mystery may be respected and achieved in the way intended by God and not in any other way, all the members of the people of God, laymen as well as hierarchy, must be as faithful as possible to the spirit of Christ which is the spirit of union.

A TIME OF CHANGE

*Jesuits as beneficiaries
and victims of change*

RAYMOND C. BAUMHART, S.J.

FATHER GENERAL ARRUPE, in his first speech to the General Congregation which elected him, said, "We are in a historical situation marked by transition and, as in all periods of change, everything seems to be in flux." Later in the same speech he added, "Let us not forget that we are living in a period of historical transition which, in this respect, resembles greatly the period during which St. Ignatius lived." Just as every generation hears that it is living in the most calamitous times, just as every succeeding ten years of a Jesuit's life is referred to as "the dangerous decade," so every generation thinks that it is going through a period of unusual change. Nicholas Murray Butler started the story that Adam, as things began to happen after he had eaten of the apple, said to the woman, "Eve, we're living in a period of transition."

Nevertheless, there are indications that in our day the rate of change has accelerated, the tempo of transition has become more rapid. In the physical sciences, for example, the time span between an important discovery and its successful application has been rapidly narrowing; the interval for the electric motor was 65 years, for the vacuum tube 33 years, for the x-ray tube 18 years, for the nuclear reactor 10 years, for radar 5 years, and for the transistor only 3 years.

Let me document briefly the thought that this is a time of great change by recalling some of the innovations of the past decade. It is significant to note how many of them we would have described in 1955 as "impossible."

We are witnessing what has been called a "triple revolution"; in cybernation, in weaponry, and in human rights. The cybernation revolution is being achieved by combining the computer and the automated, self-regulated machine. One relevant example is the computerized teaching machine which provides teaching programs that are adaptable to the needs of the individual student. In some ways cybernation is reorganizing our lives according to the demands of the machine.

On the national scene, Congress has made it illegal for a public institution to refuse to serve a person because of the color of his skin. For the first time in history, the American people elected a Catholic as President. Recently, many states have approved the use of tax money to pay for the distribution of birth control information and implements.

Scientists have been responsible for the most spectacular innovations, especially those connected with space. We now take it very much for granted that men can travel at the speed of 20,000 miles per hour. In electrical engineering, things are developing so rapidly that many feel a graduate engineer's knowledge and skills will be 50% obsolete in ten years. Heraclitus was right: *panta rei*.

And there have been changes—less striking but significant—in the Church. The fast before Communion has been shortened; so has the breviary. Both the breviary and the Mass are now said in the vernacular. Who would have predicted that in our age Mass would be concelebrated, and that the epistle would be read from the sanctuary by a layman. Was there a seer among us who, a decade ago, envisioned nuns picketing around the country? As a result of Pope John's endorsement of ecumenism, Boston's beloved Cardinal speaks almost as often in synagogues and Protestant pulpits as in Catholic churches. And who could have guessed that a Pope would offer Mass in Yankee Stadium? *Tempora mutantur*.

Changes there have also been in our least Society. They are meaningful to us, though hardly earth-shaking. We can trace their beginning to the day when we stopped wearing birrettas in the

refectory. Now, we have become so lax that the Brother Sacristan does the deacon's wash without priestly help. As bell-ringer at the novitiate, I recall ringing the house bell twenty-seven times each day. Now, some of our houses have no bells. Who would have thought that the Chicago province would one day purchase a Hilton Inn, thus providing the scholastics with private rooms that have air-conditioning, wall-to-wall carpeting, and music piped into the room?

Changes in the Church

Customs change. A decade ago the minister of scholastics in our theologate forbade crew cuts; today there is no minister of scholastics, and the rector wears a crew cut.

Attitudes change. In 1955 Fr. John Courtney Murray's ideas about Church and state were not covered in the *De Ecclesia* course at one of our theologates, and permission to hold a seminar about his ideas was refused. In 1960 Fr. Joseph Fichter and others who were surveying the attitudes of young Jesuits were rebuked by superiors. Today, similar work is being encouraged by Fr. General, and a Jesuit psychiatrist has been interviewing the novices of Milford for scholarly purposes.

The thirty-first General Congregation has made some historic changes; it was the first to require a second session, largely because of a record number of *postulata*—1930 was the figure I saw. This great mound of *postulata* provoked a wry comment from one of the delegates: "What can we conclude from the large number of *postulata* which the scholastics have sent in? One desire inspires them all . . . it is clear that they wanted to keep us in Rome for the rest of our lives. This is how they wished to solve all the problems of the Society."

The Congregation made it look easy to change things, even the Formula of our Institute. With dispatch, the delegates changed a long-standing regulation so that news of the Congregation's activities, which heretofore had been strictly confidential, could be released daily to the press. They also declared that it is not contrary to our gratuitous ministry to receive Mass stipends or to accept royalties, honoraria, grants, and tuition fees. They further declared that the matter of the vow not to relax poverty, which is taken by the professed, concerns only professed houses and independent resi-

dences. As a consequence, ideas about adapting our vow of poverty to the times—a topic which many Jesuits had held could not even be discussed—were prepared by a committee for the second session. The Congregation also set up norms for requesting the resignation of a general, as well as a procedure for replacing him in an emergency despite his opposition.

The individual and change

To these changes in our social and economic environment in the Church and in our Society, what is the individual Jesuit's reaction? It varies, of course. No one favors every change; cancer is a change. And no one opposes every change. Yet the typical response seems to be increased resistance to change as one grows older. That's certainly my experience. Why does man resist change? Partly because it makes him feel insecure. Over the years he has acquired a hard-earned mastery over certain problems and areas of knowledge. Knowing how to handle whatever may be required in situations which he is likely to face, he feels secure. Then along comes a change, and his habits and skills are, or may be, inadequate. He no longer feels comfortable. Threatened and consequently fearful, he is tempted to run from the change. If he cannot run, he defends himself by fighting the change. Resistance to change is less intellectual than emotional. And fear is a strong emotion.

One touchstone by which reaction to change can be predicted is its relation to one's skills and area of competence. We tend to be more favorable to change in things of which we are spectators or consumers than in things of which we are producers. The owners of wagon teams fought the introduction of canals in the early history of this country. Then the wagon drivers and canalmen opposed the coming of the railroads. Later the railroads fought the car and the airplane. But all along, those who journeyed in these constantly improving vehicles approved the changes.

If a change happens to somebody else, it's progress; if it happens to me, it's a problem. Maybe this is a double standard, but it's understandably human. The farewell message used by Mexican villagers is: "May you go with God and may nothing new happen to you." Some mornings we would welcome that greeting as we walk into the classroom or office. Yet when nothing new happens in the life of an organization or a person, the result is stagnation. A

static existence leads to a torpor of mind and spirit. Unless a man stays flexible, adaptable, by forty he can crystallize into what someone has aptly called "a young fogey." Every good change is a kind of rebirth, a sip from the fountain of youth.

Would that we could keep the resilience of youth, the capacity to learn and grow which the young display. Pediatricians have commented favorably on the large number of very difficult skills which a child develops before he is five years old. If you have ever watched an adult polio victim try to re-educate himself to walk or to eat, you know why the pediatricians are amazed at the young.

Fr. Walter Ong has suggested that a useful index of maturity is the ability to face the unknown with a modicum of equanimity; in other words, the mature man can live with change. In a similar vein, it is obvious that if a teacher cannot handle change in his own life, it is unlikely that he can prepare students to cope with it in theirs. It is very important that universities produce graduates capable of meeting the demands of changes that involve their knowledge and skills, persons who will not be imprisoned by a too-rigid education.

Change and the group

In addition to individual resistance to change, there is also group resistance. A change is introduced into a going organization, not into a vacuum. So it disrupts an entire structure of relationships. When feelings of insecurity are communicated within the group, they are intensified.

In any large organization, including a university or a religious order, individuals are gradually tied down to elaborate institutional patterns. These patterns increase their efficiency but reduce their mobility, and probably generate a bias for the status quo. Fr. Fred Henley describes this bias with the phrase, "whatever has been, will be." Such an attitude does not welcome change.

A large organization also seems to breed an intolerance of diversity. While there are reasons for all to "say the same thing according to the Apostle," there are times when it is more important for some to say different things. To encourage diversity, a certain climate is needed. My limited experience suggests that a climate which stimulates "loyal opposition" is not usually present in our houses.

Change requires innovation, to which there seems to be built-in

opposition within the Church. We can see it in certain familiar phrases. The opening words of Pope Leo XIII's celebrated encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, are rightly translated "revolutionary change." The phrase is classical, used by Cicero, and has a set meaning—which is why Pope Leo used it. The point is that, to the Roman mind, new things were suspect. Rome was conservative, and it continues to be so. As always, there is reason for the Church's attitude. The new involves the possibility of error, and error in certain matters is repugnant to the Church. Revelation, the faith handed down to the Apostles, is unchanging; there has been and will be nothing added to the deposit of faith. It is a crucial function of the Church to guard this deposit delivered to her by Christ. But there is dogmatic development, and there are new emphases in the Church's teaching resulting from social, economic, and political movements; the recent developments in her teaching about the immorality of segregation and nuclear bombing are good examples.

Of course, the Church as a social institution must, and does, adapt to the changing ways of every generation. The Church of today is a far cry from the Church of the Catacombs. But Paul Tillich may have been accurate in writing that since the Counter-Reformation Catholicism has been fighting a defensive war. There is about many Catholics, clergymen included, a touchy defensiveness, as though we are running scared. Perhaps we have not fully grasped the notion that "the spirit of Christianity must continually form itself anew and differently in each age," as Karl Rahner expressed it.

Thus far the arm-chair analysis of forces in the individual, the Society and the Church which incline most of us to resist change. Despite our resistance, it is clear that our lives will continue to be affected by innovation. There is no stopping the young or the scientists. Scientific findings will, for instance, require us constantly to revise the content and method of our teaching. It won't be long before students will have a choice between a Jesuit teacher and a teaching machine which can carry on a conversation about the material taught in some basic courses.

In the Church, the doctrine of collegiality may make some important differences in the autonomy of the activities of religious orders. Probably there will be some relaxation in the Church's laws

concerning priests who have given up priestly practice, attempted marriage, and are living as head of a family. And if you give odds, many will wager that the Church's position on birth control will be modified within five years.

Jesuits as innovators of change

Up to this point, we have considered change from the view-point of those affected by it, namely, ourselves as beneficiaries or victims. Nevertheless, much of what has been said can be predicated with equal validity about changes of which we are the agents, that is, changes which we effect. Obviously, both teachers and administrators are change-inducing agents. Let us turn to a few thoughts about the actions proper to change-inducers, for if these men perform their role effectively, there will be a minimum of resistance to the changes.

To innovate, a man must have a clear idea of the setting in which the change will take place, that is, the history of the matter and the reasons for existing rules or customary behavior. Chesterton says somewhere that no one should be allowed to tear down a fence until he knows why it was put up. Once a man is convinced of the desirability, reasonableness, and practicality of the desirability, reasonableness, and practicality of a certain change, he must decide how to bring it about. The planning should include steps which will be taken beforehand to explain the change to all involved parties, efforts to persuade probable opponents of the change, and a rough time-table.

With typical Jesuit emphasis on a logical and reasonable approach, Ours usually watch the "what" and the "why," but often attach less importance to the "how." Since much of the opposition to change is emotional, the "how" can be very important. An older member of my Province told me that the reason for an anti-liturgical attitude among his classmates was the way that an early liturgical fan tried to push the liturgy down their throats.

A person whose responsibility it is to promote change can easily agree with the sentiments voiced in the prayer: "Lord, grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, the courage to change the things I can, and the wisdom to know the difference."

This prayer leads us to some spiritual considerations. Granted the continuing fact of change, and an inclination to resist it, so what

spiritually? As the celebrated ascetical phrase has it, "Quid hoc ad aeternitatem?"

For a Christ-like acceptance of change, a person's attitude is crucial. If one has ever lived near a lake during the summer, he must have noticed, when a north wind is blowing, that one boat will sail east while another, using the same wind, will sail just as rapidly west. The boat's direction depends on the way its sails are set. A person's attitude is like the set of a sail, and change is like the north wind. Confronted by change, the person with a flexible, receptive attitude can sail closer to God. Another person, with a rigid, defensive attitude may sail away from God. The Pentecost Sequence puts on our lips this relevant request to the Holy Spirit, "Flecte quod est rigidum" (make pliable what is inflexible). The Sequence parallels inflexibility with uncleanness, ill health and inconstancy—all are apparently undesirable qualities for the spiritual man. We also pray to the Holy Spirit that we might be "re-created," and that He might "renew the face of the earth." Perhaps it is not stretching too far to refer to the Third Person of the Trinity as the "Spirit of change."

In search of a saintly exemplar of the Christian attitude in the face of change, we might choose St. Joseph. First he adjusted to Mary's mysterious and unexplained pregnancy, then to an anxious trip to Bethlehem, and then to a sudden, angel-urged excursion to Egypt. Joseph certainly displayed a praiseworthy tolerance for change.

We are sons of Ignatius. What was our father's attitude toward change? Surely he would have measured every proposed change by the yardstick of the Society's apostolic end. Will the change be for the greater glory of God? If so, then let's do it, do it at once, and do it well. *Tantum-quantum* was his rule of thumb, and he expected it to be ours. He wanted his sons to be apt instruments for the hand of God. Our changing times require instruments that are strong, yet flexible, like steel that has been annealed.

With regard to changes decreed by the Church, Ignatius told his sons to think with the Church. With regard to changes decreed by Fr. General or the General Congregation, Ignatius expected his sons to be obedient, assuming always the right of representation. He knew that his followers would vigorously oppose any changes

which they thought harmful to the goals of the Society. But once an issue had been discussed and a decision made, for or against change, Ignatius expected the members of the Society to fall into line and ride hard to implement the decision. Much Jesuit thought and discussion has centered on obedience of the will and blind obedience. My impression is that the Society's apostolic efforts would be more effective if we had more of that lowest degree of the virtue, obedience of execution.

In 1957, on the occasion of the centenary of the arrival of Jesuits in Chicago, a successor to Ignatius, Fr. John Baptist Janssens, wrote a letter to the members of the Province. In it he commended Loyola University for "providing leaders for the Church and for the legal, medical, and business life of what has now become a powerful metropolis and the largest Catholic center in the country." He also reiterated the words of the Jesuit Provincial of the Chicago area in 1857: "Remember why we go to Chicago, it is for the good of religion, the good of souls." That exhortation can serve as our yardstick for deciding whether a proposed change should be initiated or not: is it for the good of religion, the good of souls?

Fr. Janssens' successor, Fr. Peter Arrupe, directed us to prepare for change in words spoken on May 25: "This is an age of transition and change. . . . We must adapt but in an organic way, and this may take time. But we must move with confidence and with courage." To which may we all say Amen.

REPORTS

In February of 1966, Rev. Fr. Provincial John J. McGinty, S.J., appointed a number of committees to study contemporary problems facing the New York Province. Printed reports of these studies were widely circulated to members of the New York Province for their personal use. The editorial staff of WOODSTOCK LETTERS felt that it would be of some interest and use to Jesuits of other provinces if the results of these studies and the recommendations of the committees were made available. The present issue features excerpts from the reports of two of these committees: the Report of the Committee on Prayer and the Report on Communications Within the Society.

The report on prayer contains a summary of questionnaire findings on present Province attitudes toward the practice of prayer and a set of proposals for fostering the prayer life of the Province. The conciseness of the report on prayer permits us to reprint the text almost in its entirety. The second report is a lengthy and thorough document from which we have selected the summary conclusions and recommendations for improving communication. Hopefully the results of similar reports from other provinces will appear in future issues.

COMMITTEE ON PRAYER

AS A PRELIMINARY STEP in reviewing the question of prayer in the New York Province, the committee made a survey to determine what were some significant questions to put to the individual Jesuit. In this preliminary survey, a member of the committee led a discussion in each community of the Province; groups of theologians, regents and brothers worked out suggestions; written comments were invited and received from individuals. On the basis of this investigation, a brief questionnaire

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

was composed. It asked fourteen questions about conditions or factors which, in an individual's judgment based on his own experience, actually help or perhaps would help or effect his prayer. In addition, each Jesuit was invited to append further reflections on prayer in his own words. The only identification asked of respondents was self-classification in one of several categories ranging from "a novice" to "a brother with final vows" or "a priest ordained more than fifty years."

The questionnaire was sent out in May, 1966 to 1,392 Jesuits who either belonged to the New York Province or resided in its territory. A total of 773 Jesuits (56%) answered. Of these, 10 did not give answers directly to the questionnaire, and 5 answered too late to permit including their replies in the computation. Consequently, the findings here reported are based on 758 questionnaires returned. Approximately two-thirds of these returns (about 510) had reflections appended in the respondents' own words.

A breakdown of the respondents shows that replies came from the following: 40 novices, 33 juniors, 77 philosophers, 74 regents, 35 theologians not yet ordained, 38 brothers, 288 priests ordained up to 20 years, 161 priests ordained 21 years or more, 12 who failed to classify themselves in one or other of the above categories. The responses revealed the extent to which experience varied from man to man; views were not unanimous on any given question, even within a given age category. Yet, certain trends or convergences did appear. The committee's recommendations are based on the returns.

Summary of questionnaire findings

Of the 758 Jesuits who answered the questionnaire, 586 (77%) thought their prayer would be helped if they were free to determine the time of day for their own "formal prayers," i.e., private prayer such as meditation and examen. Those disagreeing were chiefly brothers with final vows and priests ordained more than twenty years. The great majority of those in other categories tended to agree rather strongly with the statement.

While 162 out of 758 disagreed with the statement that their prayer would be helped if "formal prayer" were held to a lesser amount of time than is presently prescribed, the dissenters came in greatest part from among the novices, philosophers, brothers with final vows, and priests ordained more than twenty years; regents and priests ordained less than ten years were particularly strong in agreeing that less prescribed time would help.

Almost four hundred (398) agreed explicitly with the statement that their prayer would be helped if they were held to some formal prayer every day but were free to determine the amount each day; of the 247 disagreeing with that statement, 111 came from among the total of 192 brothers with final vows and priests ordained more than twenty years.

A total of 521 expressed disagreement with the statement that "it would help my prayer not to be held to any daily formal prayer, but to be free to determine each day whether I will give any time to formal prayer," while 126 (16%) agreed.

Of the 288 priests ordained twenty years or less who answered the questionnaire, 176 (61%) thought it would help their prayer to have the reading of the Office commuted regularly to a corresponding time of spiritual reading; 88 (55%) of the 161 priests ordained more than twenty years thought such an arrangement would not help their prayer.

Though a large number (220) gave no opinion on a statement that lightening one's workload would help his prayer, three out of four (409 to 129) who answered this question said they did not think their workload was that much of a problem.

A large number (336) expressed the belief that greater freedom in choosing a spiritual director would help their prayer; while 265 (35%) of all respondents expressed no view on the matter, there was notable agreement with the proposition in some categories—novices (50%), juniors (64%), philosophers (70%), regents (69%), theologians (69%), all brothers (70%).

As to whether it would help one's prayer not to be obliged to attend litanies, two out of three who expressed an opinion thought that their prayer would be helped; only 14% of all the scholastics not yet ordained and 20% of all priests ordained less than 20 years expressed disagreement with this view, but 43% of all priests ordained more than twenty years stated they did not agree that their prayer would be helped if they were not obliged to attend litanies.

A total of 729 out of 758 felt that having a clear understanding of what it means to "find God in all things" is or would be at least fairly important in helping their prayer; felt to be quite or very important, 700.

Again, 498 viewed informal discussion of prayer and spiritual matters with other Jesuits as quite or very important for their prayer; only 67 out of 758 felt it is or would be unimportant.

Similar proportions attached roughly the same degree of importance to (a) discussion of prayer and spiritual matters, in relation to one's personal state, with a priest; (b) making the daily examination of conscience.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

Slightly less than half of those expressing a view on the actual or potential importance for their prayer of praying at times in small groups, along the lines of the *collatio* or "meditation in common," felt it would be of some importance; only 11% felt it would be very important; greatest openness to this sort of practice appeared among younger Jesuits in the novitiate, philosophy and regency.

Finally, 672 declared that the spiritual formation they received in the Society was of importance as a help to prayer.

Committee recommendations

1. That under the direction and with the interest and concern of the superior for each Jesuit as a person and an individual, he be allowed to make his formal prayer (meditation and examen) at those times of day he finds most conducive and to spend that amount of time in formal prayer which, with experience and direction, he has discovered makes him an effective apostle.

2. That superiors make it possible for the individual Jesuit, especially a brother or scholastic, to pick out freely as his spiritual director a priest who understands his needs and aspirations. In the area of prayer, group training gives insufficient attention to individual needs and graces, and it is the younger Jesuit especially who appreciates a spiritual director who makes the life of prayer relevant to his apostolate. Often such a spiritual director will be one doing the same or nearly the same work as he is.

3. That it be made possible and a matter of public knowledge that any Jesuit priest can, for good reason, obtain a long-range commutation by which he may regularly substitute a corresponding time of spiritual reading for the prescribed reading of the Office. The "spiritual reading" could be the Scripture, the liturgy, even the breviary itself, not, however, with an eye to covering the requisite pages, but with an eye to spending the requisite time reading and reflecting prayerfully.

4. That those of the Society who have influence in the matter work for an official breviary that would be shorter than the present one and better calculated for meaningful recitation and prayer (e.g., better choice and translation of hymns, less repetition, etc.).

5. That the sense in which a Jesuit can "find God in all things" be clarified through further historical study and through a sharing of personal experience, especially in conversation with fellow Jesuits. Both

the objective answers to the questionnaire and the numerous comments made when the answers or on other occasions indicate that most of the Jesuits of the Province find it very important for their prayer to understand what this phrase means concretely in their individual lives. Many feel they have not reached a sufficiently clear understanding. Our semi-monastic type of training still tends to make us dichotomize prayer and "the spiritual life," on the one hand, and work and study, on the other. As a result, we are often unsatisfied with our various personal syntheses.

6. That the Jesuits of the different communities take steps to find ways in which the community, as a community, can pray together. This recommendation, like the preceding one, corresponds to a need felt by many in the Province. However, like the preceding one, this recommendation is regrettably vague. The committee confesses to seeing no specific proposal it could recommend across the board for the whole Province.

As a form of communal prayer, the *collatio* has helped a good number, often to their surprise. But even among the scholastics who responded, over one-third thought that it would not be important in helping their prayer. The attitude of older Jesuits is much more reserved. It cannot be recommended as a form of prayer for the community as a whole. An occasional concelebrated community Mass, e.g., just before feasts, seems like a good idea, if kept optional for the individual. It would seem advisable to have more than one form of community prayer, and it does not seem necessary that there be some every day. One thing is clear: litanies do not meet the need of community prayer, just as they do not help the prayer life of the majority of Jesuits. One might add that such forms of prayer as the traditional external devotions (to our Lady, the Sacred Heart, the saints, and the various benedictions and novenas) have changed their significance for many of Ours. Some consideration must be given to reviewing this area of Christian life.

The reactions throughout the Province to the present study testify to the extraordinarily live desire of the individual Jesuits for true prayer. What underlay the reactions—as it does our recommendations—were certain convictions. We need prayer and formal prayer. Prayer is a supernatural act, primarily the work of the Spirit. "You cannot say the name of the Lord Jesus except by the Spirit." Prayer requires faith and increasing faith, which the Spirit gives. Likewise the experience of Ours brings out the teaching of Vatican II that the liturgy does not exhaust

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

the founts of Christian piety. Private (personal) prayer is also required: "when you pray, enter your room, close the door and pray to your Father in secret." The committee has neither ambition nor competence to evaluate the prayer life in the Province. But no one who has had the contacts we have had in preparing our report could fail to be impressed by the signs of genuine union with God which so many of Ours have, through God's help, worked out for themselves.

But what has been a primary obstacle to present-day Jesuits' working out their union with God and what stands before them as a primary obstacle to future development is the double standard that exists in the Society on this matter. One standard is what is officially proposed as ideals and rules: two or three hours of daily prayer, the "prayerful" reading of the Office, the "helpful" spiritual direction available from the fathers named to the post, the time order posted, and the "community prayer" of litanies. The other standard is what the majority of Ours have found by experience makes for a fruitful prayer life. What they have found is not an easier or less demanding way, but it is a more meaningful and effective way for one who is trying, in our times, to be a man of God. Incidentally, it is, in several respects, closer to the way St. Ignatius, in his times, practiced and recommended.

There has been recently a movement toward modifying the official standard (e.g., in according more freedom in choosing the hour of Mass). But the official standard still blocks and hinders the Jesuits of the Province from developing further their life of prayer. It infects conferences, exhortations, writings, community planning and discussion, consultation of superiors and directors, and even informal conversation concerning prayer. As a persistent background, it gives little help to the man working out his prayer, but rather saps his energy by giving rise to discouragement, guilt feelings, or alienation from the Society. For a few conspicuous and unrealistic prescriptions can obscure the far larger and more valuable tradition of the Society on prayer.

This is the point of all the practical recommendations above and *the* point we want to make. We urge as strongly as possible this preliminary step: that the double standard that has come to prevail in the matter of prayer be eliminated and that we face singly and squarely our real needs and possibilities. This means that those in a position to do so—including the General Congregation—exercise leadership and present only those rules and directives that promote the authentic prayer life viable for a Jesuit today. It means that each of us recognize the deep concern of the others for prayer and thereby have confidence to discuss it for-

mally and informally and to create gradually in our communities, despite our many strong differences of opinion, the atmosphere and practical conditions most conducive to prayer.

RICHARD BRAUN, S.J.
 THOMAS BURKE, S.J.
 FRANCIS FAHEY, S.J.
 ROBERT MCGUIRE, S.J.
 JOHN MILHAVEN, S.J.
 ROBERT MITCHELL, S.J.

COMMUNICATIONS WITHIN THE SOCIETY

THE WORK OF THE VARIOUS COMMITTEES formed to study different problems facing the New York Province today was defined by Rev. Fr. Provincial as being primarily educative for the rectors of the Province, and secondarily to provide information on topics which will be raised at the next session of the General Congregation and also be the subject of community discussions throughout the Province.

In specifying the particular work of this committee, the area of investigation assigned was communications on all levels, both horizontally and vertically. The committee was instructed to look into the problem of opening up internal channels of information and promoting the free circulation of ideas among Ours. It was hoped that the recommendations of the committee would lead to more cooperation between individual houses and individual projects and thus to the development of a common bond, common purpose, and common spirit, in brief, to a sense of community throughout the whole Province.

The committee met five times from February to June, 1966. The early meetings were mainly discussions of the problems of communications in the Province. Later meetings were concerned with the more practical aspects of arranging visits to individual houses to conduct group discussions and of preparing the questionnaire, which was sent to a representative sample of the Province. The final meeting of the committee took place over the weekend of June 24 to 27. The agenda for the final meeting was to assemble all the information and ideas which had been collected through the discussions of the committee, the visits to individual houses, and the returns of the questionnaire, and to plan the final report of the committee.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

Communications as the object of the study of the committee was understood as the process by which Jesuits share information and knowledge with their fellow Jesuits. In the study of this process the attention of the committee has been focused on the question of whether such sharing actually takes place and on the particular means by which it is accomplished, e.g., letters, meetings, consultations.

VERTICAL COMMUNICATIONS WITHIN THE WHOLE SOCIETY

We understand vertical communications as communications between subjects and superiors, and hence we understand this particular area to deal with communications between Very Reverend Father General and his Curia and the whole Society.

Conclusions

1. Father General has the ability to increase greatly the sense of unity and universality of the Society.
2. In the ordinary, day-to-day administration of the Society this is not achieved, in the sense that most Jesuits feel that his directives and decisions do not have much influence on their life and work.
3. In this area there is definitely a problem of generations. Means of achieving unity, which were successful in the past, as shown by the response of older Jesuits, are not as effective with younger men.

Recommendations

1. Insofar as possible, through the assistance of an adequate and competent staff, Father General should be freed from the routine chores of administration, in order that he may devote his time to the task of unifying the Society and instilling in all its members a fuller realization of the service which the Society is to render to the Church in the modern world. In this connection we strongly recommend more visits to particular areas, such as the recent visit to the United States.
2. Means should be adopted to bring Father General into closer contact with the ordinary working Jesuit.
 - a) Well in advance of the time when the consultors of each house are to write to Rome on the state of their community, a community discussion should be held with the explicit purpose of examining this question and making suggestions. The minutes of this meeting could then be sent to Rome and the consultors in

writing their reports could comment on these, as well as treat of any other matter they deem necessary.

- b) Unless there is an explicit reason for secrecy, any communications which superiors receive from Father General should be known to the whole community. Further, on occasion, Father General should write an individual letter, not a form letter, to a community as such.

3. After hearing Father General's talk at Fordham and knowing all the work which went into the Vatican Council and the sessions of the General Congregation, a letter to the whole Society on the Society in the light of the Council and the Congregation is anxiously awaited soon after the close of the Congregation. It is hoped that such a letter will be, on the one hand, more instructional than exhortatory, and on the other hand, more concerned with general principles and directions than with minute details.

VERTICAL COMMUNICATIONS ON THE PROVINCE LEVEL

This area is understood to deal with communications between the Province and Rev. Fr. Provincial. The area is divided into communications between Fr. Provincial and individual Jesuits and communications between Fr. Provincial and the works and communities of the Province.

A. Communication Between Fr. Provincial and Individual Jesuits.

Conclusions

1. Personal contact with Fr. Provincial, the opportunity to discuss their works and their personal life with him, is desired by most, but not all, of the members of the Province.
2. The need for this is felt much more acutely by the younger men, especially the scholastics, than by the older men.
3. By the very size of the numbers of men involved this is a huge burden for Fr. Provincial.
4. The present indirect means, *informationes*, consultations, etc., which are used to learn more about men, do not fill this need.

Recommendations

1. Insofar as is possible, through the assistance of as large a staff as may be required, Fr. Provincial should be freed from the routine details of administration so that he will have the time to devote to visiting the individual houses and seeing the individual men in a leisurely and mutually satisfactory manner.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

2. That the following changes be made in the order for the visitation of a house:

- a) The customary exhortation be replaced by a concelebrated Mass, with the priests free to concelebrate or not, and with Fr. Provincial giving the homily.
- b) A community discussion be held at the beginning of the visitation to consider the work of the community, its effectiveness and its needs.
- c) Personal private interviews with Fr. Provincial be optional, with the understanding that Fr. Provincial may call in anybody or everybody, if he so desires.
- d) In the course of the individual interviews the substantial points of the traditional manifestation of conscience be discussed, but informally, instead of in a catechetical fashion.
- e) That at the conclusion of the visitation Fr. Provincial give a conference on the results of the visitation and invite discussion from the members of the community.
- f) That after a suitable period of time for reflection and prayer a letter be sent to the community summarizing the results of the visitation.
- g) That such visitations should be held even in houses located in another Province, if there are a substantial number of members of the Province in such a house.

3. That the following changes be introduced in the system of *informationes*:

- a) That the questions themselves be restudied with the purpose of replacing questions that are ordinarily impossible to answer, and of introducing questions more directly suited to the purpose for which the *informationes* are being sought.
- b) That among those to whom *informationes* are sent some of the persons' contemporaries always be included, at least from regency on.

B. Communications Between Fr. Provincial And the Works and Communities of the Province

We feel it is appropriate to quote here a comparison between traditional and new directions in organization theory by Hebrert A. Shepard (*Journal of Business* 29/4 [October, 1956]):

Traditional Theory

New Direction

1. Wide Participation in Decision-Making Rather than Centralized Decision-Making

If the organization has been properly designed with rational delegation of authority and responsibility and clear and correct specification of tasks and goals at each level, the only important decision making to be done concerns major changes in the organization's course; these are clearly the responsibility of top management; in fact the whole point of organization design is to reduce the necessity for decision making at lower levels.

People resist tasks, goals and changes which are imposed upon them and show a good deal of creativity in developing methods of resistance; they want to perform tasks, set goals, and make changes for ends to which they are committed; they are committed only to the kinds or organizations which belong to them—"belong" in the sense that the members have some power of decision in areas that affect them; under these circumstances creativity is used for achieving organizational goals rather than for self-defense against organizational rules.

2. The Face-to-Face Group Rather than the Individual as the Basic Unit of Organization

The organization is a pyramid of superior-subordinate relations; responsibility and authority are delegated to individuals; no two individuals should have overlapping responsibility.

The organization is a large group composed of numerous interlocking subgroups; the interdependence of jobs must be matched by an interdependence of the organizational members; the supervisor's main responsibility is maintaining communication between the managerial group of which he is a member and the work group of which he is a member; within each group all problems affecting the group's work must be shared openly.

3. Mutual Confidence Rather than Authority as the Integrative Force in Organization

The organization proceeds on the basis of systematic order giving and checking from top to bottom of the hierarchy of superior-subordinate relations; the orders are designed to produce behavior which will contribute to the

Mutual confidence refers to a supportive atmosphere and a set of procedures which insure, on the one hand, that individual merit is recognized and, on the other, an absence of intrigue; standards of performance and

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

attainment of the organization's goals; hence obedience to authority is the integrative force in the organization.

responsible membership must be group-shaped and group-supported; however, this degree of group responsibility can be maintained only if the same degree of confidence and support exists in inter-group relations; that is the supervisor must be an effective member of both groups.

4. Growth of Members' of the Organization to Greater Responsibility Rather than External Control of the Members Performance of Their Tasks

Supervision should be production centered rather than person centered; the task is central and permanent; people are replaceable; the supervisor's job is to see that people do the job as it should be done.

If a person accepts responsibility for getting the job done, the supervisor's task is one of giving training and help rather than of policing; hence the supervisor's main responsibilities are to provide a setting in which people are willing to accept responsibility and to aid them in developing their capacities to the fullest possible extent.

Conclusions

1. By and large, Jesuits in their work feel out of contact with Fr. Provincial and remote from him.
2. Such contact is greatly desired since the decisions of Fr. Provincial are recognized as being of importance.
3. The desire for such contact is stronger among younger men than it is among older men.
4. Indirect contact with Fr. Provincial through immediate superiors has not achieved the desired result.
5. Whatever contact there is, or should be, through the Province Consultors has not achieved the desired result.

Recommendations

1. The recommendations already made in the preceding section concerning the communication of Fr. Provincial with individual Jesuits are reaffirmed.
2. We commend for the consideration of all, both those in a supervisory capacity, superiors, headmasters, deans, etc., and those subject to super-

vision, the serious consideration of the ideas presented by Shepard in the comparison quoted above. Since communication is a two-way street, these ideas have implications in both directions.

3. Since the local superior is the normal contact between the community and the Provincial and the Province, we strongly approve the regular meetings of rectors and superiors of the Province which have already begun and make the following recommendations concerning them:

- a) That well in advance of these meetings the agenda be sent each community and all members of the community be invited to submit any ideas they may have about topics on the agenda or about topics that should be on some future agenda;
- b) That, whenever an item has been presented at the request of some individual, the man who presented it be required to report back to the one requesting this on the fate of his item;
- c) That as far as possible the minutes of these minutes be made available to all members of the Province.

4. Since special groups of consultors for Fr. Provincial already exist, e.g., colleges, high schools, we recommend that lists of all such groups be published and that all be encouraged to contact them on any matter they wish discussed.

5. We recommend that consideration be given to the question of the extent to which the Province Consultors are to act as a channel of communication between the Province and the Provincial. If it is determined that this is to be one of their principal tasks, measures will have to be taken to improve the effectiveness of this means of communication.

VERTICAL COMMUNICATIONS ON THE LOCAL LEVEL

Vertical communications on the local level is understood to refer to communications between the superior and the community in local communities. This is again broken up into two parts; the contact of the individual Jesuit with the local superior and the part which the community plays in the decision making for the community.

A. Contact of the Individual Jesuit with the Local Superior

It was noted that the practice of manifestation seems to have disappeared, at least for priests. It was felt that perhaps the name is bad and creates a false impression of what is supposed to happen. The committee agreed that there should be an opportunity for the subject to

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

discuss his work with the superior, to tell the superior of the problems and difficulties he is encountering both in his work and in his personal life, to give the superior knowledge so that he can make informed decisions. In the same context it was brought out that the main burden of public relations for the institution devolves on the superior. The result is that superiors more often than not must be absent from community activities and are engaged outside the house when the community is free, e.g., in the evening.

Conclusions

1. Subjects do not question the sincerity and dedication of superiors.
2. Everybody appreciates the difficulties which superiors face in running our various institutions, which in many cases have become extremely complex business operations.
3. The consequent preoccupation of superiors leaves little time for close personal contact with the individual Jesuits of the community and this personal contact is missed.

Recommendations

1. Superiors should be given an adequate and competent staff for handling the ordinary running of the institution. If competent Jesuits are not available, then professionally trained laymen should be hired.
2. Communities should come to the aid of superiors and relieve them, as far as possible, of the onerous and, thus far, lonely burden of public relations spokesmen. On numerous occasions some other member of the community can fill a speaking engagement or attend a function as the representative of the institution, thus freeing the superior for more important business.
3. Superiors should set aside specific periods of time in which they are available to the members of the community both for granting permissions and for longer interviews concerning a man's work and personal life. Many Jesuits do not need frequent interviews, others do. Once sufficient time has been set aside, using good human sense the superiors will be able to satisfy the needs of all. This would also make it possible for men to see the superior promptly, when the need arises.

B. Community Participation in Decision-Making

The participation of which we are speaking consists of sharing with the superior the preliminary tasks of isolating the problems, gathering information, and exploring the possible avenues of solutions. If a con-

sensus develops, the superior has been greatly helped. If a consensus does not develop, then the superior must decide, but only after the community has helped him with the necessary steps preliminary to a decision.

Regular community discussion meetings were touched upon in the community discussions which the committee conducted. At Shrub Oak the committees composed of faculty and students to discuss community problems were highly praised. The need for training in communications was also brought out. The traditional means, speech work and composition, for expressing one's ideas have fallen into disuse. There is need for training in group dynamics and the elementary principles of team work. At Auriesville it was noted that there are some men who will never speak up in a discussion and, hence, that there must be a provision for written communication or private interviews to allow them to express their views. Fr. John J. McMahon called attention to an item in *Acta Romana* (14[1965]630, No. 10) in which discussions are prescribed for houses of study. He noted that this is the first official approval for discussions of any type.

Conclusions

1. There is a very widespread desire for what the faculty of Shrub Oak, in their position paper, call "meaningful participation in decision-making."
2. This participation by and large does not exist.
3. The traditional means for attaining it, i.e., house consultors, contact with the community on the part of the superior, either have not been used or have not been effective in most of our houses.
4. The community discussions held during the past year offer a highly popular means of attaining such participation.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. At least once each year there be a conference to inform the community of the financial situation of the house.
2. The following steps be taken to make the house consultors a more effective channel of communications:
 - a) The list of consultors be published, so that everyone knows who they are and also understands that, if they come to them with the request that an item be brought up in a consultors' meeting, the consultors must bring it up.
 - b) Consultors' meetings be announced to the community well in

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

advance so that everyone will be reminded of this opportunity to have their opinion or suggestion discussed.

- c) Insofar as possible, the agenda for consultors' meetings also be announced to the community and their ideas and suggestions be solicited.
 - d) When a consultor has brought up an item at the request of a member of the community he report back to the man that he has done so and, if the matter is such that the decision can be made known, he make it known, without, however, revealing the details of the discussion.
3. The following steps be taken to make the community discussions more fruitful:
- a) In each community a man be appointed to serve as the coordinator of these discussions. He should be someone trained in group dynamics or at least willing to study the subject.
 - b) The man so appointed serve as a clearing house for suggestions for the agenda of these discussions and also as a means for anyone, who does not wish to speak at the discussion, to have his views heard either orally or in writing.
 - c) Well in advance of a scheduled discussion an agenda be prepared and posted so that everybody will have the opportunity to give some thought to the topics to be discussed and to discuss them in smaller groups.
 - d) Effective means be used to keep the discussion on the proposed topics, to limit the amount of time for individual comments, and to get as many of those present as possible to participate.

HORIZONTAL COMMUNICATIONS ON THE LOCAL LEVEL

In order to avoid trying to handle too much at one time this area is broken down into three parts: teamwork, the problem of age groups and grades, communication between individuals.

A. Teamwork

The question taken up in this area is the question of the extent to which we work together to form a coordinated team in striving to attain our goals.

Conclusions

1. Although on occasion our communities work together as a team to

attain some common goal, by and large, this is not the case.

2. The knowledge we have of one another's work and the interest which we take in it usually does not exceed a polite, gentlemanly acquaintance.

3. The normal situation is that each man is given a particular task to perform and pretty well left to sink or swim.

Recommendations

1. In the process of formation some attention must be given to group dynamics and to the fact that on almost all levels Jesuits are involved in working together for common goals, in the Church, in the Society, in the Province, in each particular house.

2. Men engaged in the same type of work should meet more often both informally and formally to discuss their work, to exchange ideas, to relate experiments and methods which have proved helpful, and most of all to break down the barriers isolating us from one another. Such meetings should be held both within individual communities and on a Province-wide basis.

3. Beyond this it seems that all that can be recommended is that each individual realize that this is a two-way street. Interest and cooperation must be shown to others, if they are expected to be interested and cooperate in my work. My work is not a private preserve, but should be making an important contribution to the common goals of the whole community.

B. Grades and Age Groups

In the community discussion at Shrub Oak this topic came up. It was pointed out that even in the novitiate men have the desire to talk to formed Jesuits but are forbidden to do so. The famous Cuba Sodality trains its men by putting them into contact with successful sodalists. Young men need this contact. They are asked to take much on faith. They need the assurance of those who have found fulfillment in this life to encourage them. It was stated that there is a universal desire among the scholastics for more contact with the faculty, one recreation room, one haustus room, no special places in the refectory. A true family relationship calls for this.

A large part of the community discussion at St. Peter's Prep was taken up with this topic. The scholastics said that the system of grades and separate places at table prevent them from really getting to know the fathers, learning from them and profiting from their experience. The

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

fathers brought out the diversity of interests between younger men and older men, which makes conversation difficult and forced mingling artificial.

Conclusions

1. There is a problem in the Province of tensions between various age groups.
2. These tensions are felt much more keenly by older priests, i.e., beyond seventy, and by younger men, i.e., below forty, than they are by men in the forty to seventy bracket.
3. The practice of grades accentuates the problem.

Recommendations

1. That more institutes, such as the ones at Fordham and Woodstock during the past summer, be held in order to give men the opportunity to become acquainted with new trends in theology and that local superiors encourage members of their community to participate in these institutes.

2. That during periods of vacation scholastics from houses of study spend time in other communities making friends with older members of the Province, exchanging ideas, and getting some concrete experience of the work for which they are preparing.

3. That in all communities, outside of houses of study, separation of grades be abandoned so that there are no special places at table and, if separate recreation rooms should be maintained, everyone is free to recreate where he chooses.

4. Since, without an effort on the part of all, any improvement is most unlikely, that everyone considers the problem and the practical means required to improve the situation.

C. Communication Between Individuals

In the community discussion at Shrub Oak the scholastics stated that too often pat answers are given to problems or solutions to nonexistent problems, that the fathers fail to hear the scholastics out before handing them an answer, that they are not looking for answers from others but rather for some one to listen and point out any serious error in their thought or direction.

Conclusions

1. Traditional community recreation after dinner in most houses has ceased to be an effective way of bringing the community together.

2. Most feel they profit from informal recreation in getting to know other members of the community better.

3. A significantly large portion of us experience great difficulty in carrying on more than trivial conversation with one another.

Recommendations

1. That each community be allowed to set up a daily order which is adapted to the particular nature of the community and its work and, in particular, when most people are not really finished the day's work until late in the evening, that a recreation period be scheduled at that time.

2. That greater efforts be made to organize opportunities for our men to get together in groups, such as special parties, outings, weekends at one or other of the various house villas.

3. That every haustus room and recreation room have painted with large letters covering even a whole wall, if necessary: "Let them advance their reasons with modesty and with charity and with the intention not that they may seem to have the upper hand but that the truth may appear."

HORIZONTAL COMMUNICATIONS ON THE PROVINCE LEVEL

This area deals with communications between the various houses within the Province.

Conclusions

1. Effective communication between various houses of the Province is practically nonexistent.

2. The idea of general meetings such as for the junior clergy exams and Father General's visit has wide support provided these meetings are more than just a party.

3. The hospitality shown to fellow Jesuits is good but can stand improvement in some respects.

4. The hospitality shown to religious from other orders and to lay people needs improvement.

5. The *Newsletter*, in spite of many drawbacks, is still a popular and effective means of communication.*

* As of June 1966, the name of the *Newsletter* has been changed to the *Jesuit Times*. An expanded format and interpretive articles now supplement factual reports.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

6. *S.J. New York* is most popular.

Recommendations

1. Dinners to bring as many members of the Province together as possible, with attendance optional, should be held at least once a year. We suggest that an appropriate occasion for such a dinner would be the return of Fr. Provincial and his companions from the General Congregation. We further suggest that an appropriate program would be to start with a concelebrated Mass (sacraments produce what they signify), followed by a report on the Congregation, and then drinks and dinner.

2. The various villas, Mitchell Farm, Cold Spring Harbor, Deal, should be put to frequent use for smaller gatherings of Jesuits for class anniversaries, meetings for men from all over the Province engaged in the same work.

3. With regard to Jesuits, it should be declared that the official policy of the Province is that any Jesuit is welcome in any house at any time to stay overnight, if there is a room available, and always for meals. Common politeness, of course, requires that Fr. Minister should ordinarily be informed if one intends to drop in for dinner.

4. Insofar as possible, the same hospitality which is extended to fellow Jesuits should be extended to all priests and religious brothers.

5. The efforts already underway to convert the *Newsletter* into a more timely, interesting, and informative means of communication deserve the support and cooperation of everyone.

6. Insofar as it can be done without adding another burden for Fr. Provincial, *S.J. New York* should be continued and, hopefully, even appear more frequently.

ROBERT I. CANAVAN, S.J.
JAMES J. DIGIACOMO, S.J.
JAMES J. FISCHER, S.J.
EDWARD D. HORGAN, S.J.
ANTHONY F. LABAU, S.J.

HISTORICAL NOTE: THE GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF THE AMERICAN NOVITIATE

THAT THE CHURCH AND WITH HER THE SOCIETY of Jesus is in a period of transition and that many of the familiar aspects of religious life which we have accepted as absolute are now being called into question seems hardly to need any supporting evidence. As a result of this phenomenon, we cannot help but feel a tension between the security of what we have known and the fear of what lies ahead. One illustration of this tension is the new voice calling for novices not to be sheltered in the idyllic environment of Florissant, St. Andrew, Wernersville, or Shadowbrook. To make this tension the more intense, this voice comes from none other than the General Congregation, which declared in 1965 that "beginning with the novitiate and throughout the entire course of studies there should be a close integration of spiritual formation, the work of study, and apostolic activity."¹ For a calm discussion and intelligent solution to the problem of the novitiate's relation to the rest of the course of spiritual and intellectual formation, two extremes must immediately be eliminated: first, the position of those who adhere to what they cite as the "time-honored traditions" of the Society; and second, the position of those who refuse to acknowledge any tradition as relevant to the modern world. In reality, both positions are those of the "prophets of gloom." The former frequently call tradition what is actually a new development. The latter destroy all tradition (and, effectively, the Society) by demanding a complete denial of the Society's past. But the Society, like any person or group, is today because of what it has been in the past. A knowledge of that past is of no small help in understanding the present

¹ *Decretum de scholasticorum institutione praesertim in studiis*, n. 2, *Acta Romana Societatis Iesu* 14 (1965) 629.

and in progressing into the future. The study of true tradition, or history, is no cause for alarm, but is, as Pope John told the Second Vatican Council, "the teacher of life." An exposition of the historical development of the novitiate, particularly in the United States, can help clarify what has been the Society's traditional view of the novitiate's role in the formation of Jesuits and its relation to the world. This exposition, however, does not in itself constitute either an argument for abandoning the present location and the consequent ascetical practices of novitiates, or, much less, a condemnation of those of our predecessors who, for good reason, modified the ideas of St. Ignatius and the early Society.

Departing from the practice of older religious orders which sought to hand down their traditions to their novices in an atmosphere completely isolated from contact with the outside world, St. Ignatius demanded that his novices make a personal confrontation with their vocations as future members of an active order of clerks regular. Of the six experiments he required of candidates for the Society of Jesus, the hospital and pilgrimage trials especially made personal demands on the novice in close association with the outside, non-religious life of cities. By thus exposing them to the necessity of making personal decisions, says Fr. de Guibert, Ignatius thought the novice would reveal what was inside him and would not merely superficially mirror a sheltered environment.²

To carry out his unique novitiate plan, St. Ignatius at first made no provision for novitiates separate from colleges and professed houses, which were located in urban areas. During his lifetime, however, the Society grew rapidly and a more formal organization had to be developed than that which Ignatius and his followers had adopted in the early years of the Society. As early as 1547, he recommended to Simão Rodrigues that he establish a separate house of probation at Coimbra to facilitate the financial support of the novices and place them under the exclusive spiritual direction of one father.³ The first establishment of a separate novitiate, however, did not actually take place until the generalate of St. Francis Borgia when San Andrea in Quirinale was opened in August, 1566.⁴ While Borgia insisted that novices be kept apart from other Jesuits and Laymen as far as possible,⁵ the new novitiate, under the guidance of Fr. Alfonso Ruiz, was oriented toward apostolic activity—work with the poor, visiting hospitals, and teaching catechism. A second novitiate

² Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1964), pp. 102-03; *Epitome*, 138-39.

³ MHSJ, *Monumenta Ignatiana: Epistolae et Instructiones*, I, 603-06.

⁴ MHSJ, *Polanci Complementa: Epistolae et Commentaria*, II, 664.

⁵ MHSJ, *Sanctus Franciscus Borgia*, IV (1563-1568), 398-400.

remained connected with the professed house in Rome.⁶ Therefore, although Ignatius' original plan had been somewhat changed, prior to the suppression of the Society there never seems to have been any attempt to move the novitiate away from the city; but the training was formalized and concentrated to provide for the increasing number of candidates for the Society.

After the suppression

But the period of the suppression considerably altered the situation. By the time of the restoration, many of the city houses, like San Andrea itself (which, however, was eventually restored), and much of the Society's property had been confiscated. In France, for instance, where the Society had been suppressed for fifty years, the anti-Bourbon factions soon brought about a second expulsion of the Jesuits. When the Society returned in the 1830's, it had to open houses in inconspicuous, country places. In England, the government remained officially opposed to the re-establishment of the Society until 1829, although it tolerated the novitiate at Stonyhurst and later Hodder Place, where it was joined to a preparatory school to conceal its true purpose. This joining of a novitiate and "college" was explicitly approved by Father General Gruber and Pope Pius VII.⁷

Since the ex-Jesuits of the United States had been members of the Maryland Mission of the English Province, they asked for advice from Fr. Charles Plowden, the English master of novices, when they decided to open a novitiate in 1806. In giving his ideas on novitiate training and in transcribing the daily order followed at Hodder Place (strikingly similar to that followed at American novitiates up to the present), Plowden mentioned the great opposition to the novitiate he had encountered among the other English Jesuits of the "old Society," who felt that the novice regimen, inaugurated under Borgia and Aquaviva but influenced by the peculiar situation of the English novitiate at Watten in Flanders, was contrary to the will of St. Ignatius and unconnected with the life of the Society and its apostolates.⁸

In fact, the situation of the Society of Jesus in the United States in no way paralleled that of other countries; for the period of the suppression had also witnessed the American Revolution, which cut off the nation from any ecclesiastical superior during the period 1776 to 1784, when John Carroll, an ex-Jesuit, was named superior of the Mission.

⁶ MHSJ, *Polanci Complementa: Epistolae et Commentaria*, II, 10-11, 85, 701.

⁷ Gruber to Carroll, October 19, 1804, Woodstock Archives.

⁸ Plowden to Molyneux, April 29, 1806, *Woodstock Letters* 85 (1956) 175-191.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

(In 1789 he became the first bishop of Baltimore.) Although he never rejoined the Society, Carroll was the recognized leader of the ex-Jesuits in America. A Maryland aristocrat, he felt no inferiority to his fellow Americans because of his religion, but strongly identified himself with the nation. Under his auspices, on October 10, 1806, the first novitiate was opened at Georgetown College. Thus, the first Catholic contribution to American higher education and the formation of the young American Jesuits were temporarily to go hand in hand. According to John McElroy, one of the first novices, the novices occupied the second story of the old South Building of the college and were under the guidance of Fr. Francis Neale, who was himself a novice.⁹ Anthony Kohlmann soon came as socius to Neale and reported to Fr. William Strickland at Stonyhurst that the novices, now in a house separated from but near the college, taught catechism twice a week. Neale and Kohlmann also observed the distinction between first and second year novices provided for in the *Epitome* by allowing second year novices to continue their studies for the priesthood.¹⁰

Another site needed

By 1810 it became obvious that some other site would have to be found for a novitiate. Lack of privacy for the novices from the young boys attending the college, financial insecurity, and Fr. Neale's spreading his time and efforts over his many apostolates made Georgetown unsuitable. In September, 1811, the novitiate moved to St. Inigoes while a residence at Whitmarsh was being constructed. This was the first of many changes of location during the period 1811 to 1833.¹¹ Two years later the war with England drove the novices to Frederick, but soon they were back at Georgetown because of lack of room and the poverty of the Frederick establishment. Although Anthony Kohlmann urged his superiors to found a novitiate in Manhattan, which he foresaw would be a center of American Catholicism, Fr. John Grassi, who had succeeded Francis Neale as President of Georgetown, sought and obtained in 1815 John Carroll's approval to build a novitiate in the city of Washington.¹²

⁹ John McElroy, S.J., "An Account of the Re-Establishment of the Society in the United States," *Woodstock Letters* 16 (1887) 161.

¹⁰ Kohlmann to Strickland, February 23, 1807, *Woodstock Letters* 12 (1883) 87-89; Carroll to Plowden, January 10, 1808, *ibid.* 10 (1881) 101-02; Carroll claimed that Neale was the master of novices in title only while Kohlmann actually exercised the office; see also *Epitome*, 123.

¹¹ For a list of the various locations, dates of establishment, and masters of novices from 1806 to 1840, see Mark L. Smith, S.J., "Notes of Jesuit Activity in American History," *Woodstock Letters* 69 (1940) 47-48.

¹² Thomas Hughes, S.J., *History of the Society of Jesus in North-America:*

Bishop Leonard Neale laid the cornerstone of the building on the north side of F Street between 9th and 10th Streets, N.W., on May 25, 1815.¹³ Fr. Grassi thought that when the new capital grew, this location would be in the very center of the city. In January, 1818, Fr. Van Quickenborne wrote to his confreres in the Netherlands that the novitiate was about to move from Georgetown to the new house,¹⁴ but later the same year, Fr. Peter Kenny, on his official visitation to the Maryland Mission, transferred the philosophate and theologate from Georgetown to the new building. In 1824, the Washington Seminary, as it became known, ceased to be a Jesuit house of studies and was opened exclusively to lay students.

In March, 1819, the novitiate, deprived of its Washington site, moved to Whitemarsh again, but the protracted dispute with Archbishop Merechal over ownership of the property made the situation extremely tenuous. Fr. Charles Neale, the Superior of the Maryland Mission, was on the verge of closing the novitiate and dispersing the novices when Bishop Dubourg requested the aid of the Jesuits among the settlers and Indians in Missouri. Therefore, in 1823, with Neale's approval, Fr. Van Quickenborne, the master of novices, and his socius, Fr. Timmermanns, took the Belgian novices to Florissant, Missouri, and the Whitemarsh novitiate was closed.¹⁵ No American novices were received into the Society until 1827 when once again a house of probation was opened at Georgetown with three novices under Fr. Dzierozynski, the Superior of the Mission. Although John McElroy, now a priest at St. John's in Frederick, urged Fr. Kenny on his second visitation to put the novitiate at Frederick, the latter transformed it back to Whitemarsh in 1831. The eminent Fr. Grivel, a close associate of Father General Brzozowski in White Russia and Fr. Pierre Clorivière in France, was named master of novices, but he felt Whitemarsh was too isolated from American life. At length, Kenny assented to McElroy's request to use Frederick; and Fr. McSherry, who became the first Provincial of the Maryland Province in 1834, made the necessary arrangements for the removal of the novitiate.¹⁶

Colonial and Federal, Documents, I, Prt. II (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910), p. 944.

¹³ John M. Daley, S.J., *Georgetown University: Its Origin and Early Years* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1957), p. 195; "Father James A. Ward: A Sketch," *Woodstock Letters* 25 (1896) 407-08.

¹⁴ "Letter of Father Van Quickenborne, January 16, 1818," *Woodstock Letters* 30 (1901) 85.

¹⁵ Laurence J. Kelly, S.J., "Father Charles Neale, S.J. and the Jesuit Restoration in America," *Woodstock Letters* 72 (1943) 249.

¹⁶ "Father James A. Ward," *Woodstock Letters* 25 (1896) 418-19.

Fr. Grivel thought the new Frederick location was ideal for a novitiate. McElroy had a college there and soon hoped to open a seminary and scholasticate. By contemporary standards, Frederick was a large town and the fathers had every reason to believe it would eventually become as important as any coastal city. With a population of 6000 at a time when no American city had more than 250,000 inhabitants and only one out of eleven Americans lived in towns of 2500 or more, it lay at the entrance to the Cumberland Road and on the new Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. Moreover, as Fr. Grivel told Nicholas Sewall, the Maryland-born former English Provincial, there were "great advantages for the novitiate to be in a town, for catechizing, visiting the poor-house, prisons, hospitals, etc."¹⁷

St. Andrew

In the meantime, in the summer of 1873, the New York-Canada Mission opened a novitiate at West Park, almost directly across the Hudson River from the future site of St. Andrew. In 1885, however, six years after the Mission merged with the Maryland Province to form the new Maryland-New York Province, the novices were moved to Frederick,¹⁸ where the novitiate remained until it was transferred to St. Andrew-on-Hudson in 1903. The choice of this rural site as the permanent location for the novitiate demands some explanation. During the period 1834-1903 the Maryland and later the Maryland-New York Province had experienced considerable change, mirroring the predominantly immigrant character of the American Catholic Church which developed during the century. Fr. Felix Soprani, during his visitation from 1859 to 1861, recommended that the site for the common house of studies, then proposed, be in the country, away from the commerce of the cities in a place where the community could grow most of its food, since it could not depend on the relatively poor Catholic population for support. According to the presently available evidence, Woodstock College, the house of studies resulting from this proposal, was the first house of the Society built in a rural area for reasons other than to escape persecution by the civil government.¹⁹

In the decade preceding the construction of St. Andrew which followed the norms laid down for Woodstock, the American Catholic Church found itself embroiled in a hot controversy between Cardinal Gibbons and

¹⁷ "Some Letters of Father F. Grivel," *Woodstock Letters* 10 (1881) 255 (Grivel to Sewall, March 31, 1831).

¹⁸ Smith, pp. 48-49; see also *Woodstock Letters* 38 (1909) 86, 130.

¹⁹ A memorial of the Soprani visitation is in the Archives of the Maryland Province.

Archbishop Ireland on the one side and Archbishop Corrigan, Bishop McQuaid, and the Jesuits on the other concerning cooperation of the Church with public schools, the establishment of the Catholic University of America, and the general attitude that Catholics should take toward a pluralistic society. It is probably more than conjecture that Rome, like Fr. Sopranis earlier, feared the American experiment and the exposure of novices to contact with Protestants which would inevitably occur in American city life. Hence, while St. Andrew may legitimately claim to be the heir, through Frederick, of the old Roman novitiate, the essential feature of the latter's urban location is missing.²⁰ It is interesting that of the 156 years that the Society of Jesus has had a novitiate in the United States, seventy-nine were spent in the city or an urban environment. Hence, the new voice which we hear calling for a novitiate less isolated from the modern world is not so new after all, but rather echoes one of the Society's oldest traditions.

GERALD P. FOGARTY, S.J.

²⁰ "The New Novitiate," *Woodstock Letters* 31 (1902) 452.

READERS' FORUM—

The Apostleship of Prayer

The 1966 Spring issue of WOODSTOCK LETTERS, with its many pages devoted to high school evaluation, was a *mélange* of the trivial and the essential, the creative and the chaotic, the naive and the sophisticated. To praise the strong points or to censure the weak elements would tax the ingenuity of many experts. However, the editors claim a desire for a candid, open-ended discussion of our Society's work in secondary education. With this in mind some points on the Apostleship of Prayer should be considered.

In the body of the "Theologate Reports" there appeared what might be considered a most naive statement on the function of the Apostleship of Prayer in our schools. In addition to the poor logic of the statement, there are the many unproven implications concerning the place of the Apostleship in the high school. Further, through implication, there seems to be a lack of understanding on the place of prayer and spirituality in apostolic work of our Society.

The "Theologate Reports" statement reads: "In a spirit of honest re-evaluation, it seems necessary to express serious doubt about the formative value of the Apostleship of Prayer in our high schools. Since it is no

longer a relevant way of Christian formation for students today, it simply has no effectiveness. Rather than desperately holding on to the Apostleship, it would be far better to search out practices that grow out of the students' needs. Artificial and outmoded structures can serve little value."

The final sentence of this statement might pass muster, but it seems that the authors would have to prove such things as "artificial" and "outmoded" in relationship to the Apostleship of Prayer. Several conclusions seem to have been gratuitously drawn without proof. This alone presents the difficulty of knowing where to begin a reply, since the statement is so sweeping and all-embracing; it actually covers the spiritual background of our Society, the statements of the Popes on the Apostleship of Prayer, and the theological foundation of devotion to the Sacred Heart.

What is the Apostleship of Prayer?

In the history of the Apostleship of Prayer the first name to appear is that of Francis X. Gautrelet, S.J., the spiritual director of the Jesuit philosophical and theological school at Vals in France in the year 1844. Fr. Gautrelet challenged his seminarians to spread the kingdom of Christ upon earth even while they spent their days in study. In the beginning this challenge led to

an organization of simple practices of daily offering and impetration.

It was the part of Henri Ramière, S.J., to unite this Apostleship of Prayer with devotion to the Sacred Heart. The nature of the Apostleship, even indicated by its motto, was the extension of the kingdom of Christ. In this way the Apostleship intends the actualization of the desires of the Sacred Heart. As Ramière saw it:

In the devotion to the Heart of Jesus, when so understood, who does not recognize the Apostleship of Prayer? From the moment when we do not see a special practice in the Apostleship, but rather a spirit (the spirit of devotion which impels the Christian to take to heart the interests of the Heart of Jesus, to appropriate His intentions, to pray, to act, to suffer in union with the prayer of Jesus), we then have the right to say that this devotion, so comprised, mingles with the devotion to the Sacred Heart. Not only is the latter one of the Apostleship's principal practices; indeed one would not exaggerate to say that it is of the essence of the Apostleship. And this is so because the essence of Sacred Heart devotion is the love between the Christian and Jesus Christ—and that love consists essentially in the fusion of interests and of sentiments between the hearts which it unites. (A. McGratty, *The Sacred Heart: Yesterday and Today*, p. 216.)

Basically a member of the Apostleship of Prayer unites himself to the universal salvific will of the Redeemer, and makes every attempt to render the intentions of the Sacred Heart his own through the spirit of prayer and offering. The union of this apostolic spirit in the members and the practical devotion to the heart of our Lord takes place in the Morning Offering, which is the first grade of activity in the Apostleship of Prayer. And this Morning Offering is, basically, what the "Theologate Reports" claim to be irrelevant to Christian formation in our

students and without effectiveness.

Through history the Apostleship of Prayer, in League with the Sacred Heart, enjoys many approvals on the part of the Popes, the theologians, and the universal Church. The recitation of the Morning Offering is but the foundation and elemental practice of members of the Apostleship. The holy hour, First Friday Communion, the Acts of Reparation, and the consecration to the Sacred Heart all have their proper place. These practices not only enjoy the approval of the Church, even in this era of Vatican II, but also are valuable to young people today, despite what some may claim.

Look first at the approval of the Apostleship. As recently as 1956, the late Pope Pius XII issued his encyclical, *Haurietis Aquas*, on devotion to the Sacred Heart. Pius XII went so far as to single out the Apostleship for special notice as one of the chief instruments in promotion of this devotion. He said: "We mention especially the proofs of deepest piety given by the Apostleship of Prayer, under whose auspices and care homes, colleges, institutions, and at times whole nations were consecrated to the most Sacred Heart of Jesus. Not infrequently by letter, public address, and even by radio We have extended our paternal congratulations to these undertakings" (Dachauer, *The Sacred Heart*, p. 35). The same Pontiff makes an earnest plea for prayers in his encyclical, *Mystici Corporis* (*Catholic Mind*, November, 1943, p. 42): "... to make this intention more efficacious, the daily use of the offering made by the members of the Apostleship of Prayer will contribute very, very much, and We welcome this occasion to recommend that Association highly,

as one which is most pleasing to God."

As recently as May 25, 1965, the present Supreme Pontiff, Pope Paul VI, in a letter addressed to superiors of religious societies which derive their name and inspiration from the Sacred Heart, has urged us to employ this devotion to further the renewal of spirit of Vatican Council II. In concluding, Pope Paul states: "Our intention in making our desires here plain to you who have special obligations to the Sacred Heart is that you continue the works of the apostolate which have been your particular commission in the Church, with perseverance and confidence in their efficacy to further the great design of the Church (*Letter*, p. 2).

With regard to our Society's own approval we need look no further than the first letter of our present Father General as he took office. Acknowledging the receipt of the letter of Pope Paul VI, Father General felt it necessary to share this letter of the Holy Father in fulfillment of the special obligation to let us know the desires of the Pope. Father General calls upon all of us and states: "It is equally clear what must be our response, in view of our tradition of practicing and spreading this devotion and especially in view of our obedience and loyalty to the Vicar of Christ: that we continue with renewed enthusiasm to exemplify and promote the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus to the very best of our ability, putting into prompt execution this new mandate of the Supreme Pontiff (*Letter*, June 17, 1965).

Perhaps even more important is the letter of Father General to Daniel F. X. Meenan, S.J., on the occasion of the centenary of the foundation of the

Sacred Heart Messenger. The great contribution of the *Messenger* to the Apostleship of Prayer is acknowledged in this letter. And, almost directly opposed to the "Theologate Reports" observation, Father General states: "What your *Messenger* has been promoting among the faithful—namely, the practice of apostolic prayer and of devotion to the Sacred Heart—*has not lost its relevance; indeed, it is more relevant today than ever*" (*Messenger*, January, 1966).

Effectiveness of the Apostleship

What can be said of the "Theologate Reports" general condemnation of the Apostleship as lacking in effectiveness, failing to meet the needs of the students, and in general being outmoded and artificial? In addition to contradicting the testimony of the popes and Father General, these assertions also seem to be opposed to the testimony of those experienced in the field of the Apostleship of Prayer. It is here that it can be observed that the assertions may come from the theologians' own failure to promote the devotion themselves during their regency, and the failure of many of our schools to make full use of this means of sanctification. Just because the horse you see in the field is standing still does not mean you have to destroy him because he is not a good race horse; you have not seen him in action!

Where can you find the action? You might find it in the various issues of the *Sacred Heart Messenger*, although the recent improvements in our own *Messenger* still fail to meet the sophisticated approbation of some of Ours. Better still, the theologians can read the background paper in this area for the 1966 Workshop on Christian

Formation. The article, "Formation through the Apostleship of Prayer," was written by Edward Carter, S.J., and contains many practical suggestions as well as testimony to the effectiveness of the Apostleship in at least one school. Or the theologians might pick up the book edited by Thomas Diehl, S.J., and John Hardon, S.J., *Teaching the Devotion to the Sacred Heart*.

Additional testimony to the efficacious nature of the devotion to the Sacred Heart and function of the Apostleship of Prayer in the present-day apostolate is to be found in this volume. In the first place the methods and projects have been culled from sources where they have proven effective with young people. And this was not ten or twenty years ago; the book came out in 1963. It shows what can be done with the Apostleship of Prayer and how the Apostleship fits in so well with the liturgical observances we wish in our schools and in the personal development we want in our students. A glance through the table of contents in this book also indicates that the work is done on the high school level.

Any desire to drop the Apostleship of Prayer in this day of intense apostolic activity might be said to reflect the so-called "heresy of action" which was mentioned and discussed by Father General in *Newsletter* No. 9 of the Thirty-First General Congregation, June 17, 1965. There we read that "the answer then to the problems of the apostolate does not consist in decreasing our activity, but rather in

deepening our supernatural lives." Mention of this also comes up in the late Fr. John B. Janssens' letter (December 8, 1963) to the whole Society on the Virtues of Humility and Obedience. In the letter, our late Father General explicitly states that "one will not be a contemplative in action unless he exercises himself long and solidly in contemplation" (23).

The proliferation of apostolic activities, of such programs as the C.A.P., in our high schools, might be some of the "practices that grow out of the students' needs" according to the "Theologate Reports." However, these apostolic endeavors will be sterile unless the individuals involved are founded on a supernatural realism that places human effort and activity only after union with Christ. The primacy of the spiritual is to be found throughout Ignatian spirituality, often repeating ideas woven into the Spiritual Exercises.

It would be a strange commentary on the youth of today to consider them too immature for prayer and reflection, to consider them incapable of any depth in the spiritual life. They are generous. And they are also ready to receive anything that can be given to them to deepen their spiritual life and help make them true apostles of the Kingdom. From the testimony of others, and from experience, this depth can be found in the Apostleship of Prayer.

EUGENE M. ROONEY, S.J.
St. Joseph's Prep
Philadelphia, Pa.

THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS

Christian in the Market Place. By Karl Rahner, S.J. Translated by Cecily Hastings. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966. Pp. 184. \$4.00.

ANY WORK BEARING KARL RAHNER'S NAME is sure to elicit theological interest. This "new" work, however, is more interesting for the fact that it (and similar Rahner works) is published now at all. Although its Sheed and Ward copyright date is, 1966, there is no essay in the book more recent than 1959 and two of the selections date back to 1953. If the essays were significantly important in themselves or in showing the development in Rahner's thought, their publication at this time would be a great favor. This, however, is not the case. The selections are mostly papers read to various apostolic groups with little unifying theme. Moreover, the volume, though perhaps not very accessible in this country, already exists in an English translation. One cannot avoid the thought that Rahner's reputation is being abused and the emerging Christian reading public being taken advantage of.

There are moments, however, when the reader is caught by the suggestions of depth and insight one has come to expect from Rahner. To my mind the most interesting theme which recurs in several essays (and is perhaps the original justification for the book) is Rahner's notion of secularity. A more significant contribution than the present volume would have been a treatment of this theme throughout Rahner's theology. While the debate on *The Secular City* is still with us, Rahner's thoughts on the subject would be most welcome. Those who were somewhat unsatisfied with Harvey Cox's book would appreciate a development of such statements as that made in the fifth essay, "The Parish Bookshop: On the Theology of Books," of the present volume:

The secular world, as secular, has an inner mysterious depth, in all its earthly mysteries from birth to death, through which, by the grace of God and his infinitely incomprehensible love even when it is not, before receiving the explicit message of the gospel, aware of it. Not only are there many anonymous Christians, there is also an anonymously Christian world.

The idea of secularity occurs also in the second essay, "Railway Missions." Here Rahner sees man as having lost the protection of nature, protection by what is "other than himself." The mission of the Church

to the secular world is "the protection of man defenseless in the new age, so that he should remain and become what he has to be: a man and a Christian."

The other essays are also noteworthy for the mature Christian messages they deliver. People involved in the same types of work will find them of particular interest. "Parish and Place of Work" discusses the tension between reaching the Catholic in his local parish and where his interest is more naturally centered. Priests involved in prison work will find "The Prison Pastorate" encouraging as well as challenging. One interesting note in this latter essay strikes home to anyone working in the apostolate. Rahner notes that truly to love one's neighbor means to have the same realistic hope for him as for oneself, to recognize in him the same calling one has oneself. The prison chaplain would indeed have special difficulty here, but it is a real problem for all involved with people, particularly the less educated.

If there is any essay which can claim theological significance it is the one on the "Theological Meaning of Devotion to the Heart of Jesus." Here Rahner develops his theory of the *Urwort* and applies it to the concept of Heart for our times. This calls for only passing mention here, however, since the essay has already received fuller treatment by Donald Gelpi, S.J., in a previous issue of *Woodstock Letters* 95 (1966) 405-17.

The other essays include a speech to a German apostolic group on "Paul, Apostle for Today," points for meditation on "Ignatian Spirituality and Devotion to the Heart of Jesus," and a sermon entitled "First Mass." There is also an appendix with Rahner's article, "Notes on Obedience" [previously published in *Woodstock Letters* 86 (1957) 291-310].

In the light of this discussion of the book's contents, the initial negative comments may seem too harsh. But it must be admitted that it is disappointing to see a book published in 1966 by the man who many consider to be the Church's leading theologian in which there is not the slightest mention of Vatican II. Indeed the latest reference in the book is to Pius XII's *Haurietas Aquas* (1956) in an essay which the source-list dates to 1953. It does Rahner no credit to publish essays of his which must be updated to include a 1956 encyclical, nor does it show respect for the Christian reader. At least an introduction might have pointed out the rationale behind the book, if there was one.

If, as the publishers note on the jacket, "It is the kind of book which is read with ease," much of the credit must go to translator Cecily Hastings' consistent clarity.

EDWARD J. MURPHY, S.J.

GUIDELINES FOR RELIGIOUS

Functional Asceticism: A Guideline for American Religious. By Donald L. Gelpi, S.J. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966. Pp. 191. \$3.95.

IN THIS SERIES OF ESSAYS on religious life in this country, Fr. Gelpi suggests that the open window of *aggiornamento* might profitably let in the fresh air of healthy American pragmatism. The American spirit has always been one of establishing a definite goal and then making use of the most direct means to attain it. American religious life, however, like the American Church itself, has only recently attempted to achieve an identity distinct from its European progenitors. This groping towards self-identity has occasioned the current conflict between "old guard" and "new breed," or, as Fr. Gelpi prefers, between an older "nominalistic" asceticism and a more functional approach to the religious life.

Nominalism is defined as "the rigid substitution of one possible conceptualization of reality for the reality itself." Fr. Gelpi finds its historical roots in the Counter Reformation's exaggerated response to Luther's rejection of the authority of tradition. Theological nominalism, with its insistence on "blind assent to religious authority as the only 'sure' path to holiness," and its consequent suspicion of new formulations of the truths of revelation, begets an ascetical nominalism: "the effort to define the meaning of sanctity theoretically, abstractly, and a priori by appeal to approved ascetical formulas, and to impose that definition rigidly and absolutely upon the personal lives of each individual Christian, regardless of his personal, individual need and concrete situation." Its symptoms are a rigid and artificial distinction between the "religious" and the "secular," a spirituality based on external observance, a bureaucratic stifling of creativity, a good measure of self-righteousness, and resultant sterility.

Aggiornamento in America, according to Fr. Gelpi's analysis, will consist to a large extent in learning to cope with this nominalistic heritage. Experimentation would be the logical outgrowth of a re-evaluation of contemporary American religious life in the light of a functional approach to asceticism. "In our bustling society there is little room for a spirituality of purely symbolic gesture." Functionalism would reject a ritualistic approach to asceticism which can become a "cult of renunciation for its own sake" that, at its worst, degenerates into a "Jansenistic suppression of 'nature' that 'grace' may more abound." Such renuncia-

tion, based on a false notion of opposition between the incarnational and the eschatological, is irreconcilable with the New Testament message.

Yet a functional re-appraisal of religious practices, Fr. Gelpi insists, need not imply a rejection of asceticism. In functional asceticism, however "the only absolute is the end itself" of the religious institute; and fidelity to the institute does not mean blind preservation of institutions and practices, but faithfulness to the basic goals and values of the institute. Under this rubric Fr. Gelpi makes some brief suggestions about specific religious practices including common life, spiritual direction, common and private prayer, religious dress, and re-evaluating our "brick-and-mortar" commitments.

The most extended application of functionalism in this analysis is devoted to religious authority. Ecclesiastical authority, in Fr. Gelpi's view, is itself functional. It exists for the common good: to mediate the grace of Christ to all men. Thus the superior-subject relationship in religious life becomes "the functionally necessary but freely accepted subordination of one person to another for the sake of a common enterprise." It would begin on both sides with "a frank mutual admission of their human fallibility and would add to this an insistence upon the need they have for one another in order to reach the supernatural goal to which they freely aspire." From this approach Fr. Gelpi sees emerging a vital *esprit de corps* in a community "dynamically united by its joint action for a common purpose." Once this sense of common movement toward a predetermined end flourishes in a community, many of the problems concerning self-fulfillment which currently plague especially the younger members of the community would vanish in the ardor of dedication to a common purpose, and in the sense of personal responsibility, mutual interest, and charity resulting from this sense of purpose.

Functionalism of the vows

Fr. Gelpi's brief discussion of poverty is limited to rejecting a purely symbolic, "poverty of dependence" nominalism, and an undetailed demand for a more apostolically oriented poverty. He supplies "just one banal example": if superiors want their subjects to stop smoking, they should propose the motivation that a particular apostolic need will be unfulfilled because of the money spent on cigarettes. Clearly, Fr. Gelpi's functional approach is in need of further articulation, and possibly less naïveté.

Fr. Gelpi is somewhat hesitant in speaking of "functional chastity," and perhaps with good reason. He properly condemns "a purely ritualistic celibacy, with its emphasis on sexual repression and taboo," as

well as "the negatively functional notion of a celibate life as a purely practical means of achieving a certain freedom of activity in the work of the apostolate." In presenting a positively functional approach, he insists that celibacy is not, and cannot be, a renunciation of sexuality, but that the religious must make use of his (her) particularly masculine (feminine) virtues in the service of apostolic love. One must wholeheartedly agree with Fr. Gelpi that the human love demanded by the apostolate is total and must proceed from a man's whole being, but, lacking a further articulation of his thought, I am reluctant to concede that a strictly functional approach to celibacy would result in this highly desirable Christian freedom. Fr. Gelpi has not succeeded in answering the objection he starts with: that this functional approach to chastity risks "degrading and depersonalizing it if we reduce it to nothing more than a means to an end." Whether his approach can avoid this danger is a question that will lack a final answer until Fr. Gelpi further develops this crucial application of functionalism.

Both the strength and weakness of Fr. Gelpi's work seems to lie in his analysis of "nominalism." He is skillful and cogent in attacking its false ascetical views. His portrait of the "strictly hypothetical" seminary in which the intellectual and religious life is totally imbued with nominalism is an Orwellian caricature of sterility. Curiously enough, despite his rejection of the a priori thesis approach with its inability to understand the adversaries, his separate essays follow this tried-and-true outline: first, the *status questionis*, then the objections of the adversary ("the nominalist"), then the advantages of functionalism and the resolution of proposed difficulties. Fr. Gelpi would be the first to declare that the "nominalist" is a merely hypothetical being, a "pure position" with no exact correlative in reality, but he may well have listened more attentively to his own warning: "Our thinking . . . is already too much plagued with artificial and somewhat bigoted stereotypes to add that of 'nominalist' to the list."

Another problem remains

Yet nominalism is a devil which lies hidden in most of us. Only by admission of its existence can it be exorcised, and Fr. Gelpi's caricature can be of help here, so long as we do not succumb to the ever-present temptation to create a nominalistic "they," a vague external threat which true functionalists must be ever willing to repudiate, and on which can be placed the responsibility for everything that is wrong with the Society or any other religious congregation.

This devil must be replaced with something positive, lest it return in a different guise and bring seven other devils with it. Perhaps func-

tionalism can serve this purpose, but, as Fr. Gelpi himself seems aware, the name itself can be a problem. Functionalism connotes a business-like, coldly logical movement towards a given apostolic goal, and the functionalist must always keep before his mind the principle that true functionalism begins with "a recognition that each human person, redeemed as he is by the love and grace of Christ, is morally speaking an end and can never be degraded to the level of a pure means." Otherwise we may well escape into an alternate version of 1984.

The positive suggestions Fr. Gelpi makes are sometimes too vague, and often leave one with the feeling that he has heard all this before. Certainly the movement towards a more apostolic notion of common life, obedience, celibacy, and of the lesser details of religious life is already vigorously growing in this country. Perhaps the value of Fr. Gelpi's analysis lies in throwing light upon the various, frequently unconscious movements in our souls, and in manifesting that our American heritage is not of itself opposed to the generous and sincere living of a true religious asceticism.

ROBERT E. WHITE, S.J.

THE THEOLOGY OF REVELATION: RECENT CATHOLIC BOOKS IN ENGLISH

(*Listing prepared and commented upon by Fr. Avery Dulles, S.J., professor of systematic theology at Woodstock College.*)

THE FIRST CHAPTER OF THE VATICAN II *Constitution on Divine Revelation (Dei Verbum)*, entitled *De ipsa revelatione*, deals with a comparatively new theme in Catholic theology, namely the theological understanding of revelation itself. Until a decade ago, nearly all the discussions of divine revelation in Catholic manuals were apologetic in character. Treating the nature of revelation as something almost self-evident ("*locutio Dei attestans*"), they plunged forthwith into the question of its demonstrability to unaided reason. Many Catholics, accustomed to the older approach, are puzzled by the sudden emergence of the new dogmatic treatise on revelation. Fortunately, however, there is an abundance of excellent literature explaining the aims and contents of this treatise. The following pages intend to serve as a guide to some of the more important books by Catholics which have been published in English during the past two or three years.

Those desiring a brief discussion of what the Council accomplished would do well to procure the inexpensive commentary of George H.

Tavard, A.A., *The Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation* (Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1966). Tavard's commentary—previously published in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 3 (Winter 1966) 1-35—gives a good survey of the historical background and indicates the general tenor of the successive drafts of *Dei Verbum*. As one would expect from his earlier work in the field, Tavard is at his best in discussing the notion of tradition and the use of Scripture in the Church. His translation of the Constitution, which appears in this edition, is less idiomatic and on the whole less accurate than, for example, that of Msgr. Joseph Gallagher in *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild Press, 1966). Nor has Tavard seen fit to provide any footnotes except one, dealing with a minor textual problem.

The most imposing monograph is unquestionably that of René Latourelle, S.J., *The Theology of Revelation* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1966), a slightly revised translation of the French original (1963), reviewed at length by the present commentator in *Theological Studies* 25 (1964) 43-58. Latourelle presents a full treatise on the Christian idea of revelation as set forth in Scripture, in the Fathers, in the documents of the magisterium, and in classical and contemporary Catholic theology. In the English edition he has added a brief section on the Epistle to the Hebrews and a rather full commentary on chapters one and two of *Dei Verbum*. While he fails to deal adequately with some of the more urgent questions being asked in our day, Latourelle gives a splendid and up-to-date synthesis of what has been done. A thorough study of this work would be the best preparation for anyone who hopes to launch out into deeper waters.

In comparison with Latourelle's bulky (and expensive) volume, the brief treatment by Werner Bulst, S.J., *Revelation* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1965), offers rather meager fare [cf. the present author's review in *Theological Studies* 26 (1965) 306-308]. While Bulst makes many valid points, his book leaves the impression of recommending the positions of Protestant biblical scholars of a generation ago as the alternative to the tenets of the jejune *De revelatione* manuals published by Catholics in the same period. This work, which first appeared in German in 1960, barely suggests the range and depth of the new studies of revelation by systematic theologians; both Protestant and Catholic, which are appearing in great abundance in our time.

A young American

American readers will be particularly interested in the work of the young American theologian, Brother Gabriel Moran, F.S.C., which is keen and stimulating, sometimes even controversial. The author first

became known to the theological community through his concise and penetrating little study on *Scripture and Tradition* [New York: Herder & Herder, 1963; reviewed by the present commentator in *America* 109 (1963) 529ff.]. At the end of this work Moran pointed out that the question whether all revelation is contained in the Bible cannot be answered until one has dealt with the prior questions what revelation is and how *any* revelation is contained in the Bible. Recently he has set forth his views on these matters in his *Theology of Revelation* [New York: Herder & Herder, 1966; reviewed by the present reporter in *Commonweal* 84 (Sept. 16, 1966) 591ff.]. Following the general direction of contemporary European phenomenology, Moran holds that revelation is essentially "a personal union in knowledge between God and a participating subject in the revelational history of a community." Putting the accent on personal encounter, he tends toward a somewhat actualistic position, and evaluates the historical and doctrinal aspects of revelation almost entirely in terms of their power to contribute to a present existential communion with God.

Quite naturally, therefore, Moran has rather independent views on the manner in which revelation should be taught. His latest book, *The Catechesis of Revelation* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1966), emphasizes the need of proportioning religious instruction to the needs and capacities of the student, neither overburdening him with exegetical and doctrinal materials which have no religious meaning for him, nor demanding a fullness of commitment which youth cannot yet sustain. His observations on making catechesis relevant to the contemporary American adolescent offer a clear and forceful challenge to the prevalent biblical-kerygmatic approach. Some readers will feel that Moran's approach is rather one-sided and will balk at his opinion that the catechist should renounce the effort to deliver *any* message, whether dogmatic or biblical. In his own words, "Other religions demand that men accept this or that thing. Christianity only invites men to accept themselves and their own freedom in a community with God" (*National Catholic Reporter*, April 13, 1966). At times Moran almost seems to be saying that because revelation is an encounter with God it must lack any determinate structure or communicable content.

Rahner on revelation

Karl Rahner, S.J., in many of his writings, deals with the relationship between revelation as an ineffable experience of God and as a determinate message. He distinguishes between a transcendent, non-thematic aspect, consisting of the elevation of man's intellectual horizons by an interior enlightenment, and a predicamental, thematic aspect, posses-

sing a definite content which can be expressed in words and other objective signs. In his brochure *On Heresy* (Quaestiones Disputatae 11. New York: Herder & Herder, 1964) Rahner lays particular stress on the necessity that the interior, gracious self-disclosure of God should be correctly translated into human language in order that the revelation may work itself out in man's conscious life and become an effective principle of his concrete behavior. The incorrect formulation of revelation, he maintains, is a threat to the reality of the salvific encounter itself. While the opening pages of this essay sound frighteningly intransigent, Rahner later surprises the reader by conceding that in our time almost any living man must be, at least materially, in a state of heresy.

Volume 5 of Rahner's *Theological Investigations* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1966) reproduces, in a clumsy translation, the article, "What Is Heresy?" which we have just analyzed. It also contains several other articles of great significance for the theology of revelation. One of these, "What is a Dogmatic Statement?" profoundly explores both the necessity and the limitations of conceptual formulations in religious language. Another, entitled "History of the World and Salvation-History," develops the thesis that what we normally call salvation history is a particular segment of the one history of mankind which has been officially and explicitly interpreted by word-revelation; but this special interpretation puts us in a position to see that the general history of grace and salvation is in fact co-extensive with the history of the world. In still another article in this volume, "Christianity and the Non-Christian Religions" [which previously appeared in the same translation in the compilation *The Church: Readings in Theology* (New York: Kenedy, 1963)], Rahner gives an interesting development to his thesis that all men are touched by grace—understood as the a priori horizon of all man's spiritual acts. He holds that this unthematic or transcendental revelation can express itself in the extra-biblical religions, which consequently play an effective role in the mediation of revelation and salvation for peoples who have not yet entered into a sufficient historical encounter with Christianity to recognize it as the definitive and universally valid self-manifestation of God. For a fuller exposition of this relatively optimistic appraisal of the non-Christian religions, which is obviously of great import for the incipient interfaith dialogue, the reader may consult H. R. Schlette, *Towards a Theology of Religions* (Quaestiones Disputatae 14. New York: Herder & Herder, 1966).

In a recently published conference [K. Rahner and J. Ratzinger, *Revelation and Tradition*. Quaestiones Disputatae 25. New York: Herder & Herder, 1966; cf. this writer's review in *Theological Studies*

26 (1965) 722ff.], Rahner argues that the progressive thematization of revelation within the Judaeo-Christian tradition is not simply a series of discrete interventions from on high, but a providentially directed self-fulfillment of man's primal religious consciousness, as modified by his innate (and gratuitous) ordination toward the vision of God. The distinction between acquired and revealed religious knowledge, on this theory, is formal rather than material. The self-giving of the revealing God and the self-fulfillment of man seeking communion with the divine coalesce into a unitary act. In dense and difficult prose Rahner here sets forth some truly explosive ideas which will overturn many of our accustomed ways of thinking about revelation, but which promise to offer an escape from the painful dilemma between a Modernistic immanentism and an anti-Modernist extrinsicism.

The philosophical presuppositions of Rahner's theology of revelation will be greatly illuminated for the English-reading public by the forthcoming translation of his *Hearers of the Word* (New York: Sheed & Ward). This is an early work, composed before Rahner evolved his famous doctrine of the "supernatural *Existential*" and at a time when his view of revelation was more propositional than at present. In preparing the new (1963) edition, Rahner's disciple, J. B. Metz, has tried to bring it into line with his master's current thinking by adding a number of helpful footnotes. Even though this does not make the book one that Rahner would be likely to write today, Metz has rendered no small service. Some familiarity with this work is a prerequisite for understanding much of Rahner's subsequent theologizing on religion and revelation.

The Bible as revelation

Rahner's brochure on *Inspiration in the Bible* (Quaestiones Disputatae I. New York: Herder & Herder; revised translation, 1964) made theological history by putting the doctrine of inspiration on a wholly new footing. Departing from the psychological approach in use among scholastic theologians, Rahner views the formation of the Bible in terms of the successive stages of salvation history and the progressive action by which God established his Church as an "eschatological community of salvation." Rahner thus brings the doctrine of inspiration out of its previous isolation, and into close proximity with the theory of revelation as well as ecclesiology.

Pierre Benoit, O.P., long known for his strictly Thomistic views on the subject of inspiration, has been progressively modifying the somewhat rigid positions taken in his 1947 commentary on St. Thomas'

treatise on prophecy. (An English translation, with numerous revisions by Benoit himself, was published by Desclée in 1961 under the title *Prophecy and Inspiration*.) A recent collection of several articles, *Aspects of Biblical Inspiration* (Chicago: Priory Press, 1965), contains a lengthy analysis of the notions of revelation and inspiration. While Benoit is obviously anxious to adopt a more dynamic, historical view, and to take full advantage of modern biblical theology, his efforts to move simultaneously toward the Bible and St. Thomas, while preserving all he can of his own previous positions, involve him in wearisome and oversubtle discussions of terminology. He elaborates his notions of both revelation and inspiration in almost exclusively psychological terms, and distinguishes between them on the ground that while revelation is an elevation of the speculative intellect, inspiration is a supernatural impulse bearing essentially on the practical judgment "in the wide sense of the speculative judgment related to action, that is, speculativo-practical" (p. 124).

Benoit's doctrine regarding inspiration is luminously summarized by Wilfred J. Harrington, O.P. in *Record of Revelation: The Bible* (Chicago: Priory Press, 1965). Harrington's exclusive reliance on Benoit gives pedagogical simplicity to his presentation, while his appendix on Rahner and J. L. McKenzie provides the reader with a brief introduction to other—and perhaps more fruitful—lines of inquiry.

Whereas Rahner approaches inspiration in the light of salvation history, and Benoit in the perspectives of Thomistic faculty-psychology, Luis Alonso Schökel, S.J. supplements both by his approach through linguistic and literary analysis. In his *The Inspired Word* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1965) he shows on the basis of a thorough grounding in linguistic philosophy and modern literary criticism, that the recent scholastic theories of inspiration (Franzelin, Pesch, and even Benoit) have been based on a crude and misleading schematization of the relationship between thought and language in the process of literary creation. Alonso Schökel's personalistic view of the word, as a medium through which God enters into communion with man, enables him to develop a flexible and nuanced doctrine of biblical inerrancy, or, as he might prefer to say, of biblical truth. The truth of Scripture, on his view, is not a simple matter of correspondence between statements and objective realities; it is primarily a presence of God imparting grace through his word. This rich and original theologico-literary treatise does much to shed light on several statements in the documents of Vatican II regarding the living presence of God in the biblical word when it is read and proclaimed.

Theology of the word

Other aspects of the theology of the word are developed by Otto Semmelroth, S.J. in *The Preaching Word* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1965). Subtitled "On the Theology of Proclamation," this study is primarily concerned with the salvific efficacy of Christian preaching and its relation to the sacraments as channels of grace. But the first half of the book offers a well rounded discussion of the word as revelatory. The author explains how words and deeds complement each other in constituting the fullness of revelation, and how the word, besides communicating what it objectively signifies, communicates something of the speaker himself.

The symposium *The Word*, compiled by American seminarians at the Canisianum, Innsbruck (New York: Kenedy, 1964), contains well-chosen selections from some of the theologians already mentioned (Latourelle, Rahner, Semmelroth). Outstanding in this volume is the article, "Revelation in Word and Deed," by Edward Schillebeeckx, O.P., who has developed a profound theology of the word on the basis of recent phenomenological investigations by philosophers such as Buytendijk and GUSDORF, whose work is too little known in this country. In another article, "Exegesis, Dogmatics, and the Development of Dogma" [in the collection, *Dogmatic vs. Biblical Theology*, edited by H. VORGRIMLER (Baltimore: Helicon, 1964)], Schillebeeckx outlines his theory of revelation and faith as a dialogue between God and man carried on within the context of salvation history. A valuable collection of Schillebeeckx's articles on revelation and theology, *Openbaring en Theologie*, which includes the two articles just mentioned, has already appeared in Dutch (Bilthoven: Nelissen, 1964) and in French translation (*Révélation et Théologie*, Brussels: Éditions du C.E.P., 1965), and will hopefully find an English translator soon.

Readers of a meditative bent will find many suggestive ideas on revelation in the various essays of Hans Urs von Balthasar, notably those contained in his *Word and Revelation* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1964). He, like Schillebeeckx, is a vastly erudite theologian deeply versed in modern existentialism and phenomenology. While possessing a remarkable gift for building bridges between theology, spirituality, art, and literature, he does not write in a systematic style and is therefore often difficult to follow.

Miracles and signs

The preceding works deal with revelation primarily under its aspect as word; but, as the Constitution *Dei Verbum* repeatedly tells us, the mighty deeds of God in history are themselves revelatory. For this

reason it is important for the dogmatic theologian—and not merely for the apologist—to concern himself with the traditional theme of miracle. A very comprehensive and fully documented study of this subject has recently been published in English translation: *Signs and Wonders* by Louis Monden, S.J. (New York: Desclée, 1966). In the first half of this book Monden develops a dogmatic theology of the miracle as a sign and symbol, whereby God communicates with man. In the second half he goes on to discuss the apologetic value of miracles as evidences supporting the case for Catholic Christianity. While acknowledging that the decision to believe cannot be coerced by the evidences, and that the discernment of miracles depends upon prudence and good will, Monden shows that the argument from miracles can still be presented in a very impressive way. Whether or not the “proof” from miracles is convincing by itself, Monden’s careful gathering and sifting of the evidence is an unquestionable service to theology.

In his doctrine of miracles, Monden relies heavily on the theory of signs and their discernment as developed earlier in this century by authors such as Blondel and Rousselot. Readers wishing to explore these questions more deeply will be grateful for the recent publication, in English translation, of Blondel’s so-called *Letter on Apologetics* [New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1935; reviewed by this commentator in *Theological Studies* 26 (1935) 498-500]. In essence this letter is a defense and explanation of his thesis in *L’Action* (1893) that philosophy prepares the paths of faith by disclosing man’s need for grace and revelation.

A contemporary theologian heavily influenced by Rousselot, Guy de Broglie, S.J., has explored the logic of belief with great acumen in his *Revelation and Reason* (Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism 9; New York: Hawthorn, 1965). The central theme of this book is its analysis of knowledge by signs, which de Broglie believes to be discernible by a type of concrete logic irreducible to either scientific induction or deduction. Once this is granted, it is evidently futile to seek strictly demonstrative knowledge of the occurrence or significance of miracles.

The old-style apologetic treatise on revelation, which would attempt a full *demonstratio christiana* on the basis of miracles and prophecies, has probably seen its day. If de Broglie is right, the judgment of credibility depends in great part upon the Christian message itself. Apologetics must therefore include some examination of the contents of Christianity—an undertaking which lies beyond the scope of the traditional treatise, *De revelatione*.

Some of the present writer’s thoughts on apologetics are set forth in

his *Apologetics and the Biblical Christ* (Woodstock Paper no. 6; Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1963). This brief sketch argues that even a New Testament apologetics must assess the value of the corporate testimony of the Church itself as a herald of revelation and cannot proceed by the sheerly objective techniques recommended in positivistic historiography.

In this memorandum we have restricted our attention to public revelation—that which forms the message which is proclaimed by the Church as the way of salvation for all mankind. But private revelations are of interest because they touch closely on public revelation and are sometimes, indeed, hard to distinguish from it. The relations between public and private revelation are adequately discussed in Laurent Volken, M.S., *Visions, Revelations, and the Church* (New York: Kenedy, 1963). A briefer, but more difficult and incisive, treatment of the same subject may be found in Karl Rahner, S.J., *Visions and Prophecies* [Quaestiones Disputatae 10. New York: Herder & Herder, 1963; reviewed together with Volken by this commentator in *Theological Studies* 25 (1964) 453-56].

This sketch has deliberately confined itself to very recent Catholic books in English. Nothing has therefore been said of the periodical literature, or the untranslated literature in foreign languages, or the works on our subject by Protestants (W. Pannenberg, the “post-Bultmannians”) and Anglicans (J. V. Langmead Casserley, A. Richardson). Nor has any effort been made to gather together the fruits of Catholic biblical scholarship pertaining to our theme (D. M. Stanley, J. L. McKenzie, X. Léon-Dufour, R. Schnackenburg). We have said nothing, moreover, about recent studies concerning tradition (J. R. Geiselman, G. H. Tavard, Y. Congar) or the act of faith (J. Pieper, H. Bars, M. Novak, C. Cirne-Lima). Anyone studying the Catholic theology of revelation should, however, be at least marginally aware of the developments in these and other cognate areas, for theology is a vital whole in which a shift in any part modifies the life of the entire organism.



WOODSTOCK
L E T T E R S

SPRING 1967

VOLUME 96 NUMBER 2

INTRODUCTION

This issue continues with the letters from the Congregation, Part II, in an effort to present a personal view of the 31st General Congregation. They were translated from the *Lettres de Rome* edited in the Province of Montreal.

In our age of renewal, every aspect of the Society has been or will be evaluated in the light of the recent Congregation. Robert F. Harvanek, S.J., newly appointed Provincial of the Chicago Province, reports on the International Congress of the Spiritual Exercises held at Loyola, Spain, during the summer of 1966. The report discusses the significance of the Exercises in today's world and the methodology for giving them. Joseph A. Slatery, S.J., Professor of English at Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, interprets the *Exercises* in terms of the ascetical and homiletic writings of St. Augustine.

In 1963, WOODSTOCK LETTERS presented its first Ignatian Survey which assessed articles written on the subject of Ignatian spirituality over the previous year. Associate editor Robert C. Collins, S.J., again has compiled and edited an annotated bibliography of interest to all Jesuits, especially retreat masters.

Every college has the task of creating a climate whereby the students are encouraged to act in a morally responsible manner. This winter, at Woodstock, Michael P. Sheridan, S.I., of the Wisconsin Province, conducted an institute on the contemporary college student. His article, together with the selected readings which complement the ideas in the article, discusses the necessary framework for such moral growth.

CONTENTS

SPRING, 1967

INTRODUCTION

- 143 THE 31ST GENERAL CONGREGATION: LETTERS FROM THE
FIRST SESSION, PART II • *James P. Jurich, S.J., ed.*
- 196 THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES •
Robert F. Harvanek, S.J.
- 212 SAINT AUGUSTINE AND THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES • *Joseph A.
Slattery, S.J.*
- 229 IGNATIAN SURVEY: 1966 • *Robert C. Collins, S.J., ed.*
- 244 THE CAMPUS AS CLIMATE FOR MORAL GROWTH • *Michael P.
Sheridan, S.J.*

REVIEWS

- 255 CHRISTIAN BROTHERHOOD AND MARRIAGE • *Patrick J.
Ryan, S.J. and Robert H. Springer, S.J.*
- 262 JESUITS AND NORTHWEST HISTORY • *Thomas E.
Morrissey, S.J.*

SELECTED READINGS

- 265 HIGHER EDUCATION • *Michael P. Sheridan, S.J.*

BIOGRAPHY

- 271 FERDINAND C. WHEELER, S.J. • *R. Emmett Curran, S.J.*

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

WOODSTOCK LETTERS solicits manuscripts from all Jesuits on all topics of particular interest to fellow Jesuits: Ignatian spirituality, the activities of our various apostolates, problems facing the modern Society, and the history of the Society, particularly in the United States and its missions. In general it is our policy to publish major obituary articles on men whose work would be of interest to the whole assistancy.

Letters of comment and criticism will be welcomed for the Readers' Forum.

Manuscripts, preferably the original copy, should be double-spaced with ample margins. Whenever possible, contributors of articles on Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit history should follow the stylistic norms of the Institute of Jesuit Sources. These are most conveniently found in Supplementary Notes B and C and in the list of abbreviations in Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. W. J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 609-16.

STAFF

Published by the faculty and students of Woodstock College. Editor: Edward J. Mally, S.J. / Managing Editor: Patrick H. Samway, S.J. / Associate Editors: Robert C. Collins, S.J., James P. Jurich, S.J., R. Emmett Curran, S.J., Michael C. Reilly, S.J., Edward F. Salmon, S.J., Raymond A. Schroth, S.J., Richard A. Blake, S.J., Peter D. Ford, S.J., Richard P. Kane, S.J. / Book Editor: Kenneth DeLuca, S.J. / Business Manager: Paul L. Horgan, S.J.

THE 31ST GENERAL CONGREGATION: LETTERS FROM THE FIRST SESSION

Edited by JAMES P. JURICH, S.J.

PART II

June 27-28, 1965

Apostolate and procedure

Back to the Congregation, I presented the text on the social apostolate which provoked only two more or less favorable interventions. One requested that we insist more on participation in international organizations. The other intervention suggested the text was too prudent. The text will doubtlessly be adopted definitively during the week. In my last letter I spoke of the vote on the Assistants. In order to limit the length of their term, a two-thirds majority vote would have been necessary. However, the vote taken last Thursday, while close to that majority, did not make it.

Some who were disappointed at the results made an "intercession": the *Formula* of the Congregation allows anyone to appeal within three days if he thinks that a vote was irregular or illegal, etc. But others, who said that there had been nothing irregular about the first vote, did not want to allow this appeal. The result was a long discussion on procedure in which everyone from the General on down was involved. As a last resort, the question was referred to a special session which was held quite unusually on Sunday morning and which confirmed the first vote. Many deplored the fact that the Jesuits were unaware of modern rules of procedure for deliberative assemblies. For example, it was unforeseen by the *Formula* that someone might be able to introduce an amendment to a proposal, much less an amendment to an amendment. Voting was always on the entire proposition, adopting it or

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

rejecting it as a whole. The General realized the difficulty and publicly asked those who had recommendations to make on procedure to forward them to him.

Interprovincial cooperation

Yesterday, while we were discussing interprovincial cooperation, a father from behind the Iron Curtain stepped up to the microphone for the first time since the session began. "Non sum provincialis, numquam fui, et numquam ero provincialis (I am not a provincial, I never have been a provincial, and I never will be)," he said. Smiles and laughter from the audience—and he continued:

I wish that the other provinces would support us in our struggle to preserve the Society and the Church in Communist countries. I mean, first of all, that they pay attention to our fate. I myself, under some sort of pretext, was thrown into prison, and there I remained for six months. I was never convicted of any definite crime or sentenced by any judge. In my country, we have no recourse against this arbitrary treatment except international public opinion, the opinion of the West. When an arrest of this kind occurs in Franco's Spain or Salazar's Portugal, the whole world is filled with Communist protests. Why shouldn't as much be done when *we* are the victims? Why couldn't each of the Jesuit provinces arouse public opinion in its country whenever the Society suffers when one of its members is arrested, imprisoned, and tortured behind the Iron Curtain? Wouldn't that be an excellent form of solidarity and interprovincial cooperation? When one of the members suffers, shouldn't the whole body be alerted to defend him and itself?

The speaker, who himself was quite moved, had stirred the emotions of his listeners. When he stopped, they applauded this dramatic appeal for a long time. Shortly afterwards, the General intervened to tell us not to be surprised if, in the near future, he took serious steps in this area of interprovincial cooperation—not violent steps, he made clear, because "violenta non durant," but effective steps to respond to the needs of the hour.

June 28-29, 1965

The fountain is dry

This morning it was so hot—over 95°—that I tried in vain to think of something else in my room (the sun had been beating on it all day). I reached the conclusion that nothing was getting done there and that I might as well go to the garden. Even there I lost all desire to work or to read Smulders' book on Teilhard de Chardin. (The Congregation wasn't meeting this morning because of Fr. Baumann's funeral. He had lived at the Curia for twenty years.)

The fathers began coming out of their rooms mopping their brows and filling the corridors. To make matters worse, the Pepsi machine was

locked. When it was finally opened after many attempts, the disappointment was even greater: the machine was completely empty! The question of adjournment came up for discussion again. Those who live on the sixth floor are complaining loudly because they also have the heat from the tile terrace which forms the roof.

Outlooks

As for the end of the Congregation, there are three possibilities: (1) if the Congregation wanted to complete all the work it had before it, it would take at least until August 1, and more probably until August 15; (2) if the Congregation established some priorities and satisfied itself with that, it could end around July 20; (3) if the heat forced us to hold a second session, the end would come in the second week of July.

The new Assistants

We are breaking in the new Assistants elected yesterday. There are only four, as the new decree specified—the “Big Four,” as they are already called. We spent the day on that election process, which was quite long, since no one was elected on the first ballot. I will give you a few details on each one.

The first elected: Fr. Swain, elected on the second ballot. This was a tribute to the man who had been Vicar General and who had done his job to everybody's satisfaction. Everyone respects him and has confidence in his judgment. He is unassuming, does not raise his voice, shrinks from publicity, and knows the operations of the Society very well. Someone even said to me that Fr. Swain belonged to the whole Society, that he could no longer be thought of as a Canadian or as a representative of Canada. From the beginning, his election to the office of Assistant seemed assured.

The second: Fr. O'Keefe, rector of Fordham University. During the four days of information-gathering, everybody was saying that if the Americans succeeded in agreeing on a candidate, that candidate would have every chance of being elected, for everyone realized that an American had to be on the Big Four. But which American? Bringing this about was painful for the Americans, who met several times before finding the man who not only was suitable but also would agree to live at the Curia in Rome. The choice finally fell on the rector of Fordham University, much to the despair of the Provincial of New York, who is losing a good man and who has to find another president for Fordham University. In any case, the night before the vote, at the last meeting of the Americans, Frs. O'Keefe and McGinty (Provincial of New York) gave their consent and the thing seemed to be in the bag. In fact, as

early as the first vote—the one that elected Fr. Swain—Fr. O’Keefe was among the front-ranking possible choices and appeared to all to be the candidate on whom the Americans agreed. So there was no difficulty getting him elected as the second Assistant. All the same, the poor father had hoped to the end that he could avoid it, especially after the election of Fr. Swain. When I was congratulating him for showing well in that election, he said to me: “Now the danger is over. The Congregation will not elect two Assistants from North America.” He is an unpretentious man, with a keen intellect. He did his theology at Louvain (so he speaks French) and his tertianship in Germany, where he learned German. He knows a little Italian and, as he says, American. He was one of the youngest of the Americans, even (according to him) the youngest. That’s why he was asked to sacrifice himself: he is forty-five. He is like Jonah cast into the sea, and, as one father here says, *Roma, hominum vorax*, has swallowed him up.

The third: Fr. Dezza, of the Province of Venice-Milan. Everybody knows him. As far back as 1935, he was provincial of his province, then rector of the Gregorian from 1941 to 1952. He attended the 28th General Congregation in 1938, the 29th in 1946, the 30th in 1957, and the 31st in 1965. It’s a record no Canadian will ever match. At the present time, he is Father General’s delegate for the interprovincial houses in Rome. He is a man who inspires respect, who possesses a vast experience on the question of studies in the Society, and who has close connections with the Roman Curia. ~

The fourth: Fr. Varga, Vice-Provincial of all the dispersed Hungarians. He lived for a few years at Toronto and visited Montreal several times. He was professor of ethics and social questions at Fordham University. With Fr. O’Keefe, he is the second Assistant Fordham is furnishing the Curia.

Jesuit government and the parliamentary system

There you have the Big Four Club or, to use a phrase current in Ottawa, the “inner circle” of the Society’s government. They have been elected for the lifetime of the General or until the next Congregation. They are the General’s official consultants in every situation where canon law or the law of the Society calls for their opinion. All the other Assistants will be named by the General, but nothing prevents him from assigning a regional assistantcy to one of these four.

While walking the other day with Quebec’s Minister of Labor, I explained to him the Society’s system of government and what we were doing in Rome. I told him, in short: the General Congregation currently in session is like the legislative assembly in Quebec. It is made

up of deputies who come from every part of the world. It has complete power. Not only does it elect the General (who corresponds to a prime minister or president, except that he is elected for life), but it also appoints his principal ministers for him, that is, his Assistants. It maps out and develops the legislative program, which it then hands over to the General for execution. It is completely sovereign, a true legislative body whose president is the Superior General. The Minister of Labor, thinking out loud, admitted that he had never thought the Society of Jesus was so democratic. For him, the General was like the Supreme Pontiff, an absolute monarch. He had never heard of a Jesuit legislative assembly working out the specific tasks of the General's term.

The Society in Holland

The other night we had a conference on the situation of the Church and the Society in Holland. The talk, given by Fr. Smulders (author of the book *La vision de Teilhard de Chardin*), interested me all the more because Father General, after our interview with him, had told us that the Society in Holland was passing through a crisis similar to ours in Canada. In other words, the session was worth the inconvenience because it was very instructive to Canadians. Here is a full summary.

One of the most important facts to know in order to understand the religious situation and the present crisis in Holland is the large number of atheists and non-believers in that country. In 1960, 27% of the entire population identified themselves as atheists or non-believers. In a large city like Amsterdam, the proportion climbs to 50%, and at the University of Amsterdam, the figure reaches 90% among the teaching staff. Avant-garde literature is completely atheistic. Priestly and religious vocations are going down in number, along with confessions, Communions, attendance at Mass, etc. From this situation the crisis arises. Fr. Smulders gives three signs or causes for it:

1) *The variety of adherents to different religious confessions, or what he calls a time of "religious promiscuity."* Up until quite recently, Catholics were organized among themselves, had their own religious and civil associations, married among themselves, etc. Thus they lived in a milieu where the faith grew and preserved itself almost automatically. Today, all the barriers are down. Catholics, Protestants, atheists, non-believers, etc., meet each other in the same organizations, associations, clubs, etc., and everything—the faith, like everything else—is called into question and subject to doubt.

2) *The intellectual and social emancipation of Catholics, especially laymen.* For a long time the clergy alone had the intellectual competence required to play a leading role in Dutch Catholic society. Because of this, laymen showed almost blind devotion to the clergy whom they dared not criticize. But today Catholic laymen are well-educated, and they notice that many of

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

the clergy argue from authority and that they are not as competent as they want to appear to be. Criticism grows against certain of the clergy who are considered reactionary. This is an adolescent's reaction, but it is one which is accompanied by a strong desire to be active in the things of the faith, to think for oneself, and to live free of authority.

3) *The call of conscience to apostolic duty.* Up until now Catholics had lived wrapped up in themselves, almost as if in a ghetto. Now they have discovered their obligation to be present to the world and to give witness. They realize that their exclusively Catholic organizations have cut them off from the mainstream of thought and action in modern life. They want to enter into dialogue with the modern world of humanism, but they find themselves inferior, and from this their criticisms, their impatience, and their revolts arise.

The crisis in the Society is dominated by this external situation. The younger generation feels that the Society is absent from the avant-garde, that it does not participate enough in the great movements like ecumenism, liturgical reform, the dialogue with socialist humanism and atheism. They think that the Society lives on outmoded apostolates, which are just average, like the schools, retreat houses, etc., and that we are outpaced in boldness and initiative by the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians. There is also a crisis of discipline among the young, but the Dutch have always been a bit undisciplined. Among the priests who have left the Society, none, however, have abandoned their priesthood or their faith. The young want to be present among men, to be human with people. They figure they will find God in interaction with men, and not in the sort of monastic life that too often the Society forces them to live. The ideas of Bishop Robinson (*Honest to God*) exert a great influence on them, and they realize that so far there hasn't been a genuine, theological, irrefutable response to the question posed by Bishop Robinson. Catholics and the Society are behind the times, while the world makes itself, renews itself, etc., etc. In conclusion, Fr. Smulders told us that it is necessary to have confidence because the crisis is born of a truly apostolic spirit. The young Jesuits want to be present to the world, to give witness to their faith, and to construct a Church adapted to the needs of the hour.

So you see the similarities. I have transcribed Fr. Smulders' conference almost word for word, without changing anything. I think that the General had reason to say that the situations in Holland and French Canada resemble one another. The Dutch remain optimistic, and they believe that they will surmount the crisis.

July 1, 1965

As I write to you on this first day of July, our holiday in Canada, I can picture you at the spot where I would really like to find myself at

this moment, at Villa St-Michel. Here, the temperature has stayed between 90° and 95° for two weeks, and, as good religious in this model house which is the Curia, we are still wearing our habits (and have a sweating competition going). We can't help being drawn toward that marvelous Pepsi vending machine, where the consumption has been frightening for some days now, with even the General himself going there for his bottle.

More table-talk

For the fourth time, and to my great surprise, I had dinner yesterday next to Father General. Since the Assistants had been named the day before, I thought that they would immediately occupy the places at the head table. In fact, they were there the first night. At noon yesterday, I came into the dining room. The General was alone at his table. Just as I was going to take my place at a table in the middle, he signaled to me to come and join him. I hesitated, convinced that he was forgetting his Assistants, but he repeated his invitation. . . . I took my place at his side, thinking that the Assistants must have been elsewhere celebrating their election—at the Gregorian, for example—and that that was why the General was alone. But just then Fr. O'Keefe, one of the new Assistants, came into the dining room and went to take a place at one of the common tables. Some charitable souls signaled to him to go to the table of honor, but he shook his head and stayed where he was. I was mystified.

The lot of the Assistants

At "Deo gratias" (which always comes at dessert-time during the noon meal, but never at night) the conversation got off to a fast start. After the usual greetings, I immediately asked the question: "What have you done with your ring of Assistants?" He started to laugh. He told me that at the first consultation, held that very morning, the first decision taken with and for the Assistants had been that from now on they would have no special places reserved for them in the chapel and the dining room. In the future they will be able to mix in with the crowd, with the flunkies at the common tables, and the General will be able to have a whole variety of neighbors at his table. This, he told me, is a beginning in the democratization of the Curia. The step was adopted unanimously, but it is only provisional, that is, for as long as the Congregation lasts. After that, we will see; but I have the impression that the provisional is going to last and that if you ever return to the Curia, you will be able to have your dinner next to the General and then go to recreation without being obliged to take your seat opposite him, under the eyes of the obligatory circle of Assistants. When

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

I spoke with Fr. O'Keefe after dinner, he told me that this is only the first step and that there will be many other changes at the Curia. The "desolemnization" of the Curia has begun. . . .

The Congregation's labors

Since much of the work is now ready, the Congregation is going to multiply its plenary sessions: morning and afternoon. I mentioned to the General that those living on the sixth floor were complaining about the heat, which they get from the front, the side, and the roof above. He replied that although his room is on the fifth floor, there is nothing above it and he also gets the heat from three sides, but still the Congregation has to continue. . . . For a few days, meanwhile, I have noticed that he has intervened and told some people that their intervention "non est ad rem." In my opinion, he will have to do that more often, because scores of interventions don't make sense, except to put their authors in the limelight temporarily and to waste the time of the other two hundred people listening to them. I admit that I haven't managed to understand how and why so many Jesuits want to and can intervene so often "de omni re scibili et quibusdam aliis. . . ."

The Canadian presence in Rome

Imperceptibly, we passed on to the affairs of Canada. Father General began by relating the banter he has been hearing since the first consultation with his new Assistants. Someone (I couldn't find out who) said that Canada is beginning to have too much influence at the Curia: Fr. Swain is not only the first Assistant, but he was also elected admonitor; Fr. Varga, another Assistant, worked in Canada for a long time, and he is still the superior of the Hungarian Jesuits in Canada; and Fr. O'Keefe, the President of Fordham, lives in a town which is only a suburb of Montreal! I told him that there was a little truth in this last assertion, since formerly all North American Jesuits had been grouped in a single province, the Province of New York-Canada, and it's not certain that at this period New York was not a suburb of Montreal! He enjoyed that. . . .

The Embassy versus the Curia

I sounded him out for the next day, our Canadian holiday, because all the Canadians at the Congregation were invited to a reception from 5:00 o'clock until 7:00 in the Canadian Embassy gardens. When I mentioned this invitation, the General replied: "Of course, you people have to go."

"And the Congregation?"

"That's right. . . . Well, in that case. . . ."

(Today, July 1, the Congregation was in session from 4:30 until 8:00, and quite wisely, all the Canadians took part.)

The "new" vows

A closing remark. We have some people here who try to rework the spontaneous witticisms made by our cleverest delegates. Here is the definitive text—and in Latin—of the new formula of the vows in the Society, in accordance with the *postulata* sent by the scholastics, which Father General found amusing: "Voveo laborem remuneratum (paupertatem), maturitatem affectivam (castitatem), et dialogum perpetuum (obedientiam) in Societate Iesu, omnia intelligendo iuxta meam constitutionem. . . ."

An overwhelming prospect

When I was in the juniorate (of happy memory), our professors urged us to read Godefroid Kurth's book, *L'église aux tournants de l'histoire*. This old title comes to mind at the moment, when the 31st General Congregation is involved, this morning, in a great turning point in its history. At 10:30 a *relatio* will be presented on the duration of the Congregation and the advisability of adjourning and holding a second session after the Council. Yesterday, Fr. Abellán, the Secretary of the Congregation, gave an outline of the work done and the work still to be done. When he announced to us that some items would not be ready before July 10, and others not before July 15, a burst of groans and exclamations shot through the assembly. It is clear that the Congregation must make a choice, and as quickly as possible. It has undertaken a gigantic task, one that is more far-reaching than any previous Congregation had dared to attempt. To accomplish this task, however, it has to remain in session for at least a month and a half more, if not for two months, in the middle of summer, with the hot weather that renders no one benevolent. If it does not accomplish this work, there will be great disappointment throughout the whole Society. And, in any case, two or three years from now, the General will have to call another Congregation to take up the task again, for there are some things that have dragged on for years and that Congregations have put off time after time or else referred to Father General. But to act on them he needs precise directives from the supreme legislative authority of the General Congregation.

Balance-sheet of the Congregation

Perhaps it would be good to give you a sketch of what the 31st General Congregation has done and what remains to be done. The starting point: the 1950 *postulata* questioning everything in the Society. (I recall that only 400 *postulata* were presented to the General Congrega-

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

tion of 1957.) To study these *postulata*, five large commissions have been created, to which the General has added a sixth, in charge of studying the mission of the Society in the modern world, and especially the mission of opposing atheism entrusted to the Society by the Sovereign Pontiff. . . .

Commission I: Government

This commission is made up of thirty-nine members under Fr. Swain's chairmanship, and it is subdivided into four subcommissions. Up to now, this is the one which has presented the most documents to the Congregation, more than 180 pages of texts.

Subcommission I: Government in general

So far, only two texts have been presented. One is a preliminary text, and the other is a definitive text on the qualities all government in the Society ought to have. These texts have come before the Congregation, but they received so much criticism that they have disappeared—temporarily?—from circulation.

Subcommission II: Government of the whole Society

About fifty pages have been delivered, some of which are about Father General. On this subject, a rather peculiar phenomenon has arisen. Before the General's election, the Congregation had discussed at length the advisability of limiting the duration of the term of the General. Then, faced with the impossibility of coming to an agreement, it had postponed the decision until after the election. During the first weeks the subcommission had presented a text entitled *De duratione muneris P. Generalis et de novis cautelis*, but when the text came back before the Congregation two weeks later, its title had been changed to *De muneris Praepositi Generalis renuntiatione*. In short, the subcommission had abandoned the idea of limiting the General's term, and it was only presenting new possibilities for the resignation of the General for grave reasons. Some people, who wanted to take up the discussion on the generalate for life or for a definite term once again, did not care for this about-face, and they said so, but for the moment the silence is total. . . .

The Assistants

This point has again given rise to endless debates on their number, the length of their terms of office, the method of electing them, etc. I have already spoken about that. . . .

With regard to the four General Assistants elected by the Congregation, I will point out one reaction. The Europeans—at least some of them—think that the upper echelon of the Society's government is too

Americanized. There is no difficulty about the General, for Fr. Arrupe is at least one-third European, one-third American, and one-third Oriental. No one can claim him entirely. But in European eyes, the North Americans have an exaggerated representation with three of their men belonging to the Big Four, the four General Assistants: Frs. Swain, O'Keefe, and Varga (whom they regard as Americanized), leaving only Fr. Dezza to represent Europe.

Subcommission III: Provincial government

Up to the present time, this subcommission has presented some thirty pages on three different subjects: provincials, interprovincial houses, and superiors. The only question which has been really discussed in the *aula* has been that of interprovincial cooperation, but the debate that took place satisfied no one. Some provincials who have interprovincial houses acknowledged their dissatisfaction. Others shifted the debate to financial solidarity among the provinces, and others to the unity of action in the Society, etc. The General intervened at the end to say that he considered this question to be very important and that he had the intention to act in this area. . . . With regard to the provincials, they have not yet been treated too badly. . . . It is true that they are there to defend themselves.

Subcommission IV: Congregations

We have about fifty pages on the general, procurators', and provincial congregations. . . . Right now we have before us an extremely interesting text on the number of those who would be able to take part in the next General Congregation. Will we have the time to study and adopt it? I doubt it. Broadly speaking, it involves giving each assistancy and each province a more equitable representation. The American Assistancy makes up 23.2% of all Jesuits, but it has only 15.4% of the representatives at the Congregation. The English Assistancy, which counts for 13.9% of all Jesuits, nevertheless has 14.5% of the representatives. The two new Provinces of Quebec and Montreal, which do not have 400 members, each have three representatives, while the Provinces of New York and New England, with more than 1100 members each, also have only three representatives each. So it is quite probable that a new plan for representation will be adopted, based on the number of Jesuits in each province. Then Montreal and Quebec would have only two delegates instead of three. . . .

We have before us several texts on the reform of the provincial congregation, with some very interesting suggestions on the manner of participation. If all these suggestions go through, our old Jesuits will be quite at sea, and the next Provincial Congregation at St-Jérôme is going

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

to take on a completely different look from the one we had last time. . . . But before that happens, there will probably be a long battle in the *aula*. . . . The Old Guard may die, but it doesn't surrender!

Second session in September, 1966

I interrupt my report to tell you the big news. The General and the Assistants have just proposed the following motion to the Congregation: THE PRESENT CONGREGATION WILL ADJOURN ON JULY 15 OR JULY 17 AND WILL RESUME, IN A SECOND SESSION, IN THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER, 1966. Since they approved this proposal unanimously, I think the Congregation will support it. It will be put to a vote on Monday, July 5. . . .

July 4-5, 1965

Small fry!

In my haste to finish with Commission I, on government, I forgot a prominent figure (at least in our Province), for, at the Congregation, so far no one has gotten worked up over this post. I am referring to the *socius*, whom someone defined: "Nexus inter provincialem et iuniores generationes," and of whom a former provincial used to say: "I was socius for fifteen years, and whenever people asked me what I was doing, I would answer: Nothing! The socius is the right arm of the provincial: he does nothing by himself, but does everything the provincial asks him to do." Two *postulata* are concerned with this eminent personage. One does not want the socius to be too young. The other wants to make it possible for him to take part in provincial congregations. So far, the Congregation has not judged it worthwhile to dwell on this celebrity. This is small fry, at a time when it has its hands full with these big fish (Father General, the Assistants, the provincials, the various congregations, etc.), especially since now that a second session is announced, the stock response to all these secondary questions has become: "For the second session!"

Commission II: Ministries and the apostolate

The commission on ministries and the apostolate is the most numerous of all, with fifty-nine members under the chairmanship of our Fr. Carrier. . . .

Subcommission V: Social apostolate and communications media

My subcommission. It has entirely finished its work and was the first subcommission to have the texts it presented adopted completely. There are three: (1) on the social apostolate; (2) on the communications media; (3) on an information center at the Curia. I must admit that it had rather easy work, especially since it did not concern the *Constitu-*

tions. (As soon as a text affects the *Constitutions*, there is always a phalanx of defenders who raise their shields to defend them.) Our texts stirred up little objection during the public discussion in the *aula*, and they were adopted unanimously, so to speak.

Commission III: Formation and studies of Jesuits

Under Fr. Dezza's chairmanship, this commission is the second largest, with fifty-four members. It is divided into three subcommissions: (1) on general formation; (2) on the ordinary course of studies; (3) on special studies. Contrary to the practice of the other commissions, however, it has decided to present a single text covering the work of all three subcommissions. We have in our hands, therefore, thirty pages on Jesuit formation and studies. This commission alone has had to go through, study, and discuss the 287 *postulata* referred to it, *postulata* questioning almost everything employed in our intellectual formation up until now, from the juniorate to the *ad grad*, without overlooking the professors!

The commission, therefore, has submitted to the Congregation a long document which Fr. Dezza presented with his usual mastery (he comes up to the microphone, without notes, and improvises in Latin with great facility).⁵

After a careful consideration of the numerous *postulata* which the Congregation received about this point, it has seemed best to draw up a single decree which will solve the problems that can be solved now and give an orientation concerning questions that cannot be solved now.

I

The first part of the decree deals with the training in general and is shorter, because many questions touching the spiritual life and religious discipline have been omitted. These will be taken up explicitly in other decrees. For there seemed no point to repetition. Therefore, supposing what will be taken up elsewhere, only those points are taken up here which touch on some special circumstances of those in training. This will not prevent the matter of the present decree being joined to and harmonized with what will be said in the decree on spiritual formation to be approved by the Congregation in its second session.

Perhaps even the things said in this first part do not seem new, since the tradition of the Society has professed them from the beginning. But the large number of *postulata* indicates their timeliness and importance. The youth of

⁵ At this point, the author summarizes in five paragraphs Fr. Dezza's *relatio* and the decree itself. This has been replaced here with a translation of most of the official *relatio*. In an unusual step, this had been sent to all Jesuit houses along with the decree. Three paragraphs which merely repeat what is in the final decree have been omitted here. The full Latin text may be found in *ActRSJ* 14 (1965) 621-28.

today is distinguished by both maturity and immaturity more strikingly than in the past. The maturity arises from their great freedom in action, work, and choice even from their childhood. The immaturity comes from a slower development, both biological and psychological, especially in their affective life. Add to this that the very world in which the young men live and for whose evangelization they must prepare themselves demands a unity of all things and the solidarity of all men.

The first part of the decree attempts to answer these diverse and new needs. . . .

II

The second part deals with studies and is more inclusive because this is the particular scope of the present decree.

. . . some norms are given for the revision of the *Ratio Studiorum* (No. 15).

It might help to point out clearly what the present Congregation can or cannot do, in view of the legislation of the Church and the Society.

There are many ecclesiastical laws about studies, of which some affect Jesuit scholastics inasmuch as they are preparing for the priesthood, and others inasmuch as they are working for ecclesiastical degrees.

Of these laws, some are now in force (the Apostolic Constitutions *Deus Scientiarum Dominus*, *Sedes Sapientiae*, *Veterum Sapientia*, and so on); some will soon be promulgated by the Council (the *Decree on Priestly Formation*); and some are foreseen during the post-conciliar period (a revision of *Deus Scientiarum Dominus*).

Since these laws do not depend on the General Congregation, and since to seek a dispensation from them now is neither possible nor opportune, the decree on studies was so drawn up that it does not contradict the laws now in force, is suited to the laws soon to be promulgated by the Council, and can easily be adapted to the post-conciliar laws, as far as can be foreseen.

In addition, there are the *Statuta Facultatum Societatis Iesu*, which were written by the Society, but approved by the Holy See and so cannot be changed without the approval of the Holy See. But a change will be easy to get, but not now; for, since they are connected with the Apostolic Constitution *Deus Scientiarum Dominus*, their revision is connected with the revision of that Constitution.

Finally, there are the laws of the Society, which can be changed by the Congregation, though in various ways. First, there are the *Constitutions*; however, nothing in the decree is contrary to the *Constitutions* except what is said in No. 29 about the subject matter of the *ad gradum* examination. In that section, it is determined that philosophy, as a part separate from theology, is dropped from the *ad gradum*. The reason is that the philosophical part of the examination, as many admit, is not serious. On the one hand, the scholastics have already taken an exam on all of philosophy and during their preparation for theology do not have time to review all of philosophy. On the other hand, the professors of theology, the men who do the examining, usually do not know the more serious problems of modern philosophy, and so they

tend to examine the students only about the philosophical questions that are connected with theology and can easily be fitted into it, as it is said in No. 29.

Moreover, there are the decrees of preceding General Congregations, and the most important of those dealing with studies are in the *Collection of Decrees*, Nos. 84-128. The General Congregation can abrogate or revise these decrees, and, in fact, in the new decree here given there are many points which contradict these decrees. But since the Congregation cannot carry out a consideration and revision of each of these decrees, it commits to Father General and a new commission, which is to revise the *Ratio Studiorum*, the task of revising all the decrees on studies and setting up norms, until the next General Congregation gives a definitive form to them, after research and experimentation has been completed.

Therefore, the decrees of former General Congregations and the Ordinations of Father General, which contradict this decree and to the extent that they do, are abrogated. The remaining decrees remain in force till new norms are established. To clear up some doubts and solve difficulties some norms will be given below.

Since it was asked that studies be better adapted to regional differences and necessary circumstances, not only is permission given to the provincials (or the board of provincials), but they are obliged to prepare a regional *Ordo Studiorum* with the help of *periti*. In this *Ordo*, within the limits of the laws of the Church and the whole Society, accommodations can be made to legitimate desires, and yet excessive differences avoided, so that it will not become practically impossible for a scholastic to be transferred from one country to another for studies, as now can be done with great profit (No. 16).

The provision is in accord with the *Decree on Priestly Formation*, which will soon be promulgated by the Council. This decree provides that the conferences of bishops, in particular nations or rites, shall draw up a *sacerdotalis institutionis ratio* which is to adapt the universal laws to particular circumstances of time and place. This *ratio* is to be approved by the Holy See, and regularly revised, so that the training of priests may always correspond to the pastoral needs of the regions in which ministries are to be exercised. In an analogous way in the Society, the boards of provincials are to draw up regional *Ordines Studiorum*, to be regularly revised and approved by Father General.

III

After these general remarks on the *Ratio Studiorum* for the whole Society, it will help to point out the new elements in that part of the decree called "The General Curriculum of Studies," some of which depart from the decrees of preceding General Congregations:

1. The norm is kept which requires that each scholastic ordinarily work for those academic degrees which can be obtained by means of the general curriculum of studies. But the bond hitherto established has been broken, so that it is no longer necessary to have the permission of Father General for someone to be working toward the profession in the Society yet not working for

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

academic degrees. The same will be true of those who are working for an academic degree but not now toward the profession (No. 21).

2. Since many *postulata* asked that the time spent in the general curriculum be shortened, so that more and better provision could be made for special studies, it is now allowed, without asking Father General's permission, to reduce the philosophical curriculum to two years, and to defer or even to omit regency. Hence, apart from the six-year curriculum of philosophy and theology a scholastic can use all the years of study for his specialization (No. 22).

3. Permission is also given, that in the different regional *Ordines Studiorum* regency may be so arranged as seems best: either keeping it as it is, or postponing it until after the completion of theology, or using some other method. It is necessary, however, that the goal of regency not be neglected, and if regency is not made, that goal must be gained by other means; for example, throughout the whole course of studies the scholastics may be sent during summer vacation to do suitable apostolic experiments under the direction of some experienced person (No. 30).

4. When the philosophy curriculum is reduced to two years, the prescriptions of the *Ratio Studiorum*, No. 122, must be observed, namely, concerning classes in scholastic philosophy and the history of philosophy and concerning the examinations on the whole of scholastic philosophy and the history of philosophy. For care is to be had that, even if some auxiliary or special disciplines have to be dropped in the two-year curriculum, a solid training in philosophy is received by the scholastics, as described in No. 22, and they may be able to receive a bachelor's degree in philosophy.

5. According to the mind of the Council (cf. *Decree on Priestly Formation*) and according to the desires of many, an introduction to the mystery of Christ and the history of salvation is prescribed, at least at the beginning of philosophy, unless it is given sooner. This introduction, adapted to the mind of contemporary young men, will be very significant for their religious, academic, and apostolic formation (No. 20).

6. A greater coordination between the philosophy and theology curricula is required, and a revision of all syllabi, so that useless repetitions which often happen now (e.g., between natural theology and *De Deo Uno*, between ethics and moral theology, etc.) may be avoided (Nos. 21, 25).

7. In the curriculum of theology, greater importance is given to Scripture, and the courses in it (which in No. 155 of the *Ratio Studiorum* were assigned to second year) can profitably be begun in first. There is no difficulty in having moral theology in third year, and the exam "for hearing confessions" can be taken after ordination, but before any confessions can be heard.

8. There is no need to maintain distinct series of classes for long and short courses. It is clear that some theologians will be in line for profession but not for degrees, or for degrees but not for profession, or for neither. This does not make a division of lectures necessary, and in fact it has been dropped in some scholasticates. Where it is maintained, it seems often to be a painful

discrimination. Yet according to the different talents of the scholastics and their aptitude for future assignments, a more personal care of the scholastics should be taken by professors (through special courses and seminars) (No. 24).

9. Concerning the number of classes, though no final solution can be given because of laws still in force, some lessening of class hours can be allowed, but preserving the requirements of the *Ratio Studiorum*, No. 44.3; *Ordinatio*, No. 29.1; *Sedes Sapientiae Statuta Gen.*, art. 42.4. Likewise, it can be permitted that in place of some lectures, seminars or exercises be given, in which the active participation of the scholastics is stimulated. In this area, suitable experiments in various scholasticates can be permitted by Father General, so that ways can be found to improve the training of scholastics.

11. There are many new things as regards examinations. A permission asked for by many is given to introduce written examinations, even in a major discipline. It will be the function of the regional *Ordines* to determine the proportion we are to give to written examinations and other written work done during the year in assigning the final grade. After an oral examination, the examiners can consult together, yet each must give his own personal and secret grade. It is more easily permitted to repeat an examination—annual as well as *de universa philosophia* and the *ad gradum*—without asking Father General's permission. However, the other prescriptions on examinations given in the *Ratio Studiorum*, e.g., the length of the oral examination, the number of examiners, the computation of grades, etc., continue in force. The examiners must examine as a board in the examinations *de universa philosophia* and the final examination in theology. In the annual examinations the examiners can examine separately. For those who are not working toward a degree nor for the profession, the prescriptions given in the *Ratio Studiorum* for the exams on the short course in theology are to be kept.

14. Finally, a solution is proposed to a problem arising from the need, on the one side, not to have too many scholastics in one college so that there can be a real religious community and not a barracks, and from the other side, of the need not to multiply advanced schools and faculties, of which there are already too many in the Society and which cannot be suitably kept up without a great waste of money and personnel. It is also recommended that new scholasticates not be built in deserted places, but, as far as possible, near university centers, so that communications can be established with these scholarly centers, to the advantage of both professors and students. There are risks, and so care must be used, so that the training of Jesuits is not harmed but improved (No. 32).

IV

Some norms are given on special studies, as asked for in the *postulata*; these norms were already to be found, though in scattered fashion, in the decrees of General Congregations and the Ordinations of Father General, even if they have not always been observed.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

First, mention is made of the ever-increasing need for special studies, not only for teaching sacred and secular sciences, but also for specialized ministries, or at least for special preparation for different assignments. For the general preparation is indeed necessary for all, but it is not enough for many, and so must be completed by special preparation.

The more difficult the special preparation, the more necessary is the accurate and timely selection of scholastics and direction and consistency in special studies. The Society suffers much harm from the ease with which our young scholastics, even those of outstanding virtue and talent, are given assignments in succession which differ widely among themselves. As a consequence, they do not become outstanding in anything. It seems we must try very earnestly to procure the greater and more universal good, even at the sacrifice of some particular lesser good.

V

In the last part, "Doctrine and Teaching," the decree revises, and in an organic way adapts to the needs of our times, things which had been set down by previous Congregations in different circumstances.

Some more details on doctrine, as also many particulars either in the general curriculum or in special studies, are not taken up in the decree, not because they do not deserve consideration, but because they should not be considered *now*. For these will have to be dealt with by the commission for revising the *Ratio Studiorum*, which will work after the Congregation. It will have to consider the laws which will be passed by the Church and the experiments which will be made in the Society. Then, having considered all this seriously and quietly, it can draw up new norms and present them to the next Congregation for approval. In the meantime, the present decree approved by the Congregation opens the way to a sound development and true progress in the training of scholastics in studies, which so many *postulata* have insistently asked for.

I have said enough on this for you to get an idea of this decree on studies. So far, it has not aroused any great opposition, except on the part of the Germans, who have asked to have it put off until the second session in order to have more time to study it.

Dining the other day opposite Fr. Dezza, I congratulated him on his work and asked him somewhat jokingly and to see his reaction: "How does it happen that you have agreed to support such radical reforms, which I have heard described as revolutionary?" He answered me: "All these reforms were in the air a long time ago. The only thing that remained to be done was to condense them into a decree which would be flexible and would not block the way of the future. This is what we have done. To my great surprise, however, while I was expecting some very lively opposition in the *aula*, almost nobody brought up serious objections to the reforms we propose." The decree will come up again

during the week, and it will probably be adopted by a strong majority; most people are very satisfied with it.

July 5-6, 1965

Commission IV: Religious life

The fourth commission, with Fr. Ganss, an American, as its chairman, is made up of thirty-three members. It is divided into seven subcommissions.

Subcommission III: Poverty

This is the big subcommission, the one which has given us the most texts since we began. The problem of poverty has been with us for more than a century. We have been asking for dispensations since 1824. Every Congregation since that time has grappled with this problem, but none has ever been able to settle it, because of the famous vow *de non relaxanda paupertate*. In 1957, before the General Congregation, Fr. Janssens had asked the provincials in writing if they could give up Mass stipends. Of the fifty-four answers received, fifty-two were negative. At the time of the Congregation of 1957, endless debates took place on this subject, and the Congregation, unable to agree after three weeks of discussion, ended up naming a commission which would report to Father General and the next Congregation. The commission made its report, and Fr. Janssens, when he was preparing the present Congregation, had a certain number of experts come to Rome to present the question. One of these was Fr. Delchard, chairman of the subcommission.

This subcommission has done an enormous amount of work, providing us with a hundred pages of texts and condensing everything that has been done up to this point. It has presented eight schemas or decrees which are supposed to settle the question once and for all. It goes about this in blunt fashion: "But now, having said all this, we seek answers to these questions: (a) what does it mean to have a dispensation from a law for 140 years and—something which is more serious still—*without any hope of returning to the law*? (b) What is to be said about our practice of poverty today, completely divorced as it is from the law in most cases?"

Here are the titles of the eight schemas presented on poverty:

1) *Procedure*. The question involves the *Constitutions*; they suggest a special procedure.

2) *Evangelical and religious poverty in the Society of Jesus*.

3) *The matter of the vow not to relax poverty*. This involves giving an authentic interpretation of the matter of the vow of poverty. On this point, *scinduntur doctores*, and they're battling it out with canons and

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

constitutions! Saturday afternoon, the debate raged for two hours and saw two of our Canadians intervene and win applause. . . . Fr. Delchard is on all fronts at once.

4) *Common life in the Society*. General principles which stir up no controversies.

5) *Particular cases*.

6) *The fruit of labor*. This decree declares that in addition to alms and revenues, "gain from or remuneration for work done according to the Institute is also a legitimate source of material goods which are necessary for the support and life of Jesuits." The battle is joined on this point, too, and those opposed are calling for a two-thirds majority.

7) *The gratuity of ministries*. Five paragraphs explain how the gratuity of our ministries should be understood. The subcommission tries here to reconcile our law with the universal practices of a hundred years' standing, e.g., for Masses, our ministries (preaching, retreats, etc., cigars and tobacco for Fr. S.-A.). It speaks of stipends, emoluments, honoraria, grants, tuitions, etc. . . . Here again, a big discussion: past, present, and future.

8) *Foundations*. A decree on foundations (e.g., the *Actualité* foundation). The General has a mandate to establish the norms.

That is an overall view of the texts on poverty. The discussion will resume during the afternoon. People expect some sparks to fly, but the majority has had enough of these eternal theoretical and canonical discussions and is asking for a vote.

Subcommission IV: Spiritual life

This subcommission has presented us thus far with a twenty-page text on six different subjects: (1) Sacred Scripture and liturgy; (2) the Spiritual Exercises and the renovation triduum; (3) adapting the exercises of piety, especially meditation and examen; (4) litanies; (5) devotion to the Sacred Heart; (6) the spiritual teaching of St. Ignatius. This text has not yet come up for public discussion in the *aula*. It contains some very interesting considerations and a few new suggestions (e.g., with respect to litanies). I doubt that the Congregation has the time to adopt it at this present session, especially since certain people want more radical reforms in this area.

Subcommission VI: Tertianship

We have a single text of about five pages, but it reveals the disagreement within the subcommission. The reported opinions are not only different, but opposed. Some people had said to me that the text presented was both poor and uncompromising. The question of tertianship, it seems, is not mature . . . unless it is too much so.

July 5-6, 1965

Holiday!

Yesterday was Sunday, and it was the Fourth of July. All the Americans had taken flight from the Curia to go on a spree beneath the Star-spangled Banner, which the sirocco blowing in from the desert was covering with a thin coat of dust. About thirty other delegates had signed up to go on a pilgrimage to Assisi. All our Roman and Italian Jesuits had taken off to relax in their respective houses or elsewhere. . . . At the Curia, *we* were the only ones left, “. . . we who were not worn out, perhaps!” And then they announced to us that, in view of the relentless heat in Rome, an excursion had been organized to have dinner and spend the afternoon at Frascati, where Villa Cavaletti, the Curia’s vacation villa, is located. At 10:00 A.M. we met at the Curia door, where a bus was waiting. The group was divided almost equally according to two languages, French and Spanish, with the first including the voices of three Canadians over and above three Belgians, three French, two Dutch, etc.

This Villa, where the Curia regularly spends two months in the summertime, is located twelve miles from Rome, 1300 feet above sea-level. At 11:00 we were there. During the ride, the news spread that there was a pool and that we could swim there. Our two Provincials, who have traveled the world and know how to shift for themselves in the most difficult moments, were more provident than I: they brought their bathing suits. As soon as we arrived, I asked about it, and it was true. The pool was waiting for us; they had just changed the water in our honor. Fr. Van der Brempt, the General’s private secretary, ended up handing me something resembling a bathing suit, right there in the open, on our way to the pool.

It was a fantastic thing! I realize why the Greeks, at the time of the retreat of the 10,000, let out a shout on reaching the sea—at least according to the Xenophon we used to translate in school and in the juniorate—“Thalassa! Thalassa!” At long last—water! At last, water to bathe in! In nothing flat, habits were flying on all sides, and the whole gang—Assistants, provincials, vice-provincials, and ordinary civilians—jumped in the water.

This pool is egg-shaped. At one end the water is four or five feet deep, and between eight and ten feet deep at the other. It’s deep enough for anyone who wants to dive in, and it’s also good for any of us who want to sit on the edge and discuss the future of the Congregation (which everyone would like to have transferred to this place!). Finally, we dressed and went to dinner, where Fr. Bottereau, the superior of the Curia, was waiting for us. In the afternoon, we went through the same

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

ritual at the pool. At 7:00 P.M. we left the Villa and returned to the Roman furnace, which was hotter than ever!

Late news

July 6, 1965

Disappointment! The vote on the end of the Congregation has been postponed. Some people are proposing instead to have another Congregation in three or five years. . . .

This morning, for the first time in three weeks, the thermometer went below 80° and is staying there (at least late this morning), with the result that life has become livable again, even at the pace of two four-hour sessions a day.

The debate on poverty

At present, we are at the height of the battle on poverty. For three hours yesterday afternoon the champions faced each other and exchanged blows. As I write about it, three images come to mind: a boxing match, a duel, or a tennis match. Since the first can be wrongly interpreted, I fall back on the other two.

The champions arrive on stage, take their place before the microphone, and begin by apologizing for the blow they are about to give: they don't wish to offend anyone, but the voice of conscience compels them to speak and to denounce the arguments used in the other camp. The historical investigation has not been exhaustive; they have forgotten, more or less deliberately, such and such a fact. It matters little that the document is 150 pages long; such and such a word coming from the original Spanish text has been omitted. If it has been left out by inadvertence, that's symptomatic of the unscientific quality of the whole document; if it happened deliberately, then I don't dare characterize conduct like this when the matter is so serious!

Having dealt his blow, the champion retires, and the other champion moves forward. We will soon celebrate, he says, the 150th anniversary of our dispensation in the matter of poverty. That will happen because some people who see only the letter of the law remain, at each congregation, stubbornly opposed to every change. They claim that they alone possess the truth in this domain and that their interpretation is the only possible interpretation. They appeal to Suárez, Sánchez, and the rest (I do not remember all of our illustrious commentators whom our canonists have summoned to their aid), but their interpretation remains doubtful, as they themselves admit. Therefore, it is time for the Congregation—which has the power to do so—to settle the question and give an authentic interpretation.

The first champion returns, even after having said that he would not come back and that he would retire like Achilles under his tent, and

insinuates that if a majority wants to relax the vow of poverty, he and some others intend to remain faithful to their vow as it was when they pronounced it. A lengthy indictment against the opposing judgment follows, an indictment which he sums up, before coming down from the rostrum, in these resounding words: "Illa sententia omnino sustineri non potest (That opinion is completely insupportable)."

In the middle of the debate between the champions, there are always a few innocents who intervene to say: Let the canonists and jurists come to an agreement among themselves and propose an acceptable solution to us. This question of poverty can't be settled by slashing away with arguments or literal interpretations. Our young Jesuits are expecting something else. They're expecting bread, and you're giving them stones! Bread—that is, something substantial, theological, spiritual, evangelical; stones—that is, your interminable discussions on the meaning of words, on what St. Ignatius meant, what the Spanish text means, and what the Latin text means, etc., etc.

Another one intervenes and says: With all these discussions, I realize that there's no longer anything certain in the matter of the vow of poverty. Now a vow about doubtful matter is invalid, and your vow is invalid for everybody!

Someone else gets up to add: All these discussions, leave me completely cold. I pronounced my vows as the Society understands them; and so if this Congregation finally succeeds in giving an authentic interpretation of the vow of poverty, I don't see why I should develop a problem of conscience from that.

In the midst of all this, I'm like a spectator watching a tennis match. Bang! and the ball goes to the right side; bang! and the ball is smashed back, and bang! bang! bang! My head goes to the right, then to the left, then to the right, and so on. The veterans—those who took part in previous congregations—tell me: You haven't seen anything. In 1957, it was ten times worse, and that lasted three weeks, without coming up with any solution. . . . This morning it starts again.

The Society behind the Iron Curtain

Last night after supper, we had a talk on the roof about the situation of the Society in Yugoslavia. For three quarters of an hour in complete darkness Fr. Ćurić (thirty-nine years old) spoke to us in Latin which came from the bottom of his heart, just as Fr. Dezza's Latin does. He had entitled his talk "Psychology of the Jesuits Behind the Iron Curtain." He was obviously speaking of his Province of Croatia. He summed up the situation in three words: *disorientatio*, *depressio*, and *diffidentia*. The war had been terrible for them, and the postwar situation even worse.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

Most of their houses have been nationalized, and they live in small groups, shut in on themselves with no foreign contact, and constantly exposed to government interference. For example, after the Provincial Congregation in Zagreb, the Provincial and the rector were summoned by the minister of religion and were interrogated for hours about the antigovernment plot which the Jesuits had hatched during this meeting. For some time they had succeeded in publishing an unpretentious bulletin for youth. This sold fairly well. Government agents arrived to make an inquiry about it; they thought that the bulletin should have brought millions to the fathers and that, as a consequence, they should pay the government four million in taxes (which the fathers evidently did not have, since they sold the bulletin at cost).

The chief difficulty is their isolation. They get their training entirely within their own Province, do not have any specialists, and do not know in what way they should be different from the diocesan clergy, since the only works which are left to them are preaching and parishes. The government refuses to allow them to leave so that they could go to be trained on foreign soil, for it fears the new ideas they would be able to bring back. Till very recently Jesuit provincials had followed the policy of Cardinal Stepinac, that is, of having nothing to do with the government. But a new policy, which could be called peaceful co-existence, has been taking shape with the present young Provincial (thirty-nine years old). This, however, has not been clear sailing, neither on the part of the government, nor on that of the older Jesuits, who balk at it. The Provincial of Austria has offered to take the scholastics free of charge and train them in theology, but the government is opposed to it, and wants to keep its Jesuits just as they are. So that they might attend the General Congregation, long discussions were required, and interventions by the Vatican.

Frankly, in hearing the account of this drama, I realized that we are indeed privileged, and that if these Croatian Jesuits enjoyed the freedom which is ours, they undoubtedly would have made better use of it. . . . *O Fortunatos nimium. . . . Si bona sua norint!* (This ought to be something like what Virgil said.)

Commission V: Conservation and adaptation of the Institute

Under the chairmanship of Fr. Oñate, this commission has twenty-four members and is subdivided into five subcommissions. . . .

Subcommission II: Admission to the Society and to orders, and dismissal

We have three papers prepared on this subject: (1) admission and dismissal; (2) the vows at the end of the novitiate; (3) the fifth primary impediment, mental illness. No serious discussion.

Subcommission III: The distinction of grades

There are two lengthy papers on this subject of keeping or abolishing the grades of professed and spiritual coadjutors. Since this is a substantial of the Institute, it requires a favorable preliminary vote of the Congregation to take up this subject. The battle promises to be as hard and as long as that on poverty, for the two camps—one for keeping grades and the other for abolishing them—are amply provided with arguments and champions. We have had some skirmishes already, and the whole thing is going to pick up again this morning. Some people are going to fight to the death for keeping the professed, others are asking to have everybody professed, and others still are asking that we no longer have professed in the Society.

One father read us a long set of statistics showing that in the old Society—for example, in Italy—98% of the priests were professed (in 1770, just before the suppression), and the father added: The 2% left over must have been the unwell (*laborabant capite vel quadam infirmitate*). Proceeding from this fact, the father concluded: If 98% of the Jesuits could be professed in the old Society, why not in the new? I look at the Jesuits present at this Congregation, I listen to them speak and argue, and I say to myself: Really, they're not inferior to the Jesuits of the old Society; why, then, is only 40.7% of today's Society professed?

Another father told of the complaints of the coadjutors: I am not a true Jesuit, but half a Jesuit, a second-class Jesuit, a secondary member. The distinction smacks of aristocracy and has become entirely useless. The reasons people give for keeping the distinction are no longer worth anything today. . . .

At last, suggestions to remedy the situation are pouring in, but I doubt that we have the time to tackle them seriously.

July 7, 1965

La dolce vita

Before coming to serious things, some witty remarks of our fathers. Just after breakfast, two Americans were talking right next to the barbershop where Bro. S. A. (the Curia barber) sat enthroned. One of them asked the other: "Do you know who has the easiest job in the Society?" The second one offered him several suggestions: a teacher of a freshman class? a parish priest? a mission preacher?, etc., and ended up by admitting that he didn't know. Then the first one told him: "The breakfast cook in the Curia!" And he burst out laughing, for in the morning at breakfast in the Curia, except for the coffee, there's never anything hot, or if anyone does want something hot, it never comes out cooked.

The debate on poverty (continued)

The debate on poverty ended yesterday. Nevertheless, the vote will not be taken until later on in order to give everyone time for reflection. I draw your attention here to three interventions which provided a little humor in an otherwise dry debate.

One speaker came up to say: The provinces which are opposed to the proposed change and which are absolutely set on living on alms ought to stop relying on the help of the other provinces which live on the work of their members. Let them stop asking other provinces to educate their scholastics gratis. Let them no longer come around asking us to set up a central common fund where they'll be able to draw money, for the money that's going to supply this fund will be coming from a fruit forbidden to them, that is, from the revenues of the work done by members of the other provinces.

Another speaker deplored the fact that in the decree on poverty there is no mention of the *mercatura nigra*, that is, of the *black market*. And yet a number of Jesuits engage in it with no remorse of conscience and ask me to do as much, under the pretext of poverty. The same people make false customs declarations, always to preserve poverty. It's more important to put an end to these practices than it is to know whether the Spanish text or the Latin text should prevail in the interpretation of the vow of poverty.

A stout American mounted the rostrum and declared: "Civis Americanus sum et qua talis amo libertatem! (I'm an American citizen, and as such I love freedom!)," to the great joy of his audience. The American had had enough of these useless discussions, which were like so many chains tying up our liberty and preventing us from taking action. We have to put an end to that. Freedom is a necessity for us, even for the practice of poverty. I end my appeal, he said, with these words of Patrick Henry: "Give us liberty or give us death!" The Congregation—dying—applauded this appeal to liberty.

Finally, the General took the floor to ask for prayers for the Congregation, which will have to make a historic decision. The vote will come later.

Duration of the Congregation: the vote

[WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1966) 43]

Grades in the Society

We are not at the end of our afflictions, for we have fallen out of the frying-pan into the fire. After poverty, we are in a full-fledged marathon on keeping or abolishing grades (professed and spiritual coadjutors)

in the Society. The same champions oppose one another, with just about the same arguments. An old missionary came up to make a moving appeal. Many, he said, have not taken account of the seriousness of the crisis in the Society. The title of professed has become a subject for ridicule with many people. Even the professed are embarrassed by it and don't dare take advantage of it. We must abolish this title which divides the Society into classes, and we must do it immediately. This is urgent.

Another said: At my *ad gradum* examination, they asked me twenty questions on the Trinity, questions to which I had to answer in only one word: *ita vel non*. And that's why I'm professed today.

Another one said: The professed are supposed to make more sacrifices, but for the seven years that I've been professed, the only special sacrifice they've asked of me was to take part in this Congregation in Rome, with a black soutane in hot weather like this. (This was an Indian.)

One father got up and said: They're constantly referring us to St. Ignatius, to what he decided, while asking us to remain faithful to him. But you can't find out what St. Ignatius would have wanted for his Society in the twentieth century while paging through old texts, running back to Nadal or to Polanco or even to the *Spiritual Exercises*. This is something for us to find out in the present Congregation, we who have been formed by these Exercises and filled with the spirit of St. Ignatius. If we don't do it, we're unworthy of the present Society and of the work of restoration which has to be done.

Immediately the reply came: The father who spoke takes himself for a founder of the order and a restorer of the Society. But St. Ignatius had the help of the Holy Spirit, as the pontifical bulls tell us. Can the father say as much?

Another intervened and said that he was fed up listening to this sentimental argument that a great many spiritual coadjutors feel frustrated because they're not professed. *Scienti et volenti non fit iniuria*, he reminded them. Besides, doesn't this feeling of frustration also exist among the professed? Fr. Congar has written an article in *La Vie Spirituelle* in which he shows that every man coming to the middle of his life experiences this sense of frustration. The lieutenant colonel feels frustrated because he's not general (laughter in the *aula*, with everyone looking at Father General), the pastor because he's not bishop, the instructor because he's never been made professor, the inferior because he's never been superior, etc., etc. Why, then, attribute this feeling of frustration which some experience in the Society just to the distinction of grades? It's necessary to know how to accept one's limitations, etc.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

After thirty or forty speeches, the General intervened:

"I say, speaking as a man, as a simple Jesuit, and not as General, that this is an extremely difficult question to solve. I'll tell you quite frankly that I don't clearly see the solution to be adopted. *Hodie non video*. I'm inclined to favor the proposal to set up a commission entrusted with the task of studying this whole problem and proposing to the next session of this Congregation a solution which will be at one and the same time prudent and bold. . . ."

July 8, 1965

Heat and intercession

Newsletter No. 12 contains some interesting things. You'll read there an appeal to your compassion for these poor Fathers Elector who have to work in the midst of the "very burdensome heat of this Roman summer, in which almost every day the temperature reaches 95° and sometimes 98.6°." To reassure you; I can tell you that for two days the temperature has been quite bearable and that I was even able to walk in town yesterday, something I had not done for a month.

In the same *Newsletter* you will find the text of our two decrees (those of our subcommission) on the social apostolate and the communications media. These are the first decrees to be finished, presented, and published.

It also informs you that the end of the present session will be on July 15, with this small note: this is something new, for a congregation has never yet had several sessions. We're making history! So far as I'm concerned, I believe this is the best solution. Otherwise, it would have been necessary to close up or leave some very important questions unresolved. Convinced that these questions were more important than all the reforms of government, I was growing impatient with some people's delaying and quibbling, and I wasn't alone. But now what happened to the conciliar schema on religious liberty will happen to these questions: an intermission of a year will allow us to do a much better job.

Democrat or republican?

Is the Society an aristocratic monarchy? One father tried to demonstrate this to us, apropos of keeping grades. He declared, amid grumblings of discontent in the *aula*, that St. Ignatius had set up an *aristocratic* monarchy and not a *democratic* monarchy and that it was time that they worked out the theology of grades in the Society.

That brought upon him this connoisseur's answer: The Society doesn't have a monarchical regime; but a presidential one, except that the president is elected for life. As for the theology of grades, it won't be

worth more than the theology of equality which I'm ready to undertake and to demonstrate to be the better one.

When the theologians get tangled in this, the sociologists have only to listen. . . .

The decree on studies

I have already given a résumé of the decree on the studies of Ours presented by Fr. Dezza in the name of the third commission. It is a long document—the longest presented thus far—covering the whole field of studies, from the novitiate until special studies. It's an amazing thing, but this document provoked almost no opposition nor did it give rise to much criticism in the *aula*. After it had received several observations, the commission presented its decree again without having changed very much at all. Father General had us vote on it yesterday in seven different votes, five on the substance of the question, a sixth, because a two-thirds majority was required, and a seventh, in order that the decree might be promulgated immediately and put into effect without delay.

I am not going back over the principal changes in the system of studies. I pointed them out in one of my previous letters (which drew some mild protests from Fr. Dezza when I told him that I had announced all this to Canada even before the vote—but the final outcome confirmed it all).

The seven votes received a favorable majority of more than 90%. Removing philosophy from the *ad gradum* examination is not, it seems, in accordance with the *Constitutions*, and a two-thirds majority was required, but passing that was as easy as dropping a letter in a mailbox. . . . Only one question has been asked: Is the decree retroactive in its scope, and can it be applied to those who have just taken their *ad grad* this year, so that, for example, they might get permission to retake it once? Fr. Dezza's response: "Decretum est pro futuro et habet nullam vim retroactivam (The decree is for the future and has no retroactive force)."

Jesuit spirituality for our time

The discussion on tertianship has touched on a crucial area. The two basic questions posed are: (1) What is the distinctive spirituality of the Society which must permeate us as Jesuits, especially in tertianship? (2) What is the place of the spiritual life, the Christian life in today's world?

In the subcommission on tertianship there were, it appears, as many opinions as there were members. This is a sign that we are in a period of transition and that lasting solutions are not readily available, although they are no less urgent and necessary.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

The decree on the choice of ministries: charisms

This is a decree that gives the rules and norms to observe in choosing our ministries. I will return to this point later on. Here I point out only the topic of women. One father asked that the ministry on behalf of women not be excluded. They make very important decisions, are numerous, attentive, etc. Another father said: it is important to devote our attention to priests. It is strange that one provincial had to write fifty letters to find someone to give a priests' retreat and that five people, without anyone writing to them, offered to give a retreat to women. Evidently, there are some fathers who have the charism for the female apostolate!

The decree on the choice of ministries

This is a decree which commands attention, but it does not belong in the "great" category and only prepares the ground. The big question in this area is this: in these circumstances, can we do better? We are dragging along with our old ministries; is it necessary to keep these or to undertake new ones? The decree tries to give some general orientations: (a) some norms for renewal; (b) provisions for updating; (c) fields of the apostolate especially recommended.

It was this third point which aroused the sharpest controversy, principally because the ministry for priests was not mentioned, nor were the missions. One speaker came up to the rostrum very excited and said: For ten years I worked with priests, and I was in the habit of joking that I was an *exclaustrated* Jesuit because I was living with the secular priests I worked with. But now look at this decree. It takes the joke seriously and doesn't even mention the ministry for priests as being one proper to the Society. Not only will I be an *exclaustrated* Jesuit, but I'll be one whose ministry has been ignored by the present Congregation, which is about to recommend teaching catechism to children and to young girls in the hope that one day, perhaps, one of these girls will marry the son of the emperor of Japan and exercise a great influence upon society!

Another mentioned the example of Fr. Capello, whose influence with the priests in Rome was immense and who performed this ministry with admirable zeal all his life.

Another was annoyed that the decree said nothing about the missions. And yet, he declared, all the professed who are here and even those who are not here have taken a fourth vow which commits them to go to the missions! Isn't that a ministry which merits at least a mention in the list presented by the commission?

A provincial came up and, alluding to the speech by the American who had called for freedom ("Civis Americanus sum et qua talis amo

libertatem”), declared: “Libertas, quamvis Americana, debet esse eadem omnibus.” And then he served up the following syllogism for us: “Decretum est lex, et lex debet esse clara, praecisa, et de concretis, aut non est lex bona. Atqui hoc decretum non est clarum, nec praecisum nec de concretis. Ergo non est bonum decretum, nec bona lex.”

Another one who came to make an indictment against the decree realized once he got to the microphone that he did not have the right glasses with him and that he could not read his text. He made desperate signs in the direction of his desk, and the second pair of glasses traveled a quarter of the room, passed from hand to hand, before reaching the speaker. He eagerly grabbed them and now could see clearly to read his text!

Finally, Father General made an intervention. The great problem the Society has to face at the present time, he said, is the problem of the selection of ministries. Many have complained that the decree is not concrete enough and doesn't give sufficiently precise directives. That's true. We're stating principles, we're formulating norms, but *in concreto*, are we prepared to go further? I don't think so. We don't have an adequate knowledge of today's world, its spiritual needs, and especially the ways, the methods, the means of meeting these needs. It isn't the principles that we lack, but the concrete adaptation of these principles. It will be necessary to reflect on that for years to come, perhaps for twenty or thirty years, before finding and formulating this adaptation of our ministries. So, despite its weak points, the decree presented to us remains necessary, necessary to stimulate research, investigation, study, etc.

The missions

The subcommission on the missions began its operations by presenting a brief text authorizing missionaries to return home occasionally. We discussed this yesterday. No one is opposed to it, but several people have raised the problem of expatriate Jesuits who are not living in a mission country—for example, the professors at the Gregorian, whose life, though it does not unfold amid the heathen, is apparently no less difficult. They should also have the right to return home occasionally, and the decree should extend to all those who labor outside their native country. A missionary from the Far East has just urged against too hasty action; the Chinese have a sense of self-sacrifice, too, and perhaps a more highly developed one than Westerners have. When they see Westerners allowing themselves long and costly trips to their native land, they cannot refrain from comparing their lot to that of the Westerners, because in the East they are asked to remain at their post,

with no opportunity to return home. There should be the same standard of justice and charity for all—for the Oriental Jesuits as well as for the Occidental.

The vote on the provincial congregation

Our provincial congregation: there's an institution which doesn't occur very often or make a lot of racket or prove to be too burdensome, and yet it seems that the criticisms of the Jesuits of the whole world have been heaped upon it! One might almost say that it has become like LaFontaine's donkey, "this hairless mangy thing, from which all evils come!" It has brought upon itself 146 *postulata*, eighty-six of which refer directly to the question of deciding which persons should take part in provincial congregations. In giving these statistics, the subcommission added: "Vix alia quaestio obtinuit tot *postulata*. Certe nulla alia quaestio obtinuit tot *postulata* ex congregationibus provincialibus (Hardly any other question has received so many *postulata*. Certainly no other question has received so many *postulata* from provincial congregations)."

This avalanche of *postulata* stirred up an adverse reaction. Many complained about the fact that any *postulatum* at all, even one not approved by a provincial congregation, is considered by the subcommissions as seriously as the *postulata* of the provincial congregations. I heard people mourning the fact that one subcommission spent a half hour studying a *postulatum* from a scholastic who later left the Society! If that's the way it is, they say, what use is a provincial congregation? People aren't taking account of the study which it has made of the *postulata*; anybody at all can send anything to a general congregation, and the general congregation wears itself out giving responses to the most preposterous demands!

The reaction to this subject goes even so far that one *postulatum* has been received asking that they bring to their senses all these disturbers and critics who burden the Society: from its present 35,000 members, the Society will gain by being reduced to 20,000; let them name Visitors to travel through the provinces and throw out these undersirable elements! (There was only one *postulatum* like that.)

The big complaint about the provincial congregation is that it has been a gerontocracy. The subcommission's report, far from refuting this accusation, confirms it in two key sentences: "Hodie in pluribus provinciis patres professi infra aetatem 60 . . . annorum a congregationi provinciali excluduntur *quia nimis iuvenes sunt* (Nowadays, in many provinces professed fathers under the age of sixty are excluded from the provincial congregation *because they are too young*)." The report adds: The letter of the decree has been kept, but its basis in the *Constitutions*

(which call for the participation of all the professed) has been upset. Thus, for example, in the Province of New England, there are 292 professed, and those who took their final vows on August 15, 1939, are still too young to take part in the Provincial Congregation. The same thing is true in New York, where there are 267 professed, and where the youngest to participate in its Congregation took his final vows on August 15, 1940. It is clear that such a situation cannot continue.

In its report to the General Congregation, the subcommission expressed itself on three points: (1) it is necessary to reform the present legislation; (2) it is necessary, in spite of all, to keep a certain limitation on the number of participants; (3) three norms are proposed to the Congregation with a view to limiting the number: (a) to set an age limit, e.g., 65 or 70 years; (b) to set an average, e.g., 50 years, and choose as many members below that age as above, (c) to hold a previous election of the members of the provincial congregation.

These proposals have come before the Congregation for discussion and voting. There are supporters of the present situation, which the others call gerontocracy. They are opposed to the subcommission's proposals. And then there are the supporters of a reform based on democracy. My second neighbor over, who is fiercely democratic, before going to the microphone to defend his thesis, fortified himself like the hero of *Peanuts* saying to himself: "*Grit your teeth, Charlie Brown!*" and doing just that. Let people, he said, stop glorifying the wisdom of old men taking part in the congregation. Let them stop making age the supreme criterion for participation. I ask you: in the Bible, how old were those who had the chaste Susanna condemned, and how old was the one who had her freed and who restored justice? Where's the wisdom, and where's the virtue—in the first or the second case?

But the champion for the other side got up and strongly denounced the evils of electoralism in the Society: St. Ignatius didn't want it; you're going to introduce a factor for discord, division, disorders, violations of charity, etc., with your idea of election. The Society is not a democracy, etc., etc.

Yesterday was the decisive day. But the whole thing did not take place without difficulty. Some fathers came to the microphone to ask to have the vote postponed until later and to have a new formal inquiry made. The General had to put two preliminary questions to the Congregation:

- 1) Does the General Congregation wish to vote *today* on this question? Answer: Yes (by a heavy majority).
- 2) Does the General Congregation wish to vote *according to the*

formal inquiry prepared by the subcommission? Answer: Yes (by a heavy majority).

With these obstacles removed, all that had to be done was to put to a vote the five questions already prepared:

1) Does the General Congregation wish to reform the present legislation on this point? Answer: Yes (95%).

2) Does the General Congregation wish to keep a certain age limit with respect to the number of professed called to the provincial congregation? Answer: Yes (95%).

3) Does the General Congregation wish to retain the norm of *seniority of profession*, but with an age limit? Answer: No (by a strong majority).

4) Does the General Congregation wish to keep the norm of an average age, or, in Latin, "criterium aliquod distributionis iuxta aetates"? Answer: No (but by a weak majority).

5) Does the General Congregation wish to accept the norm of a previous election? Answer: Yes (but by a small majority).

And there we have it: those taking part in the next provincial congregation will be *elected*. Only two things still have to be decided: (a) Who will be eligible? (b) Who will be the electors? Only the professed, or the professed and the spiritual coadjutors? The questions will be settled either today or Monday. The wind is blowing toward democracy! There will be other surprises. ~

July 12, 1965

Ah! these reporters . . .

When I went to the newspaper room yesterday, I saw a whole group of Americans around one of the newspapers, and they were carrying on a spirited conversation. They were pointing at an article in the New York *Herald Tribune* and roaring with laughter. I edged my way in and got my chance to read the bold headline of the article: "Deadlocked Jesuits Adjourn Assembly, 1st Time in History." I couldn't get over it; where did they get that? Some time later, I read the first paragraph: "The world assembly of Jesuit leaders failed in two months of closed sessions to agree on a streamlining of their Order and announced today they were adjourning their meetings until next year. The adjournment, the first in 425 years and 38 [sic] General Congregations of the influential Order. . . ." The rest is cut from the same cloth. . . . How they can be wrong and mislead their readers! Not only is there no deadlock at the Congregation, but the principal deadlock of all the previous congregations has just been cleared . . . and now the way is open.

The votes on poverty

Saturday, July 10, was a historic day for all: the Congregation has at last made its decision on the text *De paupertate*. That was not easy; right up to the last minute, people were afraid that the Congregation would be prevented from voting. Some continual and very strong pressure, they tell me, had been exerted on Father General to have him postpone the vote until the second session. The day before, when we were walking with Fr. Delchard, the subcommission's chairman and *relator*, we had spurred him on and even got him fired up so that he would be in good form. The poor father has been here for a year, and he has been constantly immersed in the *De paupertate* decree. Some days he was very optimistic, and on other days pessimistic. He was exhausted, but in the Congregation he has been superb. The General, to begin with, asked him to come and once again explain the decree he was presenting. He did it with confidence and clarity. If the Society refuses to approve this decree, he said, then we fall back to the zero mark. All the work accomplished by the commission named in 1957 by the 30th General Congregation will become useless, all our work for six months will have been in vain, and we will be at an impasse once again, forced to ask for dispensations from the Sovereign Pontiff and to live in hypocrisy. The present Congregation has the opportunity and the power to rule definitively on this problem which the 30th General Congregation in particular ran into. It can do this, and it should do it.

Good fellow that he is, he added: On certain points, a two-thirds majority is not required, but for some members' peace of conscience, I am prepared to agree to having someone put to the Congregation the question of knowing if it wants a qualified majority.

But the opposition did not lay down their arms. One father got up and said: A two-thirds majority is not only permitted, but obligatory and necessary, for we're limiting the vow of poverty. Fr. Delchard answered: We're not limiting it. We're only giving an authentic interpretation of the content of this vow. The opposition retorted: In an authentic declaration of a law, two things have to be distinguished: the *doctrinal* power and the *disciplinary* power; if the Congregation has the *disciplinary* power, it doesn't have the *doctrinal* power, which is dependent on the Holy See. Fr. Delchard came back to the microphone: The Congregation is supreme when it *legislates*, and this is what it is doing at the present moment. It is not a question of exercising a doctrinal power.

Another stood up and wanted to remove a sentence from the decree. In a spirit of conciliation, Fr. Delchard was prepared to withdraw this sentence, which was not essential, but some voices made themselves heard in protest. Someone else intervened and wanted to have the word

eleemosynae (alms) added in the text to reassure consciences. Once again Fr. Delchard was prepared to yield, although the addition seemed useless to him, but others were opposed to this addition.

Finally, with all the obstacles removed, it was time for the vote, or rather for the votes, for with the preliminary votes to find out if the Congregation was to make its decision now and if it demanded two-thirds majorities for such and such a paragraph, it required fifteen distinct votes to get the decree passed. Now, the big revelation of these votes has been the numerical unimportance of those opposing the decree on poverty. During the fifteen votes, the proportion of those opposed never exceeded 10% of the members of the Congregation, and several times it was only 5%. For a number of us, I repeat, this vote was a complete revelation, for right to the end people were asking themselves what the real numerical strength of those opposed was. You should realize that they included some big names and formidable antagonists—canonists, lawyers, well-known theologians, etc. For my part, up until now I have refrained from speaking of a minority and a majority, but in view of the facts I must acknowledge that a minority of less than 10% effectively blocked, by its labor, its tenaciousness, its repeated interventions, and its pressure tactics, all progress in this question of poverty.

The question has been settled juridically: in the future our law will be in accord with our way of acting, and we will no longer have to beg periodically for dispensations from the Holy See. Furthermore, the accent has been put on work rather than alms as a source of revenue for each one. The sign for the future is: "Let everyone earn his living." Teilhard, it seems, has already said that the great sin of monks is laziness. That's why they are so legalistic and moralistic. I read something of an analogy to this in a review of Marc Oraison's book *Une morale pour notre temps*: It seems that too many clerics are still at the pre-oedipal stage.

Day of glory

I return to our Fr. Delchard. After the fifteenth vote on poverty, with the whole thing now accepted by the Congregation by a huge majority, spontaneous applause broke out in Fr. Delchard's direction. The signal came from the rear of the *aula*, that is, from the young guard of professed who were in the "gallery" or "paradise." (I myself have a place in the middle of the hall, since I'm already around the midpoint in the age-spread.) For some time, this young guard had been getting noisy, carrying on conversations, and making bets. The big project was to track down which people were the opponents, the ones who were voting "red," that is, *non placet*. The first to succeed in saying the name

corresponding to the red light would win the prize. I have to say that these are the very recently professed—a year, or two or three years—and that this indeed influences their behavior.

During the fifteen-minute break, people surrounded Fr. Delchard to congratulate him, a maneuver that continued until the collation, where a whole circle formed about him, with Father General himself coming up to him to offer his congratulations, and everyone holding his bottle of Pepsi on high. Around me, some fathers who had taken part in the 30th General Congregation admitted that the climate has completely changed and that the present Congregation succeeded on the very point where the previous one had failed. Even if the 31st had accomplished only that, they added, it would have still done more than the 30th! We went back up to the *aula* for the end of the session, surrounding Fr. Delchard and singing: "The day of glory has come!" Unassuming Fr. Delchard declared: "This Congregation has accomplished more than any other one for 400 years!"

The congregation of procurators

[WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1966) 49-50]

Debate and vote on the provincials

If one were to judge by the debate and the vote on this subject, provincials do not present an exciting topic for discussion. The whole thing was a reflection of their own image: calm, dignified, level-headed, restrained. They obtained a great deal with almost no struggle. In the many *postulata* which concerned them, the greater part of them requested an increase in their powers, in the name of decentralization and the principle of subsidiarity. Eight *postulata*, for example, asked that, in the future, permission to smoke be dependent on the provincial. On the other hand, some insisted that their consultations be more frequent, more numerous, and above all, more representative (e.g., one asked to have the brothers and the scholastics take part in the provincial consultations which concern them). The *postulata* concerned with the socius wanted him to have active voice at the provincial congregation, to be distinct from the provincial's admonitor, and to be named for a definite term.

The subcommission in charge of studying these requests had presented a favorable report in almost all cases. After a very brief debate, in which only one elector was opposed to the increase of the powers of the provincials on a plea that they were already inclined to autocracy, the Congregation came to a decision in a whole series of votes. In fact,

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

it took ten votes to settle the questions on the offices of provincial and socius. In general, the Congregation allowed the General to communicate to the provincials broader powers in the following matters:

- 1) approval of plans for putting up buildings;
- 2) sending scholastics to regency before philosophy;
- 3) admission of formed coadjutors to final vows;
- 4) appointing superiors of smaller houses;
- 5) temporary return of missionaries;
- 6) journeys outside the assistancy;
- 7) journeys to Rome; journeys to one's family;
- 8) permission to use tobacco;
- 9) postponing tertianship;
- 10) faculty to offer Mass without a server; etc.

The Congregation also approved a recommendation to Father General that he have a provincial come to Rome after he has been in office for some time. It also approved a greater frequency in provincial consultations, "et iuxta res tractandas apud consultationes adsint patres vel fratres qui iuvare possint (and, according to the topics to be treated, fathers or brothers who can be of assistance should be present at the consultations)."

Finally, it turned its attention to the socius. By a 98% majority, it decided that the socius need not be the provincial's admonitor. Its reason: "Saepe valde iuvenis est ut fiduciam aliorum et auctoritatem convenientes ad munus admonitoris implendum habeat." And by a *unanimous* vote (an extremely rare happening), it changed decree 75, paragraph 3, in this sense, that the letters of the provincial's admonitor are no longer subject to censorship by the provincial. You see that there's nothing to get excited about here!

The vote on the distinction of grades

[WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1966) 58-59]

Debate on the coadjutor brothers

I have already said something about the document presented to the Congregation on the coadjutor brothers. Proceeding from the seventy-eight *postulata* on the brothers, forty-one of which came from provincial congregations, the subcommission has handed us a long report filled with statistics showing the steady decrease in the number of brothers in the Society. In the seventeenth century they formed 30% of the total, in the nineteenth century, 27%, and now no more than 16%. In 1900 there were six brothers for every ten priests; now (in 1964) there are only 2.9. They estimate that the optimum number ought to be between

a quarter and a third of the members of the Society. The figure of 16% shows that the problem is serious and that something has to be done.

The report continues with long disquisitions on the thought of St. Ignatius, on the decrees of previous congregations, etc. Finally, the subcommission presents its two decrees separately: the first, on the brothers in general; the second, on the diaconate in the Society. These two decrees, now submitted to the Congregation, have given rise to a great number of comments and a long debate in the *aula*, the longest after those on the length of the general's term and on poverty. I will give you some of the interventions in loose form.

One father was against having brothers be prefects of discipline in the schools: they are not prepared for that. He did not want to have a brother as minister in his house, either, nor did he want to have brothers made deacons: that's going to change the nature of the brothers and create two categories of brothers, the clerics and the lay brothers. When you have brothers who are deacons, he said, and they leave the Society, what bishop will want to accept them?

Another launched into a stirring speech in favor of those good brothers who are *ad domestica*. Some fathers speak of them as if they were dealing with an "extinct theological species," while in his province, to him (this was a provincial), they were "a living and blessed species."

Another member asked the question of whether the priests should always have a privileged place at table. Granting their priesthood, we understand that such a place is reserved for them in church or in liturgical functions, but the dining room is a place where the religious family gathers, and, except for the superior, no one should have a privileged place. One other father went a step further on this subject: All these customs of precedence are disappearing and are accepted less and less in our society. Thirty years ago, for example, it would have been unacceptable for Father General to come quite simply to have his coffee or his Pepsi with us and as one of our number (prolonged applause in the *aula*; the General lifted his arms and gestured in the direction of the speaker), but now we find that completely natural and brotherly on the part of our Father General (renewed applause in the *aula*).

Another father did not want them to associate the decree on the brothers with the one on the deacons. He did not like having these three orders in the Society: the priests, the deacons, and the laymen. In that case, he asked, why not establish scholastic deacons?

Another called for a postponement of the decree. Addressing the Congregation, he asked: How many brothers do you have who are capable of being teachers, treasurers, ministers, or deacons? People hope to attract brothers to the Society by passing such a decree, but those

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

who have the vocation to teach will go rather to the communities of teaching brothers, where they can be teachers, directors of schools, superiors, provincials, and even general. It is not at all necessary to pass a new decree in order to allow a brother to be a teacher or a treasurer.

A master of novices came forward and said: Seven years ago I was Father Master of the brothers, and I thank heaven for it. During that period I received a great many young men who already had a technical and professional training, and I assured them that they would be able to use their talents in the Society. The present decree confirms that assurance. If you block it, then that will be equivalent to saying that I was mistaken and that the Congregation disapproves of me. I will accept it, but in our country we will have no more vocations to the brothers. Those who have a vocation to the contemplative life enter the monastic orders, not ours. . . .

The second session, the general's term, tertianship

[WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1966) 66-67]

The parish ministry

At first sight, one can ask why we should initiate a debate on the parish ministry. It is by virtue of our *Constitutions* that we are forbidden to accept parishes. But now the fact is there: we have parishes, and many of them. This reveals the same situation as in the matter of poverty: the facts contradict the law. Hence numerous *postulata* asked the present Congregation to examine this question.

According to the report submitted to us, the prohibition against accepting parishes was based originally on two reasons: (1) the need to safeguard Jesuit mobility and freedom of the apostolate; (2) the determination not to go against poverty: according to our vows, we cannot have fixed revenues, and benefices have been or are attached to parishes.

Do these reasons still have merit today? The commission has doubts about it and offers a text which, while recalling the original prohibition, authorizes the General to extend and multiply the cases where it will be allowed to accept parishes. These are not all alike throughout the whole world. In many places, they are much more a service and a trust than a source of fixed revenue. They are no longer opposed to Jesuit mobility and freedom, for pastors and curates can always be easily changed by the provincial.

The commission appealed to statistics to support its request. Jesuits have 1228 parishes throughout the world, 350 of which are outside of mission territories. That is the extent of the exception to our general

rule. Therefore, it would be proper to resolve this question. In several countries, Jesuits can exercise their ministries only in and through the parish. The bishops do not like to authorize residences with a chapel but without a parish. That causes difficulties with the secular clergy, while a parish allows us to enter into contact with the diocesan clergy, to collaborate with them, and to carry on a more universal apostolate. Finally, nowadays the parish ministry can become a truly missionary instrument and a means well suited for spreading the faith and forming this part of the people of God which the Church entrusts to us—forming in particular lay apostles and promoting priestly and religious vocations.

Some statistics on the parishes follow, arranged according to assistancies. There are more of them in mission countries—for example, in the Indian and Far Eastern Assistancies. The English Assistancy has sixty-five parishes (England: 21; Australia: 7; Upper Canada: 8; Ireland: 2; Montreal: 3; Quebec: 1; missions attached to the English Province: 23).

Little that was new was brought forth in the discussion. One speaker wanted the decree to go further and openly acknowledge the parish ministry as one of the Society's ministries. In mission countries, the parishes are necessary for implanting the Church. They are an effective instrument of evangelization, an example of poverty, a means for making converts.

Another said: People are objecting to the loss of mobility, but every Jesuit who receives an appointment—a professor of theology, of canon law, of philosophy, or a superior of a house, etc.—also loses his mobility. Moreover, mobility in itself is not a virtue.

Another speaker went into detail: If in England the present relations between Jesuits and the secular clergy are so good, the reason for it is that we are working with the secular priests in the same parish ministry.

As of today, the vote has not been taken on this question.

July 15, 1965
(morning)

Publicity service

I point out in passing that the latest issues of *Relations*, which I distributed to the common tables on the different floors, are making a good impression. This is good propaganda; several people have thus discovered *Relations* and have spoken to me about it, even some Americans. *America* was available each week on our floor. Fr. Calvez left past issues of *Revue de l'Action Populaire* on several tables. Frs. Tucci and Giuliani adopted another method: they distributed the new issues of

their magazines, *La Civiltà Cattolica* and *Études*, to those they felt were interested. Finally, without anyone ever being able to find out by whom or how, *Time* has appeared every week on our table (the latest issue modestly turned facedown in order not to shock the innocent glances of the Curia).

The decree on atheism

I have not yet had an opportunity to talk about the decree on atheism, which has been adopted for a good week now. The starting point was the Pope's allocution, in which he entrusted the Society with the special mission of opposing atheism. How was such a mission to be interpreted? Was it necessary to go to war, and to bring up our armor and our battalions? Commission VI, which had the task of defining the mission more explicitly, provided the Congregation with a preliminary text. It treated four points: (1) the mission entrusted by the Sovereign Pontiff; (2) the knowledge required of modern atheism; (3) the difficulties which are put forward against faith in God, and the means of resolving them; (4) the conditions to be observed in the formation of Jesuits and in the selection of ministries.

The commission received many comments. Some wanted something more impressive, e.g., a letter by the General to the whole Society. Others asked for a historical justification: a short time ago, the Society was devoted to working for the acceptance of the Council of Trent and opposing the Reformation; today, it should devote itself to the work of the Second Vatican Council and turn towards the enemy of the hour, which is atheism. Some others wanted the commission to point out that a third of humanity is oppressed by atheist tyranny and that it is our duty to come to their aid. Others wanted it to say that the reason for the success of Communism and atheism is social injustice: a large percentage of the human race lives in a subhuman state, and it listens to the voice of the Communists, who accuse the Catholic Church of being chiefly responsible for these injustices.

One speaker made the observation that the idea of God must be dealt with with great discretion, for it varies from person to person and from country to country. When Sartre denies God, is it really the true God whom he's denying? Another speaker wanted the document to put more stress on the development among men of the awareness of God. Christians have to show that the Gospel of Christ is truly a salutary message for man. Let us insist upon a life lived according to the Gospel in poverty, humility, chastity, and above all, charity and union with God. A father from Latin America added: Since almost everywhere today the secular universities are centers for the development and diffu-

sion of modern atheism, we must state explicitly that Jesuits should, insofar as possible, strive to enter and work in these universities. Another speaker asked that the philosophy of Marxism be explained and subjected to careful evaluation in our schools and universities, not, however, for purposes of anti-Communist propoganda, but with the aim of a scientific and critical exposition.

After all these comments, the commission redid its decree and presented it again under the title *De munere Societatis erga atheismum*. When it was put to a vote, this decree was adopted by a 95% majority.

Spiritual life in the Society

The declarations and decrees on the spiritual life occasioned much debate in the *aula*. It was understood that everything was being presented merely to find out the thinking of the Congregation on the matter, and that there would be no vote at this session. In a preliminary report, the subcommission assigned to study these questions had divided them into six sections:

1) *The Bible and the liturgy*: the subcommission recommends using the new forms of liturgical celebration; it favors concelebration, authorizes that Compline and evening examen be combined, and asks that in each province there be an expert in liturgy.

2) *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*: the twenty-three *postulata* touching on this question either suggest or request the creation of a commission or a center for the Exercises, as a "Directory"; they also ask that one be able to make the annual retreat in six or five days, or at two times during the year, and in private even for the coadjutor brothers and the scholastics, etc. The subcommission proposes the creation of a Center and leaves the rest to Father General.

3) *The triduum of renovation of vows*: some *postulata* ask for changes: this whole manner of renovation is outdated, old-fashioned, and formalistic. The subcommission ventures to make no pronouncements and leaves all to the good judgment of the General.

4) *The adaptation of the exercises of piety*: many *postulata* deal with this point, some to demand adaptation and more flexibility, others to urge the observance of exercises of piety which may be in disuse. The subcommission makes some general recommendations:

a) *concerning mental prayer and the examination of conscience*: twenty-seven *postulata* treat these topics. Some ask that the time and duration not be changed, others that they *be* changed: one half-hour of meditation in the morning, the other half-hour in the evening; or even reduce the whole thing to one half-hour. As for the examination of conscience at noon, it ought to be done away with; it is almost

impossible to make in the midst of other work and activity. The reasons given: weakness of nerves, especially among the young; the great diversity of persons; the demands and the number of studies and ministries, etc.

The subcommission realizes that there are two opinions in the Society: (1) there is no need for a fixed hour of prayer; (2) the duration of prayer must be determined.

Accordingly, it proposes three solutions (1) that the regulation of an entire hour be abrogated, and the prescriptions of the *Constitutions* which refuse to determine the length of prayer be followed instead; (2) that the rule continue as it is—that is, a full hour for prayer—but that superiors and spiritual fathers allow for adaptations; (3) that the entire hour be kept, but as a directive norm, “pedagogice applicanda a superioribus.”

b) *concerning litanies*: some ask that they be eliminated, others that they be replaced by some other community prayers. The subcommission simply proposes “preces communes rectandae.”

5) *Devotion to the Sacred Heart*: there was no time to discuss this.

6) *A better knowledge of the spiritual doctrine of St. Ignatius*: no time.

This first report of the subcommission on the spiritual life prompted such a deluge of comments that it would be impossible to mention them all. The following are a sample of the remarks made in the *aula*. One delegate said: The *postulata* show a tendency to lessen the time given to exercises of piety; it is a new phenomenon in the Society, a fact for which causes will have to be sought out. Another: People are talking a great deal about a spiritual crisis, but isn't the greatest cause of this a loss of union with Christ? Unless all of our activity rests on the rock of our spiritual life, we will have built upon sand. All our bric-a-brac of formulas will never be able to replace the union with God acquired in prayer. Another: We ought to be “contemplativi in actione”; that we are in action is certain; that we are contemplatives, “hoc dubitandum est.” We ought to make an hour of meditation, but *do* we? Many do not because they go to bed too late, look at television too long, etc. There are some who can talk for hours with their friends, but cannot talk with God. Someone noted that only 20% of the fathers make their hour of meditation, but in the time of St. Ignatius they went to the other extreme: they wanted to make two hours of meditation a day. Another: people today talk a great deal about dialogue, but shouldn't the first dialogue one engages in be with God?

Another: The spirit of prayer in the Society is weakening, hence there

is a desire to lessen the hour of meditation. But St. Ignatius has given us the rule not to change anything in time of desolation, so let us not change anything today. Another asks: Are those Jesuits who do not make an entire hour of meditation worse religious than those who do? Who can say this with assurance? A less juridical solution which takes into consideration freedom and responsibility would be more valuable. All our rules and decrees are like so many brakes; but for the vehicle to go forward it also needs a motor. The questions elicited their response: Those who lay blame on the juridical, on rules, lack realism. Consider attendance at services on Sunday in the different religions; it is among Catholics, where there is a fixed law, that attendance is most numerous. You have spoken of brakes and a motor, "sed ubi est gazolina?" It is those who pray the most who have the most developed sense of their responsibilities. Our times need men of prayer; to shorten the hour of meditation would not be an *aggiornamento*, but rather a *procrastinatio*, a lagging behind.

Another one said: The Buddhists pray for hours, and we Jesuits can't pray an hour a day; it's a disgrace! Another came forward: This is the image of the Jesuit which emerges from the *postulata* on prayer: it is that of a religious who wants to cut down on his prayer, no longer make his examinations of conscience, say Mass when it pleases him, eliminate litanies, obey when he wishes, and who believes that all can be saved regardless of what religion they belong to! If there is a problem, the time spent in spiritual exercises should be doubled, not lessened. If you don't decide on a fixed amount of time, how many are going to pray? If they sleep during prayer, it is because they have not slept enough during the night. Everyone should have seven hours of sleep a night, "et nos melius orabimus." Another said: St. Ignatius was opposed to a set amount of time for formed Jesuits. Someone just remarked that a good Jesuit ought to apportion his day between prayer and secular activities. I don't agree with that. There ought to be nothing secular for a Jesuit, nor anything purely human. We ought to pray twenty-four hours a day; there should be no dichotomy between prayer and work. I don't agree with Jesuits who want to reserve time to pray to God, and who don't want to work for their neighbor. Prayer and union with God should by no means be confused; the latter is much more extensive. One has to force himself to find God in all things. For example, we have worked together for two months at this great task of the Congregation; I hope that we have also found God here.

Another comes to the defence of the guardians of recreation, who are too busy to find time to make a continuous hour of meditation. If there are any in the *aula*, he says, who have experienced this, let them come

forward and confirm what I say. Another says the same of professors in the schools and colleges: They have obligations to their students and must consider the good of the latter before their own.

Another: Those who faithfully make their hour of prayer are not always those who are the most charitable and agreeable companions. I know some who are very strict on this point, but who are a source of discord in the community because of their unpleasantness. Another: There is much talk of spiritual crisis in the Society. So much the better if we are in a state of crisis: "Vae nobis si crisis non haberetur!" St. Ignatius tells us that if one making the Exercises experiences neither consolation nor desolation, the director ought to question whether the retreatant is making the Exercises properly. Another: For whom are you going to approve this decree? Superiors, provincials, professors at the Gregorian, everybody in the Curia—all these live ordered lives and can easily allow themselves a continuous hour of prayer, but we who are involved in active ministries, in the parishes, colleges, etc., how can we do this? Finally, they tell us: The question of an hour is secondary; the important thing is the meaning we give to prayer. It is not the time which is lacking, but the internal experience, the appreciation. One who has experienced this latter cannot help but pray, just as lungs cannot help but breathe. To acquire this inclination, this experience of prayer, is essential; for Jesuits who do not pray, it will do no good to issue a new decree obliging them to pray. The remedy lies not in legislation ("legislatio est inimica orationi"), but in interior and personal convictions.

The discussion was then terminated for lack of time; it will be taken up again at the next session.

The debate on simultaneous translation

Several people had asked to have the question of simultaneous translation studied so that each one could express himself in his mother-tongue (at least in the principal languages spoken). The subcommission entrusted with this had come out in favor of a trial run. It suggested the use of three languages in addition to Latin: English, French, and Spanish. After some investigation, it came to the conclusion that they could rent all the needed equipment for 100,000 lire a day or buy it for around 6,000,000 lire. As for the translators, it suggested taking fathers or scholastics who had a thorough command of languages.

The question came up on the floor again at the end of the session. The objectors had multiplied: we won't find competent translators, the cost will be too great, Latin is good enough, simultaneous translation will encourage the windbags: "Timeo Danaos . . . timeo loquaces qui se non praepararent ad interventionem in aula faciendam." After many

interventions, especially ones against, the vote was taken:

1) Does the General Congregation want to introduce simultaneous translation at the next session? Answer: No.

2) Does the General Congregation want to entrust to the General a study of this whole question for the next General Congregation? Answer: Yes.

Farewell Show

Since many of the delegates are leaving the house this afternoon, last night we had a farewell party. Fr. de Sobrino had organized some folklore festivities. To begin with, the Americans came up to sing a few popular songs with words appropriate to the Congregation. For example, they recalled the principal phases of the Congregation to the tune of "John Brown is dead," and everyone joined in the chorus. Fr. Bru of France told us a few tales of his own invention. The Flemish Provincial of Belgium presented us with a trio of very fine voices, including that of our Assistant, Fr. Snoeck. One father did imitations of the speakers at the Congregation, with as much success as our Fr. Burns. Fr. Divarkar, an Indian, gave us a satire on the interventions in the *aula*, which won him warm applause. (I hope to get the text; it's a gem for the connoisseurs!)

At last, the General himself performed. Asked to sing, he came up to the microphone (this affair was being held on the Curia roof, with lights, microphone, and loudspeaker) and said: "Placetne Congregationi Generali ut cantet Generalis? (Does the General Congregation want the General to sing?)" Everyone applauded and said: "Placet." And the General added: "Accendantur lumina!" He sang us a Basque song—of which I understood nothing, except that the singer has a fine, cultivated voice. For an encore he sang a Japanese song—also completely incomprehensible, except that the singer has a very flexible voice well suited for expressing Oriental laments.

While I'm on this subject, I point out once again the quality he has of mixing with people easily and of putting them at ease. He is a very good mixer. Above all, he has the means for doing this, that is, he can speak each one's language, which is extremely important for a general. If there are any young Canadians who aspire to being general, let them learn languages: besides English and French, Spanish is necessary, Italian is useful, and German can help.

As the finale, the Provincial of Rome sang "Quanto sei bella, Roma!"

July 15, 1965
(9:30 P.M.)

The last moments

I was not thinking of returning to the typewriter, but before going to bed I have left myself a little time to put a finishing touch to my series of letters on the Congregation. Three events are worth mentioning for the day now ending.

The closing session

The final session took place this morning at ten. No discussions and no interventions, but only a series of votes to put everything in order, especially for the second session. Then the oldest professed, Fr. Ascona, the Spanish Assistant, expressed the customary thanksgiving. Finally, the General took the floor to thank and congratulate everyone for the work done.⁶

A visit by Cardinal Antoniutti

Before we broke up, the General announced that His Eminence Cardinal Antoniutti, prefect of the Congregation of Religious, had accepted an invitation to dine with us. (The General had also invited Cardinal Bea, but he was not feeling well and could not come.) At dinner we had the same ceremonial as when the Master General of the Dominicans came. The two tables of honor were put together; Cardinal Antoniutti and the General were in the center, with Frs. Svain and Dezza and two others alongside. All through the meal the General chatted with the Cardinal as with an old friend. (I note in passing that this was a big "first" so far as the opulence of the meal is concerned—something not to be sneezed at, since gastronomical opulence is a rare thing at the Curia.)

At the end of the meal, the Cardinal spoke: he had brought with him a menu of a meal he had had with the Jesuits in 1938 when he was apostolic delegate in Spain and the Society had just been restored after the civil war. "I have in my hands," he said, "the parchment on which the fate of the Society depends, and that surely gives me a certain amount of importance. I have come here for the closing of your Congregation more as a friend than as prefect of the Congregation of Religious, for I have very good friends among the Jesuits, especially in Spain and in Canada. I urge you to fight the good fight, as in the past, for God and the Church."

In response, the General made the observation that because so many pages had to be printed at the end of the Congregation, there was no time to print a menu like the one in Spain, but the welcome is just as

⁶ See WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1966) 70-71.

warmhearted. We are at the service of the Church and the Sovereign Pontiff. Our whole Congregation has labored only to find the best ways of fulfilling our task and this service.

On TV

At 9:15 tonight someone came to the recreation room and told us: "Father General is speaking on television about the Congregation." They turned in the station just in time. The announcer explained the session which the Jesuits had just held and then turned it over to Father General. Fr. Dezza, who was there beside me, said: "He's going to speak Italian." The General did, in fact, speak Italian, but he followed a carefully prepared text. No questions were asked. He simply explained what took place at the first session and announced that the second session would be devoted to the spiritual life. . . . It was brief, but clear and impressive.

And that's where I'll end my correspondence! I would have liked to draw up a balance-sheet of the whole session, but there's no time. I have to pack my bags and throw out a few tons of paper before leaving. . . .

APPENDIX

The text of Fr. Divarkar's contribution to the Farewell Show on July 14, 1965:

Satirical parody on the interventions made in the *aula* during the Congregation

Reverend Fathers,

I actually have nothing to say, and even this nothing has already been well said by many others. Nevertheless, I want to offer a few words to increase your merit. Do not fear; I will be brief. I will not say more than ten words after my time is up.

This nocturnal celebration pleases me, or rather it pleases me a great deal, but the English title "Farewell Show" is less pleasing. On the contrary, it seems to me that a celebration of this kind is illicit and invalid and should

Reverendi Patres,

Revera nihil habeo dicendum, et etiam hoc nihil ab aliis multis iam bene dictum est. Tamen volo aliqua verba proferre ad augendum vestrum meritum. Ne timeatis; brevis ero: non plus quam decem verba proferam post elapsum meum tempus.

Haec celebratio nocturna mihi placet, immo valde placet—sed minus placet titulus anglicus "Farewell Show" seu spectaculum valedictorium. Immo videtur mihi huiusmodi celebrationem esse illicitam, invalidam et statim

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

be stopped immediately. Here are the reasons:

1) Because it is contrary to the mind of St. Ignatius. I do not wish to undertake a historical investigation, nor is it necessary. For we have a convenient and sure criterion for recognizing the mind of St. Ignatius; namely, Ignatius thought the way I do. But this celebration does not please me. Therefore, it is contrary to the mind of St. Ignatius. But if you should ask why it does not please me, I would say:

2) Because it creates insurmountable juridical difficulties. I am not an expert in law, but I wish to speak as an expert, since everybody does this. Moreover, according to the legal experts, all questions which arise from the interruption of the Congregation should be solved as if the Congregation were not being interrupted. In other words—clearer and less juridical words—all problems are to be solved as if they did not exist.

An excellent formula, indeed, for solving certain difficulties! (I speak sincerely, Fathers. For example, all those great difficulties about the traveling expenses for the second session could be solved by explaining to the airline agencies that they should make their calculations as if there were only one trip to be made.)

But what about this case? According to the principle expressed, our farewell is invalid, because it supposes an interruption, or rather it supposes the conclusion of the Congregation. Or, if it is valid, then what is worse, the second session itself will be invalid. Its decrees will be invalid, the carrying out of the decrees will be invalid, and so on.

3) Someone may say, "I don't care about legalism; your argument doesn't

suspendendam. Rationes sunt:

1) Quia est contra mentem S. P. Ignatii: nolo instituere inquisitionem historicam, nec necesse est; habemus enim criterium facile et certum ad dignoscendam mentem S. Ignatii: sc.: Ignatius cogitabat sicut ego cogito; atqui haec celebratio mihi non placeat. Ergo est contra mentem S. Ignatii. Si vero quaeratur cur mihi non placeat, dicam:

2) Quia creat insuperabiles difficultates iuridicas. Ego non sum iurisperitus, sed volo loqui ut peritus, siquidem omnes hoc faciunt. Iamvero, secundum iurisperitos omnes quaestiones quae ex interruptione Congregationis oriuntur debent solvi ac si Congregatio non interrumperetur. Aliis verbis—magis claris et minus iuridicis—omnia problemata solvenda sunt ac si non existerent.

Optima formula quidem ad quaslibet difficultates solvendas! (Sincere loquor, Patres: v.g. omnes illae magnae difficultates de expensis itinerum pro secunda sessione possent solvi explicando Consociationibus Aeriis computationes debere fieri ac si unum tantum iter faciendum esset.)

Sed quid ad casum? Secundum principium enunciatum, nostra valedictio est invalida, quia supponit interruptionem, immo supponit conclusionem Congregationis. Vel, si est valida, tunc, quod est peius, ipsa secunda sessio erit invalida. Eius decreta erunt invalida, executio decretorum erit invalida, et ita porro.

3) Dixerit quispiam, ego non curo de iuridicismo, non mihi movet tuum

move me." But, Reverend Fathers, we must consider our young men. I am speaking about these excellent scholastics who truly love their vocation. Will this farewell please them? What is certain from their many *postulata*? They are indeed demanding many things, but a single desire underlies them all: just from the number of *postulata* it is clear that those scholastics wanted to keep us in Rome for the rest of our lives. In this way they wanted to solve all the problems of the Society, and, in fact, from the news we have received, it is certain that the Society has rested in great peace during our absence from the provinces. If we return to our provinces now, it is to be feared that a new crisis will arise in the Society and new *postulata* will rise up before us.

Therefore, I think that this celebration should at least be postponed, for it is not yet mature. Let us have the farewell at the beginning of the second session, or else let us leave the entire matter to four *definidores* who will have a celebration among themselves at an opportune time!

I thank you.

argumentum. Sed, Reverendi Patres, debemus cogitare de nostris iuvenibus. Loquor de optimis scholasticis qui vocationem suam vere amant: placebitne illis haec valedictio? Quid constat ex tot eorum *postulatis*? Multa quidem *postulant*, sed unum tandem desiderium omnibus subest—ex solo numero *postulatorum* manifestum est scholasticos illos voluisse nos Romae retinere per totam nostram vitam. Sic volebant solvere omnia problemata Societatis: et revera ex nuntiis acceptis, constat Societatem in magna tranquillitate quievisse durante nostra absentia a Provinciis. Si nunc revertimur in Provincias, timendum ne nova crisis oriatur in Societate et nova *postulata* exsurgant.

Ergo puto saltem differendam esse hanc celebrationem; nondum enim est matura. Habeamus valedictionem initio secundae sessionis vel, totam rem relinquamus quattuor *Definitoribus* qui opportuno tempore celebrationem inter se habebunt!

Gratias.

• • •

A piece presented by Fr. José de Sobrino, Provincial of Andalusia:

Sequentia Pseudoliturgica Congregationis Generalis XXXI

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Ex omni plaga vocati
veniunt Patres congregati
ad istud capitulum,
Veniunt Angli, veniunt Galli,
lingua tamen inaequali:
quod facit periculum.</p> | <p>2. Indos, Slavos, Hispanos,
et Latino-Americanos,
curis tactos paribus
et Saxones salutatis
qui Statibus Foederatis
veniunt cum dollaribus.</p> |
|--|--|

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

3. Sumus omnes, sumus laeti,
sumus alacres et freti
et laboribus praesto;
et in aula pontificia
sancta replemur laetitia
loquente Paulo Sexto.
4. Iuvant proelo coadiutores,
serviunt mensis superiores
suis ipsi manibus;
et pro tanta re facienda
datur quotidie in merenda
Pepsi-Cola Patribus.
5. Electronico cerebro,
moderno, sapiente et crebro,
fiunt omnes calculi:
et in binis tabulatis
plus minusve computati
prospiciuntur numeri.
6. Discutitur Generalis,
an "per tempus" an "vitalis"
sit eius duratio:
auditis omnium quaerelis
"sit ad vitam, cum cautelis"
dicit Congregatio.
7. Generalis iam electus
per televisionem vectus
toto mundo loquitur:
et Magister Dominicus
in mensa sedens amicus
signum bonum dicitur.
8. Primo legitur "relatio",
deinde fit "disceptatio"
multis approbantibus,
sed obsistit Villanova
dicendo quod res est nova
adductis rationibus.
9. Accedit Pater Giampieri
et ab illo potest quaeri
de qua re is loquitur
Sed respondet Congregatio
quod est magna delectatio
cum de ipso agitur.
10. Cautelarum apparatus
firmus, flexibilis, gratus,
sententia est omni concors:
Generales Assistentes,
ut sint pauci et efficientes,
reducuntur ad quattuor.
11. Praesidentem Fordhamensem
factum cives curialensem
unanimiter votamus
Americanorum spei,
est O'Keefe, est Okey:
et omnes gratulamur.
12. Sed calor iam augebatur,
et sic quisque exsudabatur
ut concludendas sit res
siquidem tota creatura
adhuc erat immatura
et sic perficienda est.
13. Sit completa, sit iucunda,
sit nobis sessio secunda
anno sexaginta et sex;
Cum viribus renovatis,
sine novis postulatis,
tandem proferatur lex.
14. Patres, nationes, valet!
unusquisque et unaquaeque,
alis, curru, pedites,
sub luna Romana in coelis
altis decorata stellis
iter vestrum pergit.

EDITORS' EPILOGUE

We must thank those of our readers who have let us know of the pleasures and interest they have had in reading *Lettres de Rome*. These testimonies have amply compensated for the additional work that copying, printing, and distributing these bulletins meant for the personnel of the Provincial's Secretariat.

These tributes belong, in fact, to him whom we have been pleased to decorate with the title of *Envoyé spécial*. He has sent us no less than one hundred pages of fine text, full pages closely typed on a borrowed machine. The needs of the cause have forced us to leave out many interesting passages. Those passages we have published are already an indication of the sustained quality of this correspondence and of the virtuosity of its author.

We will meet you again in September, 1966, at the second session of the General Congregation.

Les Éditeurs

Maison Provinciale
Montréal, 1965

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES

*a genuine movement
of renewal*

ROBERT F. HARVANEK, S.J.

WITHIN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS, an International Congress on the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius was held at Loyola, Spain, during August, 1966. Forty-four Jesuits from different parts of the world took part in the Congress, which began on the evening of August 16th and concluded at noon on August 29th. The Congress was presided over by General Assistant Reverend Father John L. Swain, S.J., by the appointment of Father General Arrupe. The Secretary and General Manager of the Congress was Fr. Clemente Espinosa, S.J., formerly with the Sodality Secretariat in Rome.

It may be useful to review the history of the formation of the Congress before giving an account of its proceedings. About the time of Pope John's call for an *aggiornamento* of the Church in the modern world, there seemed to be a feeling in different parts of the Society of a need for rethinking and re-examining Jesuit spirituality and in particular the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius in the light of the contemporary spirit moving the Church and the world. A number of conferences and institutes in the United States on either Jesuit spirituality or the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius were an indication of that desire. The workshop held at Loyola in Chicago in 1962 under the title of *Contemporary Thought in the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, and the conversations at Woodstock that led to a request for the formation of an American Institute of Spirituality at Fordham, are instances of this general move-

ment. What was taking place here in the United States was taking place elsewhere in the Society also, and requests were being sent in to Rome for some action to be taken with a view to thinking through the spirituality of the Society and the Spiritual Exercises in conjunction with the movements in the contemporary world. The general idea seemed to be to establish some sort of institute of research and teaching, perhaps in Rome, in Ignatian Spirituality. Some planning sessions led to the recommendation that an International Congress on the Spiritual Exercises in the contemporary world be called. Such a congress was planned and organized for August, 1965. The place chosen was Mexico City. Each province was asked to send a representative who would not only take active part in the Congress but would also return to his province afterward to organize discussions and conferences on the local level with a view to updating the presentation of the Exercises. The program of the Mexico City Congress was very similar to the program of the Chicago-Loyola workshop on *Contemporary Thought and the Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius even to the extent of using some of the same personnel.

Difficulties in Mexico City

The Mexico City Congress ran into difficulties. The first was the criticism that it received from a number of people that it was more of a general convention in which no work could effectively be done than a workshop which could meet the problems of the times. This criticism tended to argue that what was needed was not a general congress, but rather a small working group of people competent both in the theology of the Exercises and in the practice of giving them. This group would not meet simply for a few days or a week or two, but set itself to the task of thinking out the problems and working out solutions over a sufficiently lengthy period of time. Whatever the merit of the positive suggestion of this criticism, its negative criticism about the ineffectiveness of a general International Congress in which the people had greatly different talents, training and experience was felt by many.

The second difficulty arose from one of the preparatory moves for the Congress. It was thought that it would be very useful to have a general survey of opinion from all parts of the world, and from various classes of people occupied with the Spiritual Exer-

cises as background for the deliberations of the Congress. As a result a questionnaire was prepared and sent out to each of the province representatives. They in turn were asked to distribute these to priests, religious, laymen, as well as Jesuits, who might be expected to have some sort of judgment about the Spiritual Exercises and their effectiveness in our times. A large number of questionnaires were distributed. For example, over one hundred copies of the questionnaire were sent to the Chicago Province and about eighty of these were sent out. About fifty people replied. The questionnaire was so constructed as to invite essay-type responses. The result was that when all this material began to arrive in Rome the task of digesting it and making it available in time for use by the Congress became impossible.¹ Consequently, it was decided to postpone the Congress for a year. In the meantime the General Congregation convened and the first session took place. Since it was evident that the Congregation would involve itself in the questions that had stimulated the original desire for an institute, there was some dispute apparently as to whether there should be a Congress at all.

Meeting in Spain

In any event the Congress was reorganized in the spring of 1966 and called at Loyola in Spain for the dates already given. This new Congress did not follow the format of the original one, nor did it completely follow the plan of a small working congress of experts only. The members of the Congress were not taken from each province, and they were not appointed by the provincials. Rather they were taken from a list of nominees submitted in a small questionnaire sent out around February. This questionnaire also asked for suggestions for topics to be discussed in the Congress, and for an expression of willingness to participate and to submit papers, as well as for nominations for participants in the Congress. The theme

¹ The results of the questionnaire were finally digested, summarized, and printed. They are available in an English language edition from Fr. Clemente Espinosa, S.J., Secretary of the International Congress of the Spiritual Exercises, Borgo S. Spirito, 5, Rome. The price is three dollars, and the title is: *Problematic of the Spiritual Exercises Today*. It is also available from Fr. Burke's office. The questionnaire and its tabulation were also criticized as unscientific and uncritical; there was no effective control over the responses, and it is hard to know how to evaluate them.

was likewise changed to a consideration of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius in the light of Vatican II. In other words, it was not so much the modern world that was in focus, as the work of the Holy Spirit in Vatican II, the directions in which the work of this assembly seemed to be moving the Church and the relations of the Spiritual Exercises to this.

There were certainly experts in the Spiritual Exercises at the Congress, men like Fr. Iparraguirre, and Frs. Laplace and Mollat, as well as Fr. Paul Kennedy of St. Beuno's and Fr. Thomas A. Burke of the Spiritual Exercises program in New Jersey. In general, I suppose one can say that the participants fell into three classes: professors of theology or Scripture, or writers and editors of spiritual journals; spiritual directors such as novice masters and tertian instructors, and men experienced in giving the Exercises to religious; retreat masters for student and adult lay retreat groups as well as specialists for priests and religious. The kind of experience that each one had in the giving of the Exercises varied with his circumstances just as did one's knowledge of the new theological and scriptural developments in the Church.

In the long run then, what was the purpose that the Congress was intended to fulfill? I suppose that in the mind of some of its organizers its function was still the original one: to look over the situation of the Exercises in the world today and to recommend that some action be taken to revitalize and energize the apostolate of the Exercises. It seemed to be envisioned that the form this action would take would be that of a teaching institute established in Rome for potential directors of the Exercises. However, in the minds of others, and perhaps Fr. Arrupe was among these, the purpose of the Congress was to examine and explore the relation between the work of Vatican II and the Spiritual Exercises, and, in the light of this investigation, to make some recommendations about the place of the Exercises in the Society's apostolate in the contemporary Church. The Congress therefore was a kind of extended and preliminary free discussion of a topic that was of concern to the General Congregation and to Father General, and would be able to provide some explorations of an important theme for the meditations of the Congregation and for future decisions.²

² The General Congregation did not publish a separate decree on the

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

Procedures at the Congress

Perhaps the Congress served this purpose. A large number of written papers were prepared as a basis for the discussion of the Congress. Each of the sixteen themes had at least one paper written by the principal chairman, many of them had two, three, or even more papers submitted. Some correspondents who were not able to attend submitted papers. These papers were not read at the Congress, rather they were multiplied, and wherever possible presented in three languages (Spanish, French, and English) and sent out to the delegates ahead of time. Though the assignments were made late, there was an amazing amount of cooperation with the planning committee, and most of the papers were in the hands of the delegates before they came to the Congress. At the Congress each of the themes was given a half day, approximately three and one-half hours, for discussion. The topic was first presented at a general assembly by the chairman of the committee appointed for that topic. He usually summarized at least his own paper and sometimes the other papers which were submitted. This rarely took more than twenty minutes or a half hour. After that the Congress broke up into the three language groups indicated and discussed the theme for about an hour. After this there was another general assembly at which the discussions of the language groups were summarized, after which the topic continued to be discussed for the remainder of the time by the whole body together. The three chairmen of the language groups for each of the topics were responsible for drawing up a summary of the discussion with the principal recommendations. Since the schedule did not allow for any working time for committees of this sort, it was again amazing that the summaries were for the most part completed by the time the Congress was concluded. There was not much opportunity to make observations and corrections in these summaries while the Congress was still in progress, however all were invited to send in additional written comments as soon as they could. A special committee was given the responsibility of drawing up a kind of

Spiritual Exercises, though they are mentioned throughout, especially in the decrees on the religious life. They are particularly mentioned in the Decree on Prayer and the decree itself contains a paragraph on the annual Exercises to be made by Jesuits.

general position paper or statement which would express the recommendations of the whole Congress to Father General. The last session preceding the closing concelebrated Mass in the basilica proved not to be long enough to review and discuss the entire position paper, but enough was done to gather the general mind of the Congress. The unfinished work was to be completed by a small committee in Rome working with Fr. Swain, at the end of September. It would then be submitted to Father General, and perhaps through him to the General Congregation. Further action would depend upon the decisions taken by these two agencies.

It might have been presupposed that the Congress would find that the Spiritual Exercises still do have a role to play in the life of the Church. It would be rather surprising if such a fundamental instrument of Christian experience and service were suddenly to become irrelevant to the progress of Christian life. Moreover, the fathers who were gathered in the Congress were all evidently men who had profoundly undergone the experience of the Exercises in their own lives and who had frequently found them efficacious in the lives of others. Admitting all this, there was still an element of surprise as the Congress progressed that there should be such a real and deep harmony between the movement of the Church in Vatican II and the Spiritual Exercises. In fact, I think there were moments when everyone there felt that the thing to do was to go out immediately and begin a movement for the renewal of the Exercises throughout the world because this would be the form of the apostolate that would best serve the Church and the one way in which the Society itself could best serve the Church today.

This surprise and enthusiasm manifested, I think, an initial apprehension that perhaps the shift in the Church was something which was away from the direction of the Exercises and that if the Exercises were not completely irrelevant, at least they would have to be considerably altered. Part of the new understanding that came out of the discussion however was that there should be some alteration, it is true, but for the most part this alteration would be in the direction of rediscovering the Exercises, or at least of realizing a new level and depth in them which perhaps had not been appreciated in their recent past.

I do not want to suggest the idea that the harmony between the

theology of Vatican II and the Spiritual Exercises was something that was considered by the Congress to be evident and apparent on the face of things. Rather, I would want to suggest the opposite, namely, that the harmony was rather at the deeper levels of understanding behind the words and phrases and images.

Vatican II and the Spiritual Exercises

Perhaps the point of contact came in the way of reading Vatican II, and then in the understanding this generated of the Spiritual Exercises. It has sometimes been said that the thrust of Vatican II was primarily in the development of the theology of the Church as a community, that even the renewal of the liturgy was part of this pattern. This may be true enough, but to the theologians at the Congress it seemed that the real center and heart of Vatican II was the reaffirmation and illumination of the mystery of Christ, that the constant theme of the Council was the mystery of Christ in the history of salvation, and particularly the Paschal Mystery. This kept recurring in all the documents. It meant then that the sense of revelation, both in Scripture and in the Church was that the whole history of mankind is centered in the history of Christ. It is this history which is to be taught to the faithful by the bishops and priests, and which is to be lived by the faithful. It is this mystery which is celebrated liturgically. The new emphasis on the Eucharist, and the development of biblical theology both converge to make the same affirmation.

If one read the Council this way, it became easy to see how, as one man expressed it, the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius not only harmonized with Scripture and the liturgy, and therefore with the Council, but was actually identical with them, in that it was a way of experiencing this one central mystery of Christianity.

It seemed to me at least that the effect of this was to consider the Exercises not so much as a way of arriving at a decision, but rather as a method for experiencing the mystery of Christ. In the words of Fr. Coathalem, the tertian instructor from Taiwan (who had sent a communication to the Congress, though he was not a member), the essence of the Spiritual Exercises is to be found in the sequence of the weeks. This then took the weight off what have generally been known as the key meditations of the Exercises, and off the election, and placed it upon the experiencing of the mystery

of Christ, and especially upon the process of the Third and Fourth Weeks. This means that the climax of the Spiritual Exercises is found in these last two weeks, and the whole problem of their value and place in the retreat once the election has been made is automatically solved.

It should not be understood that the key meditations and the election, as Fr. Peters would seem to argue, do not have an essential role to play in this process of undergoing the mystery of Christ. They have as a matter of fact a very important role to play as was pointed out in a communication that was sent to the Congress by Fr. Fiorito of Argentina. The role of the key meditations is to act as a kind of commentary and interpretation of the mystery of Christ, as exercises which enable the person who makes the Exercises to enter into the mystery.

The election and Paschal Mystery

The election likewise is important for the process of spiritually entering into the mystery of Christ, for it is only by our response to the invocation of Christ, by our decision to imitate Christ, that we actually participate in his mystery. The election is a kind of condition for entering into the Third and Fourth Weeks. Fr. Koevecses of Brazil introduced a distinction between two different elections (though this terminology is not used by Ignatius), which are found in the Exercises. The first is a condition of the second and consists in the choice to respond fully to Christ with complete openness to whatever way of imitation his will indicates. This is the election of the second response of the kingdom, and of the third degree of humility. It is necessary to have this response before the particular election, the election properly so-called in the Exercises, becomes operable. It follows therefore that the particular election should not always take place, but only in those circumstances where the exercitant is conditioned for it by his complete generosity to God. The point of this view then is not so much that the key meditations and the election are not necessary, but rather that they are simply stages on the way to complete participation in Christ, and that the fullness of this is found in the participation in the Paschal Mystery in the Third and Fourth Weeks. It is this emphasis on the Third and Fourth Weeks which relates the Exercises so closely to both the liturgy and to Scripture. It would be a mistake however

to think that the Paschal Mystery is limited to these last two weeks of the Exercises. The Paschal Mystery really, as Fr. Magana of Mexico kept pointing out, is something which begins with the fall and the promise of the redemption of man, and therefore is the theme which runs through the whole course of Scripture. Though Ignatius was translating his own personal experience of Christ, this experience is the fundamental experience of Christianity, both as manifested in the vocation of Israel and as manifested in the life of Christ himself. It is necessary therefore for the exercitant to go through the experience of the need of salvation, which is provided by the First Week, and then to proceed through the experience of salvation itself by the contemplative participation in the life of Christ in the Second, Third, and Fourth Weeks.

Though this basic harmony was recognized as both the thrust of Vatican II and also as the essence of the Exercises, it was nevertheless also recognized that the language, perhaps one might even say the theological constructs in which the Exercises were composed are not in the language and theology of Vatican II. Consequently when the Exercises are presented today, they must be presented in the language and theology of Vatican II, and take into account the developments in the Church which both initiated the Council and found expression in it. Perhaps the key to this new language of the Exercises is to be found in Scripture, both in the sense that some of the more scholastic portions of the Exercises, such as the Principle and Foundation, must, if they are to be profitable, be presented in terms of Scripture. Moreover, the theology of Scripture rather than of the scholastics should provide the theology of the Exercises today.

There was some difficulty experienced with the meditations of the First Week, especially the first meditation on the triple sin. This arose from the problem of the demythologizing of Scripture, and specifically of the angels. This point was never settled during the time of the Congress itself, though it kept coming back for more discussion, and the questions of the fifth meditation on hell did not get to the floor at all.

Methodology

Perhaps the other major thrust of the Congress had to do with the method of the Exercises and the kinds and types of Exercises

and the persons who should make them. The discussion of method, types of Exercises, and persons occurred under the heading of the Annotations which were taken up at the end rather than the beginning of the Congress. This was the only instance in which the sequence of the Exercises was not followed. It might be useful to mention a basic ambiguity that was brought out as soon as the Congress began discussing the question of methodology, namely, the ambiguity of considering the Exercises as presenting a doctrine so that they become something of a school of spirituality, and considering the Exercises as primarily a method of prayer and of spiritual encounter with God. If one is to present the Exercises in terms of the theology of Vatican II and of contemporary biblical theology, then it would seem to mean that the director would be expected to spend a good deal of time in explaining this theology. This would run counter to what was certainly one of the strong affirmations of the Congress in terms of methodology. There was clearly a general desire to return as far as possible to the personal style of retreats which was the original method used by St. Ignatius and indicated in the Annotations.

The opinion was expressed that perhaps the principal reason why the Exercises have begun to lose their attraction to retreatants is that they have been practiced more as a course in spiritual theology with a prayerful intention, than as a program of Exercises. The course in spiritual theology forces the director constantly to find some sort of new theme or viewpoint while keeping within the structure of the Exercises. This generated the complaint of constant repetition and ennui. Several experienced directors gave accounts of their practice of giving personal retreats, and their judgment was that the results were far greater than those of the general group retreats. Three styles of such personal retreats were reported. There was first of all the genuine personal retreat of one retreatant making Spiritual Exercises under the daily guidance of the director. Fr. Brien had done this successfully for years in his work in Canada. The length of the Exercises would depend upon the condition of the retreatant, his capacity for making Exercises of this sort, and the available time. The point was stressed several times that it was not possible to recommend this type of retreat to all of those who come to us to make retreats; many are not spiritually or psychologically prepared for this type of work.

The second style was that represented by the 19th Annotation, and reported by Fr. Van Schoote of Belgium. He has given personal retreats to clergy and laymen alike who do not have the time to separate themselves from their daily affairs, but who can afford a couple of hours a day for a definite period for making the Exercises. Fr. Van Schoote's practice was to visit these retreatants daily and instruct them on the next exercise to be made after a discussion of the previous one. One of the special virtues that seem to come out of this mode of the Exercises was the integration of prayer and action, of the work of the exercitant's daily life with the life of prayer in union with Christ.

The third mode of personal Exercises reported by Fr. Kennedy was that of giving the Exercises to a group of twenty-five or thirty (father said that a maximum amount of thirty-five had been handled this way, but an ideal number would be twenty or twenty-five) who would meet only once in a day for general instruction and direction on the part of the one who gives the Exercises. The director would then meet with each of the retreatants personally and individually each day if possible, or at least every second day, to give directions on the personal Exercises they should make, and to discuss their experiences with them.

The capacity of the exercitant

The desire to return to this original mode of giving the Spiritual Exercises was so great that one man expressed the opinion that the Society should refuse to pretend to give the Exercises unless they were such as conformed to the original intent and situation. The Congress sympathized with his point of view, but felt the Society simply could not turn down requests for retreats, even though the conditions were not ideal. On the other hand, it was thought that more could be done to "sell" the personal style of Exercises to various classes of retreatants.

This discussion led to the second major theme, the importance of the distinction between people capable of making the "light Exercises," and those capable and interested in making the complete Exercises of the Second, Third, and Fourth Weeks. The distinction is made by St. Ignatius in the 18th Annotation. It seemed to be a strong sentiment of the Congress that it was generally bad procedure simply to squeeze the structure of the Exercises from a thirty day

retreat into an eight day retreat, and into a five day retreat and finally down to a three or two or a one day retreat. In other words, when people are not able to make the longer Exercises, even for a relatively short time, such as a week or ten days, then exercises suited to their situation and disposition should be given to them, and not simply a collapsed form of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius. The types of exercises these might be were not developed or worked out, though there seemed to be some indication that variant forms of group exercises, of liturgical exercises, etc., might be quite proper for this class of retreatants.

However it was also the strong sentiment of the group that the essential methodology of the Exercises was the engagement of the retreatant in personal prayer. Everything should be organized and ordered from this point of view, that is to lead the exercitant to engage in personal prayer in which he might spiritually and interiorly experience the mystery of Christ and the movements of the Holy Spirit in his soul. It was generally thought that dialog retreats and group discussion, and retreats without silence did not lead to personal prayer and the contemplative experience of Christ and the personal guidance of the Holy Spirit. Clearly this implies the theology of the discernment of spirits and of a particular divine providence guiding the individual soul through interior motions, which is the subject of the 20th Annotation.

There was no tendency on the part of the Congress to question this theology at all, that is, to doubt it or wonder about it. In fact, when someone asked whether we should explore the theological soundness of the position, there seemed to be a kind of general impatience, as though this theology were evident to all from experience, and there was no need to take the time to demonstrate it. There was not even any tendency to restrict the discernment of spirits to the higher phases of Christian life, to mystical experience for example. It was generally felt that the spirits are operating in all Christians, and in fact in all men. It was admitted that their discernment is not always easy, and can not be achieved in every circumstance. Time is needed both on the part of the exercitant to come to a distinction of the spirits moving him, and also on the part of the director to be able to guide and direct this particular exercitant. It was felt that it would be a mistake to think that the discernment of spirits was something that could be done without edu-

cation and without patience. It was for this reason that the Congress was eager to recommend the need for more training of spiritual guides, first of all among Jesuits themselves, and secondly also among other priests, religious, and laymen. One of the constant themes that keeps coming up in congresses and institutes where the religious formation of Christians is under discussion is the lack of competent spiritual guides and the need for more of them and that they be better trained.

The Congress felt that every Jesuit ought to achieve a certain degree of competence in the guidance of souls, that this ought to be one of the effects of the general course in the formation of Jesuit priests. It recognized of course that there might be the exceptional individual whose gifts in the priestly apostolate did not include the capacity to relate to individuals in this sphere of their interior personal spiritual life, but generally it was thought that this should be an exception among us. This implied a judgment that the present formation of Jesuits has not sufficiently developed the potential in each man to become a "discerner of spirits" and a guide of souls. This was judged to be primarily because the general experience of Jesuits in the making of the Exercises was not one which formed them in the practice of the discerning and listening to the Holy Spirit in their own souls under the guidance of a competent spiritual guide, and that consequently they were not confident of being able to do this with others. The important thing therefore was to renew the original mode of making the Exercises in a personal way as intended by St. Ignatius within the Society, beginning from the novitiate, though there was some question whether there was sufficient maturity in the spiritual life at the beginning of the novitiate for everyone to be able to make the Exercises in the proper way.

This also became a matter for discussion when the question of the repetition of the Exercises annually by religious groups, by lay retreatants, and by Jesuits themselves was discussed. The general sense of the discussion, and of the basic paper presented by Fr. Granero, was that the Spiritual Exercises could indeed be repeated and, in fact, should be in certain situations; but they need not be imposed or required of everyone in any particular group or community every year. The thought seemed to be that the Exercises might properly be repeated at times of transition or change in the

progress of one's life, and if that life had settled into a pattern without any new situations anticipated in the future, then they might be repeated every several years but not necessarily every year. As regards to the Society, it was thought that a periodic repetition of this sort would be sufficient to provide for unity and continuity of spirit in the Society. In the off years, other forms of spiritual renewal might take the place of the Spiritual Exercises.³ It was further suggested that the decision as to what should be done should be as far as possible determined by the circumstances of the individual person, and consequently some sort of possibility of choice of the type of exercises to be made should be provided for. In other words, the entire community should not be forced into the same pattern, whether it be making the Spiritual Exercises, or some other type of renewal, such as a liturgical week of prayer, or an experience of Christian community, or a biblical week.

Liturgy and the Exercises

One of the difficulties that the members of the Congress felt right from the beginning was the impossibility to get very far in the consideration and discussion of any one question. The program of the Congress covered many topics which were difficult and complicated. In some instances the progress of the Congress itself took care of the matter to some degree, in that the succession of topics tended to return upon old questions, and thus some progress was made. However it was a primary concern of all at the end that it be made clear that the Congress had been able only to initiate discussion on the whole series of problems, and consequently a final determination on the interpretation and practice of the Spiritual Exercises today should not be expected from it. Perhaps the area where this inadequacy was most in evidence was the area of methodology as applied to the liturgy and to the question of community. It was relatively easy to see a fundamental identity between the spirituality of the liturgy and the spirituality of the Exercises, as was indicated above. One could see how the Exercises could both contribute to a deeper and greater participation in the liturgy,

³ The General Congregation reiterated the past practice of making the Spiritual Exercises every year for eight days, but allowed for adaptations either for individuals or for whole provinces or assistancies. Cf. the Decree on Prayer No. 16.

and how they could also complete the liturgy by giving the exercitant an opportunity to live the Paschal Mystery contemplatively in order to determine how he might live it actually in his everyday life. But not much progress was made in the question of how the liturgy itself could or should properly enter into the work of the Exercises themselves. There was general satisfaction with the recent practice of locating the celebration of the Eucharist in the middle of the day or in the afternoon on the days when the Spiritual Exercises are being made, and of relating the celebration of the Eucharist to the Exercises and vice versa. However the question of the intrinsic dependence of the Exercises upon the liturgy was not explored at any length. Rather there was a tendency to consider the two as parallel practices of Christian life, with the sacramental sacrifice holding the primacy of course, but with the Exercises standing somewhat independently as fulfilling its own role in the life of the Church.

Part of the difficulty here is that the liturgy is by its nature a communal exercise of worship, and this is one of the areas where the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius are finding their greatest difficulty today. There is a tendency to absolve the question of the experience of Christian community and involvement in Christian community in terms of the way in which Christ and the election are presented, so that the orientation and resolution of the exercitant will be in the direction of the service of the Church and of the world as this is preached by Vatican II. But this is still done within the interiority of individual contemplation, and the community as such does not actually enter into this contemplation and form a part of it according to the past practice and understanding of the Exercises. As indicated above there was a general feeling that community exercises are incompatible with personal prayer and therefore did not form an intrinsic part of the Spiritual Exercises. This does not mean at all that community exercises do not have an important and necessary place in the Church, but it means only they do not have a part in the Spiritual Exercises. This seemed to be the sense also of the letter of Pope Paul VI to Cardinal Cushing on the occasion of the annual meeting of the Laymen's Retreat League in the United States. However there were some who indicated the difficulty of some, even within the Society, who do not

seem to be able to contemplate and make spiritual exercises, at least for any extended time. It was also remarked that many who have made the Exercises tend to remain independent individuals instead of becoming persons in community. Others also had participated in experimental forms of the Exercises, in the annual repetitions, in which varying degrees of community exercises were made, and they judged that these common exercises had some value and importance.

It was the hope of the Congress that the work that had begun there would continue throughout the Society, and that a real movement of renewal and invigoration of the Spiritual Exercises, not so much for themselves, but as a very excellent means for promoting the Church of Vatican II, would take place throughout the Society. There was no desire on the part of the group as a whole, though there was some strong advocacy of the plan, to establish a central teaching institute in Rome for the formation of spiritual guides and directors of the Spiritual Exercises. It was probably the more widespread desire that there be some sort of regional stimulus for the continuing renewal of the Spiritual Exercises, whether originating out of the different national journals of Jesuit spiritual life, such as *The Way, Manresa, Geist und Leben*, or by way of regional institutes or workshops of one sort or another. It was thought that possibly it would be valuable to have some sort of secretariat in Rome, to help keep all of these in motion and to be a center of information and communication.⁴ In any case it could very well be that the important thing that needs to be done in the Society in the modern world is for it to put new life into its own personal experience of the Spiritual Exercises and in its ministry of the Exercises for others.

⁴ The position papers and summaries of the Loyola Congress have been published and are available in Latin, and probably will soon be available in English, if this is not already the case by the time this article appears in print. The Latin title of the booklet (56 pages) is: *Congressus Internationalis Exercitiorum Spiritualium—Loyola, 1966—Declarationes et Summaria*. It was distributed by C. Espinosa, S.J., Borgo S. Spirito, 5, Rome, Italy.

SAINT AUGUSTINE AND THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES

*The Patristic Age was
doctrinal rather than devotional.*

JOSEPH A. SLATTERY, S.J.

THIS PAPER PROPOSES TO EXAMINE the pertinence of the ascetical and homiletic writings of St. Augustine to the *Spiritual Exercises*. It may safely be assumed that our retreat masters, unless they have the brains of mechanical monsters, suffer, from time to time, a sort of dullness or fatigue, and look about for a new point of approach which will reawaken interest in the staple themes which for us at least, if not for our hearers, have lost their excitement from constant repetition. St. Augustine seems to supply such an approach.

Here it is not recommended that Augustinian ideas be taken over wholesale, without discrimination and adjustment. The Saint's rigorism and pessimism will assuredly be found discordant with the optimism of modern Jesuit thought. His treatment of the events of our Lord's life is not quite suited to the method of contemplation which is a prominent feature of an Ignatian retreat. But these reservations allowed for, St. Augustine remains a very rich and stimulating source of ideas and symbols perfectly congruous to the spirit and aims of the *Exercises*.

An analogy from architecture may serve to introduce the argument. Among the ruins on the Athenian Acropolis may be traced the ground plan of the Propylaea, designed by Pericles to serve as a fortified entrance to the enclosure which contained a temple of

the tutelary goddess of the city, and was its last defense. The plan of the Propylaea made it unique among ancient monuments. Its reproduction in the façade of the Philadelphia Museum of Fine Arts is surely not an accident. The American architect had the Greek model in mind. Wisely, however, he confined his imitation to form. For material he chose a native sandstone, as more congruous to the landscape of Eastern Pennsylvania, a region still reminiscent of Penn's forest, and more resistant than marble to its harsh climate. This light brown sandstone is easy to obtain, easy to work, and very durable. To some eyes, however, it may appear dull, and after sufficient exposure to Philadelphia smog, even dreary. To apply the analogy down to its last detail would be impertinent. It is intended only to suggest that if our ideas are coming to feel and look more like sandstone than marble, we need not stand at a loss for first class material. The ideas of St. Augustine are as smooth and solid, as hospitable to light and warmth, as the stones of Mount Pentelicus.

A manual of strategy

The question arises whether his material can be shaped for our purpose. Before answering let us recall a very familiar observation on the literary form and structure of the *Exercises*, the truism that St. Ignatius did not write nor intend to write a treatise of spirituality. His book is a manual of strategy, the analytic study of an action—a transforming action, a personal revolution. This psychological reversal is to be effected, under grace, by a planned sequence of decisive moves, each growing out of its predecessor, and somewhat like the minute shifts involved in the coiling of a snake, leaving the will in position to strike its object with maximum force. The over-all plan of this shift of front, to employ military metaphor, is definite; but not the tactical detail. The actual deployment of battalion or corps is left to the officer on the spot, in this case the retreat director, who will know the concrete difficulties, the morale of the exercitants, and how best to reduce generalities to specific intellectual and imaginative experiences.

The plan itself, the book which we adopt as our guide, is the masterpiece of a very extraordinary genius in the sphere of action. How effective it is in achieving the end it proposes is by now attested by all competent judges; but the incredible subtlety of St.

Ignatius' analysis of the process of deliberate volition was revealed only recently in Fr. Fessard's *La dialectique des Exercices Spirituels*, which showed that the Saint had anticipated one of Hegel's most important insights by three centuries.

If the reduction of this masterly plan from the level of strategy to that of ground tactics, its actualization in concrete images and distinct ideas, can be effected with the help of St. Augustine, very great advantages may reasonably be expected. The ground of this expectation is the universally admitted position which the Saint occupies as the chief fountainhead of theology and spirituality in the West. He is hailed as the possessor of one of the most comprehensive and penetrating minds, of one of the richest associative imaginations, and most effective prose styles ever put at the service of the Church: I would add, as a private opinion, one of the most charming personalities.

It is also my opinion that a very considerable segment of all these gifts is at our service in the ministry of the word, in and out of retreats. The exposition of this opinion may be introduced by reference to the architectural analogy employed above. "Surely," one might object, "it is courting disaster to appropriate the materials found in one intellectual structure for use in another. Here the ideas you propose to utilize were shaped to form the last masterpieces of the ancient world. Will they fit into a book which may claim to be the last masterpiece of the Middle Ages? If so, will the combination add up to a modern retreat?"

Certainly, this objection has validity. Surely it forbids us the folly of indiscriminately pouring Augustinian matter into an Ignatian mould. Great revolutions in culture separate the classical from the medieval world, and the Middle Ages from our own. These transformations have produced parallel changes in spirituality. Some of these changes will be considered presently. However, one observation should be made here which will rob the objection of much of its a priori plausibility.

In his treatise *De quantitate animae* St. Augustine has drawn up a plan or outline of the progress of the soul from its awakening to its sanctification. The process will be found strikingly similar to that presumed by St. Ignatius. Both saints take the same point of departure, envisage the same goal, and, what is perhaps more in-

teresting, prescribe the same steps to approach it. This need not be regarded as a semi-miraculous coincidence. It derives from the fact, already stated, that St. Augustine is a fountainhead of western spirituality. The extent of his influence may be accepted on the authority of Fr. Portalié: "Augustine was the inspiration of two seemingly antagonistic currents of thought, scholasticism and mysticism. From Gregory the Great to the Fathers of Trent, his supreme theological authority dominates all thinkers. The representatives of scholasticism and the representatives of mysticism appealed to his authority, nourished themselves upon his writings, and were penetrated by his spirit."

A crucial question

St. Augustine's schema, incorporated into all subsequent systems of spirituality as the doctrine of the "three ways," was part of the medieval legacy inherited by St. Ignatius. It is interesting to compare the *Exercises* with *De quantitate animae* step by step. Both books assume at the outset as normal to the human condition that, too often for our peace of mind, our fellow men are confused, led astray and eventually destroyed by impulses embedded in our nature. Yet man's destiny is to rise above such impulses, and, enlightened and supported by grace, to recognize and attain an object nobler than temporal success and enjoyment, in fact, to love and possess God. But how to achieve this transformation of attitudes, this orientation towards a transcendent ideal, how to make progress towards its attainment? This is the crucial question.

St. Augustine proposes to elevate the soul by seven steps corresponding to seven levels of its activity from simple animation to intellectual love of God at the threshold of mystical prayer. The initial phase of psychic activity is that wherein the mind obscurely discovers itself as the animating principle of a body and through the bodily senses enters into a fruitful relationship with its material environment. It then exercises the primal function of every organism, the uninhibited exploitation of its environment in the interests of survival and the normal concomitant thereto, pleasure.

In pursuit of these objects the mind develops, and discovers a more satisfying area of exploitation, namely, human society and its cultural resources. Here it seeks, as before, objects and activities which answer its demand for security and pleasure. But at this

stage, a new element is encountered. The mind is confronted with its own dignity and is laden with a sense of responsibility. It must act in accordance with certain norms derived not from its preferences, but from justice. The voice of conscience is recognized as echoing a superior mandate. Rightly fearing the rigors of incorruptible Divine Justice, it strives now to purify itself from stains which would invite just retribution. All this corresponds, it seems too obvious to insist, to the situation which is presumed in the Foundation and First Week of the *Exercises*.

St. Augustine proceeds. Happy now in its purified state and resolved to sin no more, the soul draws near to God and the contemplation of truth. Since St. Augustine in innumerable passages declares that the Truth is Christ and insists that he is the way to God, there can be no hesitation in identifying this stage of the soul's progress with the advance aimed at in the Second, Third and Fourth Weeks.

The last step seems to leave the soul at the brink or threshold of mystical prayer. Its similarity to the substance and aim of the *Contemplatio ad amorem* scarcely calls for explanation. Its precise identity would, of course, be another matter, one a retreat master is to decide for himself. This is what St. Augustine says, "illud plane ego nunc audeo tibi dicere, nos si cursum quem Deus imperat et quem tenendum suscepimus, constantissime tenuerimus, perventuros per virtutem Dei et sapientiam, ad illam summam causam, vel summum auctorem, vel summum principium omnium, vel si quo alio modo res tanta appellari debet—quo intellectu vere videbimus quam sint omnia sub sole vanitas vanitatum."

The Spiritual Exercises

The general outline of spiritual progress then, is essentially the same in the treatise *De quantitate animae* and in the *Exercises*. The great pivotal meditations of the latter are found developed in other writings of St. Augustine with great penetration and from a point of view not very different from that of St. Ignatius.

To begin with the Foundation, St. Augustine deals with the end of man and the right use of creatures under two different aspects. His first position is that of the dogmatic theologian. Starting from the fact of God's sovereignty, he deduces man's end and function and use of creatures and the required attitude of indifference to

them in the manner with which we are familiar. Changing his ground to ethics he declares that happiness is the end proposed to man and necessarily pursued by him. But happiness is the possession of God. God alone, therefore, is to be enjoyed, everything else is to be used merely. An enjoyment which does not have God as its referable object is disordered, and in St. Augustine's stern view, at least venially sinful.

The topics of the First Week, the history, nature and punishment of sin, do not receive quite the amplitude of treatment one might expect. References to these topics are relatively brief and dogmatic. This stricture, if such it is, for St. Ignatius, one must remember, wanted only brief and summary clarification of the points of meditation—is not applicable to St. Augustine's study of the psychology of sin. Here his development is ample, and it goes without saying, impressive.

Our real disappointment will come in the subsequent week, and there not in the great meditations of the Kingdom, the Standards and Degrees of Love, but rather in the contemplations on our Lord's life. Here the Saint is found in the role of parochial preacher to his regular congregation. He is content to elucidate the text and indicate its doctrinal values rather than to direct movements of personal loyalty towards our Lord.

To sum up, matter for the great pivotal meditations which like the piers of a massive bridge sustain and orient the *Exercises* will be found in the writings of St. Augustine, and this matter is throughout of superior quality. In those passages of the *Confessions* and *City of God* which develop point by point the *Contemplatio ad amorem*, one seems to reach the climax of Latin literature and the limits of excellence in creative theological writing.

The calculating intelligence

But there is one very serious reservation to be made in our admiration of the Augustinian writings as a possible aid in the giving of retreats. The chivalrous and romantic élan of the Ignatian preoccupation with Christ is missing. The Patristic Age was doctrinal rather than devotional. In this St. Augustine was a man of his times. His homilies, where references to our Lord are naturally most frequent, were addressed to an audience composed largely of converted pagans, Novations, Manichaeans, and, at the end, Pela-

gians. With them it was necessary to insist on accurate theological interpretations of the texts which dealt with Creation, the Incarnation, the Trinity, and Grace. Heaven knows it still is necessary to stress these things in our churches, but in retreats we may happily take correct doctrine for granted and devoted our time to contemplation, an act elegantly defined by St. Bernard as "verus certusque animi intuitus"; in contrast to consideration, "intensio animi investigantis verum." One is the operation mainly of the intuitive imagination, the other of the calculating intelligence.

This means that in the *Exercises* we approach our Lord not only as king, teacher, victim, priest, and ultimately judge, but as a being who though infinitely more than man, is yet precisely and univocally a man as truly as you or I. He is therefore a man with a definite character which can only be "seized intuitively, by pondering his words as he utters them and his acts as he performs them.

St. Augustine's tendency is to ignore this human character of Christ. His analysis of the text "verbum caro factum est" yields him a triad: *caro, anima, verbum*. In this triad *verbum*, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity absorbs practically all interest. *Caro* and *anima* are reduced to instrumental and colorless roles. The Saint does not seem to consider that in our Lord, just as in ourselves, *caro* and *anima* interact and that their interaction begets a certain unique thing, which, since we cannot use the term personality in this context, we must call character, or individuality. By intuitive imagination, so at least it might be argued, we present our Lord's character to ourselves as a reality of great power and charm.

Is it correct to say that this reality, divinized through the hypostatic union, is the Sacred Heart? Attention to this element in the man-God encouraged by Ignatian contemplation, and its relative neglect in methods of prayer more exclusively given to consideration may have had its part in creating a divergence between the two schools of spirituality which have divided the Catholic world since the early seventeenth century. One may even be allowed to wonder if it had a part in our Lord's decision to entrust the theological defense of the devotion to the Sacred Heart to the Society rather than to the École Française, though the latter surpassed us in learning, and in influence, and in the number of great saints which it produced.

The gospel image of Christ

Once more a protesting voice is heard. "How," it will be objected "could a grave and radical dissidence, one productive of much mutual criticism, have possibly sprung from a mere trifle, a difference in methods of meditation? It would be folly to maintain that such was the sole or even the decisive cause of this division and debate. Still, it may have had its influence.

Let us see why. The Jesuit is trained to relate to our Lord as a very distinct individual. The first meditations in the novitiate, which direct us to imagine ourselves on the journey to Bethlehem or sweeping the floor at Nazareth, may cause us to smile in later years when our heads are full of the census of Quirinius, or the identity of the (step?) brothers of the Lord. But one thing they have done; they have planted our minds firmly in Palestine as a second home-land, and this in some mysterious way helps us find reality and solidity in the gospel image of Christ. Among other, far more important traits, we come across at least three that might not interest lofty thinkers, but are as unmistakeable marks of the Hero of the gospels as his beard. Also, in spite of all the efforts of piosity, they are as ineradicable.

First, Christ is a man of *epikeia*. This does not mean breaking rules, but having the intelligence and liberty of spirit to disregard them in situations where they do not apply. For instance, the solemn inauguration of our Lord's preaching and miracles, one gathers from the prophecy of Micah, was to be at Jerusalem and presumably at the Passover. Our Lord anticipates the time and begins his miracles at Cana to please a woman who pitied the embarrassment of a young couple. He himself declared the binding force of the rulings of the Scribes and Pharisees. "Whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do." But he allowed his disciples to disregard the rule and garner a little wheat on the Sabbath. Against the customs of the rabbis, he converses with a woman in public at Jacob's well. He even has female friends, and allows one of them to scandalize the apostles by breaking poverty in the form of a bottle of precious ointment, before he was even dead! An instance, not precisely of *epikeia*, but of liberality of spirit may be seen in the abundance of strong drink, sixty gallons according to one computation, supplied at the wedding feast, when men were already exhilarated, if not well drunk.

Second, our Lord is a man of humor. To maintain the opposite seems to turn him into a very wooden stick. We find our Lord taking a day off with the apostles on the beach near Bethsaida Julias just before the second Passover of the public ministry. Then a band of pilgrims from the north spy him and begin to pour in with sundry wives and children. "Philip, you get the sandwiches!" Nearing Jericho he sees a dignified little revenue officer running on ahead, and, pardon the expression, shinnying up a tree. "Zachaeus, shinny down and see about getting dinner ready!" Then we see him before the open tomb of Lazarus. The smell of death mingles with the mountain breeze. An awed silence strikes the assembled mourners as the swathed white figure shuffles forth. Our Lord's words restore normality, "Some one ought to take off those wrappings, so that he can walk."

Third, and what a hard word to men of solid and heavy piety, our Lord liked a little fun. Was he less perfect than the saints who took that terrible vow never to waste a moment's time? Or did he perhaps consider that a little fooling among friends was not time wasted? How about enticing Peter out on the water during the storm? How about teasing the shy travelers to Emmaus by pretending to go on, or, perhaps to avoid a scene of heavy sentiment, allowing Mary Magdalene to mistake him for the gardener? We read that he blessed the children and hugged them. Did he, like our dear Cardinal Cushing, so far endanger his reputation for gravity as to play with the moppets?

These questions are not put as rhetorical flourishes. Upon our answers will depend to some extent our appraisal of the character of Christ and of the Spirit in which he wished to be imitated. Whether guidance in this crucial matter is to be sought through analysis of the status and functions of the God-man, or through an imaginative intuition such as we apply to our friends, or through an intelligent combination of both processes is a matter of some importance for those who hold and preach that Christ is the Way, Truth, and Life.

Literary cultures

For this reason it is well worth while to institute an inquiry into the causes of the divergence of the French School of Spirituality, which puts its chief emphasis in meditation upon consideration,

from the Jesuit School which in the main emphasizes contemplation. This will lead us into a discussion of the literary cultures of three periods, the Patristic Age, the Middle Ages, and the French Renaissance. Lest this appear a strange and forced approach to the subject, a preliminary remark may be in place.

Spirituality is a term to describe the process by which a man by conscious and controlled effort approaches to God, or, to explain the metaphor, with the help of grace, perfects both intellectually and morally the image of God which he is in virtue of his intelligence and free will. This resemblance is at the same time perfected mystically through the increase of sanctifying grace resultant upon these efforts. Spirituality, then is a component of two movements, that of the soul towards God, and that of God towards the soul. This second movement is privileged, and may occur in any manner which God thinks fit. The first, like most human acts, is modified by what is known as the cultural climate. This is abundantly illustrated by the history of spirituality in the Church. Striking examples are provided in the rabbinical atmosphere of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the traces of Kantian philosophy in Newman.

As a further step it may be assumed that the culture of any period, except the most primitive, may be regarded in its humanistic aspects as classical, neo-classical, or romantic. Classicism is generally taken as denoting a fairly even balance of the three faculties involved in artistic production, namely, the intuitions of creative imagination, the reviviscence of remembered sense impressions, and the control of both by the calculating intelligence. In neo-classicism one notes a remission in the intensity of the creative imagination with a corresponding intensification of the alertness of intelligence. Abstraction, accordingly, replaces concrete symbol. Cleverness usurps the place of insight, and the purely aesthetic seems to retire to the level of diction, which in the case of the great neo-classics often attains astonishing brilliance. In romanticism an opposite tendency is seen at work. Expression is often lax and unstudied, the main effort of the artist is poured into the grandiose visions of imagination, which, with the passions attendant upon them, tend to leave behind the calculations of understanding and the sober report of the senses. This analysis is applicable to three schools of spirituality whose viewpoints are pertinent to the problems here under consideration.

The Patristic Age

When St. Augustine was born, the classical age of Roman culture was no more than an ancient memory. The fortunes of the declining Empire denied sustenance to the creative imagination. Oratory had no voice on public questions, which were decided by palace intrigue. Tragedy and comedy had given place to what were once called vaudeville skits, and these, as all witnesses agree, were of a shocking frivolity and coarseness. There was a literature aimed at polite taste, a literature of the boudoir or of the pedant's study. It was an age of compendiums: abstracts of history, abstracts of science, abstracts of philosophy. None of these, aside from their archaeological interest, have the slightest value. They are store houses of useless information. Theological writing alone showed signs of vigor, and here, as was natural in an age of heresy, creative imagination was stifled in the atmosphere of didacticism and polemics.

From this dead sea of letters emerged at about the same time three very great writers whose talents might have attracted attention in any age. Ambrose, the first of these, was a poet. Jerome was a satirist of the authentic Roman stamp. Augustine, by the scope and power of his gifts, has won a place among the greatest names in the annals of mankind. Yet all three were forced by the pressures of the time to bend their energies to tasks which inhibited the free play of their genius. The bulk of their work, therefore, must be considered neo-classical. It was almost always brilliant. It was rarely creative.

This was particularly true of Augustine. That he had along with dialectical and communicative abilities of the highest order, a genuine, if limited, creative imagination is scarcely open to doubt. But one may inquire what type of imagination he exhibited. It is that of the great prose artist. This gift seems to work in three different directions, which I may be allowed to describe as outward, downward, and inward. By the first is meant the power of seizing a complex of universal or general principles involved in the understanding of a truth, event, or situation and projecting them in the order which will make them most effective. What the architect does with masses, the prose artist does with movements of thought. Pascal was hinting at this when he called it an eloquence of ideas produced by their sequence, or better by their relations, somewhat

as the eloquence of a sentence proceeds from the order and hence the relations of the words. One might prefer to call it the dramaturgy of thought. In any case the gift seems to be allied to the aesthetic instinct. The recognition of organic form in a prose composition, the perception of the unifying perspective and expressive proportion which allows an idea to announce itself with the utmost clarity and force is an element in the aesthetic experience of the reader. St. Augustine has this power of artistic construction and employs it with consummate skill in the *Confessions* and the *De trinitate*, as Marrou demonstrates in *St. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*.

The second movement of the imagination, that which is usually regarded as its normal mode, is downward. It brings the high generalizations of abstract thought down to concrete images by selected detail or analogy. In this area the fecundity of St. Augustine's mind is very extraordinary. To read him is a perpetual refreshment; his richness of allusion reminds one of Shakespeare.

To invoke the name of the great dramatist, however, is a reminder that there is yet a third movement of imagination. This turns inward. It is penetration to the deeper sources of speech and action. It is creative intuition of character. Here St. Augustine, as might have been expected from what has already been said, fails to rise above the level of his age. Now, this is failure in the precise area where a writer who wishes to present Christ's character must be supreme. For reasons, which may have been personal as well as environmental, St. Augustine does not often so present our Lord. He reflects upon him; he does not contemplate him. His method of searching the Scriptures for doctrinal conclusions became standard until the twelfth century, the age of St. Bernard.

The Middle Ages

At that epoch a great renewal of thought and feeling was under way. The clash of the tribal culture of the peoples who had possessed themselves of the Western Empire with the ancient Roman civilization produced new concepts of society and all its arts. The literature of these rude Northerners had much to learn from the decadent South in the way of style and structure, but not in the all-important matter of the imaginative conception of heroic character. Beowulf, Sigurd, and Roland stand on level footing with

any characters in Greek and Roman epic. Ker says in *Epic and Romance*, "Roland is ideal and universal, and the story of his defeat, of the blast of his horn, and the last stroke of Durandel, is a kind of funeral march or heroic symphony into which a meaning may be read for every hero to the end of the world."

If it is asked, "What has this to do with St. Bernard?", the reply is that he and the author of *The Song of Roland* were of the same nation and class and possibly of the same generation. During Bernard's boyhood years the exploits of the First Crusade, *gesta Dei per Francos*, were in every ear. During the last four years of his adolescence, when, having finished his studies under the canons of St. Vorles he was waiting for his vocation to mature, he was reading, as references in his writings reveal, very extensively and avidly in Latin literature. It is hardly likely then, that he closed his ear when the jongleurs visiting his father's castle celebrated the heroes of his own blood and faith. Nothing is more likely, and the parallel case of St. Ignatius confirms the inference, than that a romantic enthusiasm kindled by epic poetry was carried over into his piety when he became a monk, a reformer, and a preacher of crusades.

The Bernardine devotion was destined to be a paradigm for medieval contemplation. A few sentences from Pourrat's *La spiritualité chrétienne* and from St. Bernard himself will make the matter clear. Pourrat tells us, "This monk of grim austerity knew well how to appeal to the heart and to the feelings. He excelled in bringing into relief the touching aspects of the lives of the Savior and the Virgin. Devotion derived from the events of our Lord's life appears much more prominently in the sermons of St. Bernard than in the homilies of the Fathers of the Church." St. Bernard himself declares, "Because we are carnal and born of the flesh, our love must needs come from the flesh. But if this love be well guided, it will gradually become, under the influence of grace, a spiritual love, for *that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural.*"

Now to cite a passage in the original: "Nota amorem cordis quodam modo esse carnalem, quod magis erga carnem Christi et quae in carne Christus gessit vel iussit cor humanum afficiat. Nihil audit libentius, nihil legit studiosius, nihil frequentius recolit, nihil suavius meditatur. Adest oranti Hominis-Dei sacra imago, aut nascentis, aut lactentis, aut docentis, aut morientis, aut adscenden-

tis; et quidquid tale occurrerit, vel stringat necesse est animum in amorem virtutum, vel carnis exturbet vitia, fuget illecebras, desideria sedet.

"Ego hanc arbitror praecipuam invisibili Deo fuisse causam quod voluit in carne videri et hominibus conversari, ut carnalium, videlicet, qui nisi carnaliter amare non poterant, cunctas primo ad suae carnis salutarem amorem affectiones retraheret atque ita gradatim ad amorem perduceret spirituales."

"It may be said," continues Pourrat, "that all the mysticism of the Middle Ages has yielded to the influence of the great Cistercian orator." To put the idea in other terms, the insertion of medieval Romanticism into the asceticism of the Augustinian tradition may be taken as describing the spirituality which St. Ignatius at his conversion found awaiting the fusing and transforming touch of his genius.

The French Renaissance

To bring our founder's achievement into higher relief it will be well now to recall the origins of the French School which for upwards of three centuries has stood in contrast, and even, at times, in opposition to the Ignatian tradition. This will require some reflections on the Renaissance as it developed in France.

The Renaissance where it ran its natural course, as in Italy, opened with a period of discovery. Forgotten classics were unearthed and edited, or familiar texts were read with new eyes. Ideas and values which the Middle Ages tended to ignore, or if they were noticed, to deplore as evidences of pagan corruption, were now hailed as precious insights. In the second stage these ideas and values were incorporated in original works of art and literature. The third phase is that of reflection and criticism, and consequently of neo-classicism. The wisdom rather than the beauty of ancient writers, their intelligence, rather than their imagination, is the focus of humanistic interest.

In France, mainly because of political troubles leading to religious wars which ravaged the country with slight intermission from 1560 until 1640, the second or productive stage of the Renaissance was something of a disappointment. The brightest lights of French letters in the sixteenth century, Ronsard, Rabelais, and Montaigne, lose some of their lustre when set beside the Elizabethan galaxy.

It was not until the second quarter of the seventeenth century, that is, not until Jesuit education was solidly established in France, that the classical revival attained its mature creative strength.

It was during the most barren period of French culture, after more than thirty years of savage civil war, that inspiration came to Pierre de Bérulle, the founder of the French School, then doing his course of theology at the Sorbonne. A change had come over the University of Paris since St. Ignatius and his companions had frequented it sixty years earlier. Forced to reconsider St. Augustine because of the misuse of his authority by the reformers, the pessimism and rigorism of some of the views which the great doctor had incautiously espoused against the Pelagians, crept into the teaching of the doctors of the Sorbonne and inevitably perhaps, into the spirituality of their finest students. It is natural that a theology should beget an asceticism. If one believes, for example, that the sensible in man is so connected with concupiscence that grave suspicion attaches to any manifestations of instinctual life, one is a pessimist; and pessimism becomes rigorism when friendship, adventure, sport, literature, art, and music are banned on the ground that all these things are pleasant, and that pleasure, unless it comes from purely spiritual joy, weakens the dominion of grace over concupiscent man. One wonders how St. Ignatius might have turned out if he had attended the university during the Augustinian revival.

The French School

In the case of Pierre de Bérulle the issue was clear. Turning from the humanism of his former Jesuit teachers, he struck out on a line of spirituality, for which he could have found ample warrant in the writings of St. Augustine. The essential position in Bérulle's system is a conviction that human nature is so vile that its assumption by the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity constituted a humiliation too deep to be fathomed by man. The proper object of meditation is not any supposed human character possessed by our Lord, but the various states of the Divine Person subjected to supreme humiliation. Thus, our Lord is to be considered as teacher, servant, atoner and the like, all denoting an infinite degradation from his essential dignity. These states result from substantial relations rising from the Incarnation, and since the hypostatic union is indissoluble, they

are perpetual. They also sum up Christ's relations to us, and suggest our duties in the way of imitation. *Christianus est alter Christus*. The primal duty of the Christian corresponds to the primal state of the God-man. His human nature is deprived of proper personality. It exists in a state of personal denudation, or better, exinaniation. Our primal duty then, and it leads to our final perfection, is to denude ourselves of our personality, and this means, since we cannot destroy our principle of individuation, to act as though we were deprived of personal rights and preferences, renounce the exercise of dominion in the interior forum, as though we were dead to ourselves. We must find our sole joy and pleasure in sacrificing to God whatever joy and pleasure we might aspire to aside from him.

The logic as well as the nobility of this system appealed so powerfully to the mind and heart of Catholic France that its adherents could without arrogance call it the French School. Bérulle himself founded the French Oratory. Among his disciples to mention only world famous names are Jean-Jacques Olier founder of Saint Sulpice, St. Jean Eudes, founder of the Society of Jesus and Mary, St. Jean Baptiste de la Salle, founder of the Christian Brothers, St. Vincent de Paul, founder of the Congregation of the Mission, St. Louis-Marie de Montfort, founder of the Company of Mary. The French School surely dominated France in the days when France dominated European and particularly Catholic culture. It influenced, as we might expect, Jesuit spirituality.

The reason is not far to seek. If the French School was right in its inclusions, it could only be wrong, if wrong it was, in its exclusions. To take an attitude of hostility to a school so lucid in its thought, so courageous in its program, and so glorious in its heroic fruits would be to betray a narrowness of spirit hardly to be found outside a high school sorority. Certainly a hostile and even a critical attitude could expect little encouragement from St. Ignatius who wanted his sons to maintain a benevolent neutrality to all parties "though at variance among themselves." To what extent his own writings, say his doctrine of indifference, may be said to favor either rigorism or humanism is not our present concern. Certainly he finds room in the *Exercises*, along with the more frequent contemplations, for several considerations of our Lord's functions as leader, coun-

sellor, victim, consoler, and, if we read *Contemplatio ad amorem* rightly, as gift and crown.

In fact—and in conclusion—the genius of St. Ignatius is completely antithetical to that often attributed to him as a cool contriver, a hard and practical realist, a clever politician. In real life he had a comprehensive, many sided versatility such as we rarely encounter even in books. To draw an analogy from the literary tendencies mentioned before, he is a classical person, which means that he unites harmoniously all the gifts which it takes to make a man. Even creative imagination, perhaps the last faculty we would expect of him, is there. How else describe the power that selected from the matted forests of medieval spirituality the elements most to his purpose and than cast them into the perfect, the necessary form. The heart of the *Exercises* is the response of the knight to the king. What inducement does St. Ignatius hold out to make us embrace a life of rugged hardships? *Videre Christum Dominum nostrum!* But this is sheer Romanticism. He has full respect for the calculating intelligence and the fascinating, troublesome senses. Because of this capacity to contain many movements, many phases of the restless mind, he would presumably sympathize with those of his sons who held out hands of welcome to the saintly men and women of the French School, or who are enchanted with the fiery orator of Clairvaux (whose works incidentally were favorite meditation books in the Society during Ignatius' time) or who are admirers and would-be adapters of the first great teacher of the western Church.

IGNATIAN SURVEY: 1966

Edited by ROBERT C. COLLINS, S.J.

THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES

"The Sense of the Spiritual Exercises" ("Les sens des Exercices spirituels"),
by Jacques Lewis, S.J., *Lettres du Bas-Canada* 20 (1966) 6-38.

WE ARE CONCERNED HERE only with the integral Exercises—those which last about a month, and to which one gives his full time in silence and under direction. For here we best find Ignatius' thought, and, therefore, the notions which should rule adaptations of his retreat.

Ignatius reserved his full Exercises "raris hominibus," "nonnisi paucis," having these men make them only once, since their first goal is the election of a state in life. Every other long retreat foreseen by Ignatius—including that of the novitiate and tertianship—is an "experiment" of religious formation. Thus, we should not wish to give the complete Exercises to the greatest possible number of men. If we intend to give them at all, we should surely be faithful to them, remembering that fidelity is neither fixism nor literalism. It is rather a certain stability in the midst of evolution—an acclimatization of a vigorous reality.

Since the text of the *Exercises* is primarily a practical manual for the director of the retreat, one must consult other works of Ignatius if he would do justice to their spiritual richness. For example, the *Exercises* say little about the Holy Spirit, the Church as community, or our sacramental and liturgical life; yet one finds these topics treated in the *Letters*, *Story of a Pilgrim*, and *Spiritual Journal*. Finally, a last introductory observation is that for Ignatius one is not prepared to give the Exercises by the simple fact that he is a Jesuit; success with them supposes study and formation.

The Exercises as spiritual experience

It cannot be repeated too often that the Exercises were lived before they were written—that they are the fruit of an interior experience rather than an intellectual elaboration. A retreat should produce a true experience for the soul, analogous to that of Ignatius himself at Loyola-

Manresa. It should constitute an interior, living event for the retreatant, to whom the Lord communicates himself. The director's role is to discern the Lord's action, not to guide or influence it.

Ignatius' directives for the conduct of prayer, in which this action takes place, aim at establishing conditions for entering into the Christian mystery, remaining present to the Lord, and living the supernatural realities which the Exercises propose. The first annotation of the *Exercises* underlines the fact that prayer is also a means to dispose the soul to detachment and the discovery of God's will—that it is ordered towards the election. In each meditation there is "that which I seek" or "that which I wish and desire," while the whole ensemble of the Exercises aims at "ordering one's life." Thus, prayer composes our being and stamps it with its proper direction. The director's points for this prayer should be brief: they are only the sober presentation of the essential traits of a subject whose savor and import the retreatant will find for himself. True, the director often has before him people whose spiritual formation has been quite poor, but it is no less certain that they have been baptized and have the Spirit working within them. One does not give them the retreat to communicate knowledge or engender morality; one gives them the retreat to present the Christian mystery into which they are invited to enter.

It is also important to respect the differences among the diverse forms of prayer that Ignatius proposes, and to ensure their practice in the course of the retreat. Especially should the retreatant note the points where he experienced consolation or desolation and go back over them in the "repetitions." Ignatius' constant preoccupation is that the retreatant produce for himself an interior contact with the reality he contemplates—that he "feel and taste these things interiorly," thereby feeding his soul. This living adherence is realized especially in the exercises that bear on the life of Jesus. In Ignatius' contemplations one exposes himself to the mystery, confronts his own dispositions with its content, and applies it to himself in order to be really transformed by it. There is a reciprocal presence between the soul and the mystery, a contagion which the mystery works on the spiritual depths of our being. The life of the Lord is always actually present to us, because he transcends space and time. Thus we should receive his words and enter into his deeds as occurring for us right now.

The theology of the Exercises

Let us first retrace the elements at the origins of the Exercises, and then we can examine the tenor of the text itself. In examining Ignatius' reading at Loyola, Vagad's *Legende Dorée* and Ludolph of Saxon's

Vita Christi, we find many of the themes of the Exercises: magnanimity, chivalry, conquest of oneself and Satan, elections. We recognize as well the contemplations of the Kingdom and the Two Standards. Related to these readings was Ignatius' experience of different "spirits" acting in his soul. He perceived very concretely the initiative of God, coming to enlighten, expand, and move him towards a supernatural election, in opposition to the quite contrary tentatives of Satan. The Exercises also incorporate the lessons God communicated to Ignatius at Manresa. These enlightenments on the Trinity, creation, the real presence and the humanity of Christ, culminating in the synthetic illumination of the Cardoner, comprise less an objective contemplation than a wisdom ordered towards apostolic action. Later the essentials of the spirituality fashioned from these illuminations will be expressed in the vision of La Storta.

The general framework drawn from these experiences of Ignatius has our theological life proceeding from the Trinity and returning to it, while yet rooting itself in our Redeemer who makes his Spirit work in humanity and calls man to collaborate with his saving plan. Therefore we can discern in the Exercises three main traits: they reveal a spirituality which is kerygmatic, ecclesial, and missionary.

As for Paul and John, Ignatius' Lord is at once Creator and Redeemer. In the very first colloquy of the Exercises we see Jesus Christ as the creator who passes from eternal life to temporal death for our sake. This Lord calls us to follow him, and to labor with him for the kingdom, sending us his Spirit for our guidance and consolation. Do we not recognize here the *kyrios* announced by the apostles? The First Principle and Foundation bears a Christological interpretation (such that "God our Lord" is Christ), and this contributes to the conclusion that at the summit of the religious thought of the Exercises there is, as in the kerygma of the primitive Church, the Christ of glory from whom proceed creation and salvation.

The Exercises have been charged with individualism, and it is true that in Ignatius' little book the Church appears rather as the authority to which we must submit than as the community of believers—she is "the hierarchical Church." Furthermore, the exercises of the Kingdom and the Two Standards, especially if one attends to their colloquies, contain the sacramental reality of the society of the baptised only doubtfully. However, Ignatius does manifest more ecclesial views in his other writings, and even in the Exercises there is a social or cosmic perspective. The king stands "before the entire universe which he calls" (95); He wishes "to unite all men under his standard" (137); and the Trinity "regards the whole surface and immensity of the earth and

all peoples" (106). (See also Nos. 23, 60, 71, 98, 151, 232, 236, 311.) Thus, while the Exercises may often have been given with an individualistic mentality, this is not in conformity with the spirit of Ignatius. He sees the exercitant as attentive to the Spirit in order to find the way which will give him access to the totality of beings and things—as searching for his own proper way of being, with Christ, present to the world.

The Exercises also show awareness of the social dynamism of the Christian condition, where conversion implies *mission*. Jesus Christ calls each man to collaborate in the plan for which he has descended on earth; he "sends his servants and friends on his expedition," urging them to "wish to aid all men." This is not to say that one finds in the Exercises all the modalities of Christian mission that we know today, but it is to say that the essential is there.

To conclude this section on "the theology of the Exercises, we note that to present an Ignatian retreat which incorporates the perspectives of the New Testament one must remember that the Exercises are dominated by the Kingdom, and that both the Principle and Foundation and the fifth annotation must be interpreted in the sense of a kerygmatic Christology. It is the glorified Christ who is the "Creator and Lord" of the fifth annotation, the "God Our Saviour" of the Principle and Foundation, and the "Creator and Redeemer" of the fourth week.

Structure of the Exercises

What characterizes the Exercises is that they are contemplations for a spiritual choice. By prayer I enter into the data of revelation to discover, not only Christian spirituality, but my own personal way to live the mystery of Christ. Therefore Ignatius proposes as subjects for contemplation exercises which will engage our freedom. These constitute a march or movement, such that the stable dialectic of call and response becomes a continual progression. Yet among these exercises there are those which rule the overall framework of the retreat (Principle and Foundation and Kingdom), and those which directly view the election (Two Standards, Three Classes of Men, Three Kinds of Humility).

The spiritual milieu of the First Principle and Foundation is the creative presence and invitation of the Lord, while its goal is indifference: an unconditional acquiescence which will prefer whatever more conforms the retreatant to the divine will for him. In this way the third degree of humility is already globally present in the Foundation. But it is the Kingdom which is the living core of the Exercises. Here we have the actual presence of the Lord issuing His invitation to follow in the path He has traced, indicating His program, and drawing the response of the

retreatant. The Kingdom gives a crisp start to the election of the retreatant, who has now been purified and freed by the first week. Those exercises which bear directly on the election thus help to execute the doctrinal view of the kingdom, underlining the importance of the discernment of spirits.

What the structure of the four "weeks" of the Exercises amounts to is a mounting spiral: they repeat basic themes, always with greater precision, intensity, and spiritual depth. The first week attends to the sinful condition of man and aims at the suppression of disordered attachments. Only if one has entirely renounced his own will can he make a choice which would be a divine vocation. Ignatius' correspondence shows that he was aware of what we today call salvation history, and that he saw sin at the interior of the redemptive plan worked by God made flesh. This is the reason for the gratitude so marked in the first week, and why it should be seen as opening out on the Kingdom: "What should I do for Christ" who has saved me?

In the second week the retreatant, converted now by Him who has created, saved, and called him, begins to contemplate the mystery of Christ and appreciate the conditions of the kingdom. The election towards which this contemplation leads him comes, in Ignatius' view, from on high—from the Holy Trinity who communicate Christian life to us through the Incarnation. However, the retreatant must not so deliver himself over to the contemplation of these "joyous mysteries," in an unrealistic enthusiasm, that he forgets the radical poverty he came to appreciate in the first week. This would make him unappreciative of both the rude (even scandalizing) demands of Christ's message and his own subtle resistance to the spirit of the Gospel. And so, Ignatius is concerned if the retreatant does not experience diverse motions of the spirits: the message of Christ is bound to judge our egotism and cannot leave us tranquil.

The third week shows the profound toil which the Christ of the Kingdom has chosen, and the "sacred doctrine" of His standard. Here prayer reaches the level of unitive encounter, and the election receives an enhanced conformation to Christ poor and humiliated. In the third week contemplation descends into the abysses of the Servant of Yahweh, the *mecum* attains an unheard of intimacy, and the impulse to consecrate oneself to the Lord's service reaches an intensity impossible during the preceding weeks. This becomes the "desiring nothing but Christ, and Christ crucified, so that crucified in this life one mounts up towards the other resurrected" of which Ignatius speaks elsewhere.

Surprisingly, Ignatius places no exercise on the Resurrection itself in

the fourth week. This shows that he wished the Christ of Easter to be seen as risen to glory in order to work in the world and in the soul of the retreatant (see Nos. 223-224). The retreatant contemplates both the joy of Christ and the glory which will one day be his own, as the promised reward for laboring with Christ. Now the election is animated by the glory of the Paschal Christ, who communicates His power, joy, and divine life in such a way that the ideals of the Kingdom and the Two Standards—abnegation and apostolic devotion—seem possible and expanding. The Contemplation to Attain Love of God is the fruit of the four weeks. According to the directories of the early Society, it may be made during the whole last day of the retreat, or here and there through the final days of the fourth week. It is a transition from the Exercises to the daily life of all the days which follow them. The “love” of the Contemplation descends from on high, and the responding offer of the *Suscipe* has a eucharistic flavor: one returns to the Lord that which comes from Him. We should note that this love is peculiarly active: it is shown “more in deeds than in words.” God gives what He has and is, in order to act in all that He gives. His desire is to be active with and through me (to save men)—that is Ignatius’ vision. And so the contemplation appropriate to the Contemplation to Attain Love of God is, in Nadal’s phrase, “contemplation in action.” In the second preamble we ask to love and serve the divine majesty in all things. This relates to Ignatius’ desire that Jesuits seek God in all things, whose consequence is that “everything is prayer.” To live spiritually is to have familiarity with God, and to be an instrument united to him.

These thoughts on the Exercises surely neither exhaust the topic nor offer anything especially original. They suggest that the Exercises should contribute enormously to God’s glory today, just as they did in Ignatius’ time. But many seem to doubt this, and to deem them *passé*. In my opinion, the genuine pastoral solicitude inspiring this attitude questions more the understanding and use to which the Exercises have often been subjected, rather than their own reality. We must know the Exercises in themselves and from inside Ignatian spirituality if we are not to misuse them. We should joyfully agree to integrate with the Exercises all the acquisitions of the contemporary Church directed by the Spirit: biblical renewal, liturgy, the community-dimension of Christian experience. If they are living, the Exercises will fill the needs of our time, too. Profound prayer, the appropriation of salvation history, and the discernment of God’s action in men are values for every era.

JOHN T. CARMODY, S.J.

IGNATIAN UNIVERSALISM

"Ignatian Universalism: Mystique and Mission" ("L'universalisme ignatien: mystique et mission"), by Michel de Certeau, S.J., *Christus* 13 (1966) 173-83.

"FINDING GOD IN ALL THINGS." "All blessings and gifts descend from above." The Ignatian man, because *everything* manifests that the Triune God loves more by actions than by words, actively experiences that he is seized both from within and from without by a world in which *everything* is the act of an effecting, universal love. The mystery of Being is identical with the mystery of Love.

But there is more—a crucified God. Through the Exercises, the Ignatian man awakens to Christ as the mysterious *subject* from whom comes interior desires. He awakens to Christ as the mysterious *object* toward which his actions and desires find their term. Prayer flowers in action, and action nourishes prayer.

Purity of *intention* attunes the Ignatian man to the inner attractions of the Holy Spirit, to Christ insofar as Christ is "in him." A *commission* unites the Ignatian man to the hierarchy of the Church, to Christ insofar as Christ is "before him." The Ignatian man is sent both by the Spirit and by the pope through superiors. He is charismatic and commissioned. Through a dialectic of love and obedience, the Ignatian man includes the *ecclesial* as one of the factors in the discernment of spirits. Through his examinations of conscience, he remains keen to inner attractions; through the *manifestation of conscience* these inner attractions are put in dialectic with objective and more universal needs. Both enhance each other and establish an ever greater (*magis*) fidelity to God.

During studies, especially, the Ignatian man must combine love and obedience, purity of intention and his commission to serve the Church. Since studies demand "the entire man," Ignatius especially recommends that the student find God in *all* things, "in conversations, in coming and going, in all that he sees, tastes, hears, and understands." All human experience must be a way to savor God.

Ignatian service: to find in order to seek ever more universally.

HARVEY EGAN, S.J.

DISCERNMENT OF SPIRITS

"Sketch for a Theology of the Discernment of Spirits" ("Bosquejo de una teología del discernimiento de espíritus"), by Piet Penning de Vries, S.J., *Revista de Espiritualidad* 25 (1966) 90-97.

THE ARTICLE HAS FOUR STAGES. It starts with the fundamental principle that discerning spirits is a personal and individual problem. Moreover,

the particular person who discerns faces a most intimate relation with the Holy Trinity. This relation is realized in an ecclesial context within the history of salvation. Lastly, there are some comments regarding a "natural" discernment of spirits. The difficulty of the task does not need to be underlined. It is obvious that immanence and transcendence in dialogue, a fully developed individual in community, the supernatural and the natural are poles very sensitive to any kind of combination.

Fr. De Vries starts by centering the problem in the discernment, not of an evil thing from a good thing, but between two good things of which man wishes to *elect* the better. Discernment of spirits is not a cold, abstract game of the intellect. It is the activity of an honest person and it is totally oriented towards an election, with all its lively implications in actual life. This perspective changes the whole outlook of the spiritual life of the individual who will be concerned primarily with his involvement and honesty to life. God's plan for humanity presupposes and includes an individual and personal plan for each man in particular. This is that "best" with which the discernment of spirits is concerned. It implies the gradual and progressive discovery of God's plan over me as an individual. At this stage there is no other alternative to the man seriously concerned about his eternal salvation than to remain complete free from his own will and desire, he must be indifferent in a positive way.

How do we know and discover what the Father wants of us as individual persons? The answer: in Christ. This answer puts us in the realm of mystery, since indifference would then be a participation in the indifference of Christ, and that is the cross: it is to die to the old man and to the old world, to be able to become a new man in a new world.

How is it possible to find a personal way towards the Father simply by sharing the life of the Son? Is it not true that all men will find in Christ the very same example? These questions lead us to the deeper level of discernment of spirits: the action of the Holy Spirit. If we are united to the Father in the Son *by the Spirit* (and there is no other way) this means that the Spirit is active in us as persons. This activity is the one that makes it possible for us to discover and experience the Father's will. Because of the presence of the Spirit, it is not *man* who encounters Christ, but this particular man, under the guidance of the Spirit. It is a spiritual reaction that has been called "consolation" (Fr. de Vries thought of calling his article "Consolation as the norm of our action"). This "consolation" belongs to the realm of what is most private to each person. In this way the discernment of spirits does not deal with the world as a whole with universal value, but with a concrete and existential situation that varies with each individual.

There is a further step. The Holy Spirit—and with Him the consolation of union with the Father in the Son—has been given primarily to the Church. That is why Ignatius delimits the boundaries within which our personal election must take place: within the Church, because the Church “possesses Christ’s Spirit.” This is a mystical argument and, somehow, it must be such on this level, since we are dealing with a soul’s encounter with its God. This does not mean a complete passivity on the part of the members of that Church, but their active willingness to share in the same experience of the Spirit.

There is also a natural consolation, as opposed to the mystical consolation described above. It is the harmony of our affective life with God. Our whole being accepts the consolation of God’s friendship and a prayerful dialogue. It is to accept ourselves as we are: sons of God. This acceptance reaches the deepest levels of our nature and out of it springs this natural harmony.

As a conclusion, Fr. de Vries defines what he understands by discernment of spirits: it is to experience, consciously or unconsciously, the Father’s will in the contemplation of the Son, in the form of spiritual consolation, within the Church.

MARIO RODRIGUEZ, S.J.

IGNATIUS AT MONTSERRAT

“St. Ignatius’ Stay at Montserrat” (“A propos du séjour de Saint Ignace à Montserrat”), by Jean Leclercq, O.S.B., *Christus* 13 (1966) 161-72.

DOM LECLERCQ HAS PRODUCED AN INTERESTING REFLECTION upon a little known period in the life of Ignatius Loyola. He bases his thoughts on a document that has only recently come to light and which now in turn sheds light on the mind of Ignatius.

Leclercq points out that many commentators have noticed the similarity between the Ignatian mind as seen in the *Constitutions* and *Exercises*, and the rules of the great monastic founders, Basil, Cassian, and Benedict. This verbal affinity would be natural since Ignatius was writing within the tradition of the religious life in the Church and could not help but use and reflect the sayings, customs, and laws of the past. However, two questions arise, for Ignatius has always been considered as the religious founder of an order which broke out of the monastic tradition. Did Ignatius merely use traditional expressions but give them a new and different meaning? The second question flows out of the first: can one find a deeper tie between Ignatius and the great monastic tradition than merely verbal associations?

Dom Leclercq says in this article that the second question must be answered in the affirmative and that therefore the first question or proposition must be re-examined and also rethought in the light of the second. He shows that in the mind of Ignatius and those close to him—Layne and Araoz are given as two special sources—there was no spiritual gap between the monastic and the Jesuit lives: that Ignatius easily thought of himself as a “pilgrim,” “a wanderer for Christ” (*pèlerin, peregrinari pro Christo*), which are two great themes used to express the monastic vocation. How could Ignatius so interpret his own life and actions? The answer is to be found in the period spent at Montserrat as recounted in this previously unnoticed document upon which Leclercq depends and which he gives in a French translation from the original Latin or Spanish.

Fr. Araoz, who knew Ignatius so well, relates the incidents. He tells of the impression that Ignatius made upon the monks of Montserrat as he came day after day from his cave on the mountain down to the monastery for Mass and other religious exercises, and for alms to keep himself alive. Eventually the monks became concerned over the dangers that he faced from wild animals and tried to have him come down from his retreat. A boy was sent to find where he lived. Then they sent to speak to him the monk who had first noticed Ignatius at the door on all these days and had observed Ignatius' work among the other poor. He reprimanded Ignatius for tempting God; but when Ignatius answered and explained his purpose, the monk returned to the abbey without a word. When he reported to the abbot, all came to esteem even more the man living in isolation and prayer. Ignatius continued to pray before the cross erected upon the mountain and to endure the temptations and visions that attacked him.

The point of Leclercq's article comes when he interprets the events and elements of this story. Leclercq shows that this story in its general theme and in its details is inseparable from the monastic tradition. One could compare Ignatius in his cave with the life of Benedict at Subiaco; the monks with the shepherds who saw Benedict; the visions and temptations of Ignatius and also his remedy, the cross, with the difficulties encountered by the famous monks of the desert; Ignatius' desire for solitude with the Benedictine “*habitavit secum*”; the accusation of rashness against Ignatius with the charges made against many saints of being “fools for Christ.” Leclercq notes at this point how important a theme this last element is in the Ignatian writings, both the *Constitutions* and *Exercises*, all based on the Pauline theme of the folly of the cross. Finally, Leclercq notes the later insistence of Ignatius upon solitude for the retreatant, that he cut himself off from ordinary cares to devote him-

self to being alone with God.

In the end Leclercq asks, what did Ignatius change from the monastic tradition? To be sure Ignatius did not oppose solitude but demanded it for the long retreats and for any other retreat. Mortification and penance again were insisted upon by Ignatius but they were to be done in a moderate fashion. (Here one thinks immediately that such is the great claim of Benedictine monasticism, that it moderated the excessive demands of earlier monastic movements, and so, like Ignatius, reduced them to means rather than ends in themselves, as some earlier groups had tended to do; but this reflection is only implicit in Leclercq's article).

Basically, then, the Ignatian and monastic ideals are not disjunct but common: "to seek, to find, and to follow as perfectly as possible whatever is God's will for me to do for the salvation of my soul." The difference is only in the means employed. Both seek to follow the way of Christ, with humility, interiority, and mortification leading to the cross and resurrection. Ultimately, Leclercq points out, the apostolic life that Ignatius followed requires solitude and interiority if one is to bring Christ to the neighbor, while in the end the monk by his experience of God will be made into a "spiritual father" in the true sense and enabled and enjoined to help others. And so, at this level, the hermit and the apostle are again joined. They are two roads, but both lead to the one charity towards God and man.

THOMAS E. MORRISSEY, S.J.

THE RETREAT MASTER

"The Roll of the Retreat Master" ("Die Rolle des Exerzitiengebers"),
by Josef Sudbrack, S.J., *Geist und Leben* 4 (1966) 288-300.

THIS ARTICLE OUGHT TO COME AS A CONSOLATION to those retreat givers who fear that all the contemporary retreatant wants is for them to "shut up." Sudbrack finds the literature surprisingly reticent on the subject of the role of the retreat director—at least in an articulate theological sense—and tries to offer a partial remedy with this article.

Without reducing the retreat master to a non-directive counselor, Sudbrack draws a parallel between the methodology of the psychotherapist and the giver of retreats. Both are there to serve as delicate guides to a deeper self-understanding and to personal decision. Thus neither must "get in the way" of their patients' freedom; they must serve as catalytic agents for decision-making on the part of others. The textual basis for this inhibition on the part of the retreat director lies in the twenty "introductory observations" which Ignatius lays down at the

beginning of the *Exercises* for the retreat master. There is made clear the restraint which he must impose upon himself (especially in the second, fourteenth, and fifteenth). The retreat director must always bear in mind that he "should permit the Creator to deal directly with the creature" (15). And this indeed is the underlying drive and purpose behind the *Exercises*, that they are to lead to an unmediated encounter between God and man. Thus the primary "dialogue-partner" is Jesus Christ, and the meditations on His life are intended to realize this encounter experientially. The retreat master is supposed to "occasion" this, not substitute for it.

But this encounter cannot occur in a spiritualist vacuum. In a time when God's light is in eclipse, and the sacraments of secularity leave little room for different ones, it is evident that man does not come to God in sheer solitude, nor without faith. But that faith must be living, embodied, and proclaimed in the lives of others. Bookish religion and reports of bygone events will not suffice. This is where the role of the retreat master finds its theological foundation. He represents, sacramentally as it were, the living faith; he is one who has been touched by the Spirit who gives the People of God their contemporary vitality. Vatican II gave witness to the fact that this Spirit is not primarily to be found in hierarchical structure, nor in juridical prescription, nor in the work of dogmaticians or exegetes, but in the living bearers of the promises of Christ. And if men have thus been touched, they can and should speak out. And so retreat directors. . . . But they should remember that it is God, and not themselves, with whom the exercitant must primarily speak. Thus while they may guide and correct as "masters," it is equally true that they must know when to withdraw and allow the Spirit to work directly. Thus the place of scriptural meditations in the *Exercises*, and their centrality. The word of Scripture—already a testimony to the actuality of God's encounter with men—must be allowed to address the retreatant directly in his freedom.

But as a preliminary and stimulus to this end, the dialogue which the director undertakes with his exercitants is crucial. It is in the encounter with our fellow men that we find God. The dialogue here cannot be construed as a distraction from the silence and peace which is needed to dispose one for a higher kind. It is rather the prerequisite, and anyone who has actually experienced the dramatic effects of a serious "spiritual" conversation with a good retreat director knows this. It probably was the high point of the retreat, able as nothing else to dissipate the atrophy and fatigue from our faith. The shock of meeting "real faith" in another can do that.

DAVID S. TOOLAN, S.J.

JESUIT COMMUNITY

"The Body of the Society" ("Le corps de la Compagnie"), by François Roustang, S.J., *Christus* 13 (1966) 332-45.

IGNATIAN SPIRITUALITY is more than the spirituality of the Exercises, which could lead to individualism. The *Constitutions* make clear the basic insight that "the community constitutes the person before the person can become constitutive of the community." Ignatius expresses the personal formation of the novice and scholastic in terms of his becoming an active member of the Society. For Ignatius the vow of obedience is a means of integrating the individual into the Society. Obedience is not an individual virtue, but is always subordinated to the principal bond of union, the love of God. If it implies renunciation and a death, it is a death to self-sufficiency and isolation. The professed's promise of obedience to the Pope characterizes and forms the social structure of the Society as well as the personal goals of the individual Jesuit. Thus the professed members of the Society are more constitutive of community inasmuch as they have a greater responsibility to form, maintain, and increase the Society. Ignatius' notion of community, however, extends beyond the confines of the Society; for in his eyes that which constitutes members of the Society as persons and as a community is their transcendent dedication to the universal good of men, i.e., the good of each man.

ROBERT E. WHITE, S.J.

PAST AND PRESENT

"The Trial of the Times" ("L'épreuve du temps"), by Michel de Certeau, S.J., *Christus* 13 (1966) 311-31.

THE JESUITS HAVE, WITH THE HELP OF THE PAST, to determine what their spirit should be today, and, with the people of our times, to judge their origins and decide what will be their commitment as men, Christians, and Jesuits. They have to determine if there is still reason to be called Jesuit or if their institution is for men rooted in the present a mere fiction labelling a reality completely different from the historical Jesuit order.

In our present existential situation we have to ask ourselves, for our own sake and for the sake of others, who we are and what services we can perform.

We are men of our times, but depend on our past. Inquiring about our identity, we turn to our origins because we think that there must be something there which is the secret of our present. But though the

past appears to be our native country, it is also a deserted country. We have to discover there a spirit somehow lost in our evolution, but we also reject the language of this spirit as obsolete. A spirit is hidden there, but its expression has become unintelligible for us. But even this step in the direction of our origins is the first step in the building of a new language: we admit that our past is neither completely irrelevant nor completely under our control. We could get some insight if we let our past resist us (because we are dependent on it), and if we are able to resist it (because we are still creative).

The resistance of the past appears first because it is what it is and not what we might want to make it by intellectualizing it. When we read our history as it is written by others, we can discover how our past—even in the points we think peculiar to us—is dependent on the culture of its time. But at the same time we have to discern beyond the concrete forms (colleges, missions, etc.) the spiritual act which animated them: the sense of God which was translated into human achievements necessarily planned in dependence on the cultural structures of the time and place. But that shows also how the Society fit in with the time of its origin and how certain institutions would be now only a survival of the past. Recognition of this fact gives us a new creative freedom: the correspondence of the institutions with their time shows us the necessity of responding to our own epoch. But it gives us also a lesson in modesty: in what we want to do today we will always have the mark of our particular time as well as the accent of our origins and our history. In our efforts at renovation we will depend on our past, even if we deny it.

The past begins to resist us at the moment when we want to be liberated from it to be up-to-date. But the past is not monolithic: there is not one tradition, but traditions. It seems, moreover, that, in the light of the history of the Nadal-Ignatius divergences, it is possible to show three kinds of relations among the traditions: (1) all interpretations are referred back to the founder and called "Ignatian"; (2) the confrontation of Nadal's elaboration with the original language of Ignatius reveals a certain rigidity and one-sidedness in the development. This confrontation helps justify and correct the new interpretations by modifying them and making their meaning clear; (3) a pluralism of interpretations which is necessary for a sane evolution. Thus it is possible to see the deterioration of the Society when it diminishes its relations with more dynamic groups as the poor, the intellectuals, the powerful. What injects into a tradition the poison of a new time is also what saves it from inertia.

A big difference, however, appears in our time: where our predeces-

sors saw continuity we perceive the rupture. Men like Nadal would have protested if they were accused of innovating. As a matter of fact, the past and history has always been rewritten in function of the present. Our perception starts from the present and we ask ourselves what we will do with our past, felt as *passé*. From the very beginning we are heretics toward the past. The problem is to avoid being so unconsciously or with unhappy results. Just as we are tempted to deny our dependence on the past, we are tempted also to underestimate the extent of change and act as if we had to preserve some earlier immutable forms (but which?) or to consider some particular contemporary values as original (but which?). In fact we see that this labelling of "immutable" values changes in history. We are referred back to the founder as the only authentic witness to Ignatian spirituality.

We must see for ourselves in our past something other than luggage to leave behind or the archeology of the present. This is the way to be saved from the "heresy of the present" which is characterized by exclusivity. It denies the past and our brothers of yesterday. It refuses to take its place in the history which began before us. In fact, a double confrontation is necessary: a dialogue with our contemporary fellowmen, and a dialogue with the tradition. Then we can enter definitely on the way of mutual recognition. A new boldness is the true fruit of fidelity.

GÉRARD FOUREZ, S.J.

THE CAMPUS AS CLIMATE FOR MORAL GROWTH

*no problem seems to be as
universally acknowledged*

MICHAEL P. SHERIDAN, S.J.

ONE DOES NOT HAVE TO DELVE very deeply into the ever-expanding literature on the field of higher education before one or two basic facts become distressingly obvious. The first of these is that the 2,168 institutions of higher learning in this country are so diverse in origins, philosophy, and mode of operation that generalized statements are hazardous if not useless. The second fact is that among the scholars who write on the field, men not necessarily wedded to the institutional philosophy of any particular college, there is an equal diversity of views. However, some solace is to be taken in the common acknowledgment of certain problems by scholars and administrators. Technical problems, in many instances, seem common to many campuses; studies of school calendar experiments, of work-study programs, of off-campus study activities and the like now abound.¹

At the present time, no problem seems to be as universally acknowledged as the problem of the student. What has happened is truly revolutionary. Educators have ceased speculations about what the ideal student *should* be—e.g., the “profile of the Jesuit college graduate”—and have become acutely concerned with what the modern student actually *is*. Psychology and (more important

¹ Of principal interest in this field would be the series of monographs published by the Institute for Higher Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, under the general direction of Earl J. McGrath.

now) sociology have been able to make observations to which the college administrator must pay heed if important goals are to be attained. That this is so should seem pellucid; philosophically, one cannot intelligently speak of the *terminus ad quem* without having analyzed the *terminus a quo*, to break away from those categories, the ideal cannot be considered without reference to the real. Within the framework of Catholic higher education, a study of the college student is singularly important if, as some will maintain, a primary and viable goal of this activity is value change.

Assumptions and failures

But before examining the subject of value change (or, to put it differently, moral growth), it is necessary to restate the assumption that value change is a vital function of Catholic higher education. Perhaps ten years ago it would not have been important to do this; it was taken for granted. But two factors have served to push this goal to the background. First, the increased secularization of the world in general has perforce affected the world of higher education. True, some colleges have been able to maintain an other-worldly orientation; but these institutions are looked at now as academic curiosities. The Catholic colleges, in a justifiable effort to insure their students' success in the world of secular learning, have developed the status of secular learning to the point that religious learning has been minimized. Says Edward Wakin:

More than 300 Catholic colleges and universities are being forced to face an embarrassing dilemma: in trying to retain a Catholic identity they may risk loss of acceptance in the educational mainstream or in gaining that acceptance they risk loss of any significant Catholic identity. The better Catholic colleges and universities suffer from the latter tendency and the result is an ambiguous, if not misleading, identity.²

Significantly, the line of defense taken by the Catholic educators in the recent court case contesting the constitutionality of financial aid from the State of Maryland to church-related institutions bore this charge out. Witnesses seemed determined to convince the court that these schools were in reality no different from any other institution of higher learning.

A second factor involved seems to a sense of failure on the part of many Catholic educators. Even before the new breed of student

² Edward Wakin, "How Catholic Is the Catholic College?" *Saturday Review*, (April 16, 1966), p. 92.

began telling us we were not reaching him, there were signs of distress. The Greeley-Rossi study entitled *The Education of Catholic Americans* presents some alarming facts, which suggest that Catholic higher education is not as effective as it could have been in moral areas.³ The youthful writer of an open letter to the president of Notre Dame recently published in a national magazine reiterated the problem:

There used to be a time when a student coming to Notre Dame was introduced, after a fashion, to the living of the Christian life. But processions, Benediction, visits to the grotto, the rosary, and devotion to Mary can no longer do the job. Whether this is a desirable situation is discussable, but it is a fact. These things have been swept away, and nothing is taking their place. A *pastoral vacuum* exists, and it seems that nothing short of working out a *pastoral plan* for the building up of Christianity at the university can deal with the problem.⁴

The eight Catholic university presidents who replied to the letter admitted that the writer had a point.

At the same time, though, there is enough data at hand to allow for a positive approach. The administrators committed to Catholic higher education (such as those replying to the letter cited above) are not visionaries; they are used to facing cold realities. Perhaps five years ago, an article such as this one would not have been published. Or, if it were, it would have been challenged at once by spokesmen for Catholic higher education—not accepted as having some validity. The stance of the administrators can be taken, I think, because there is room for optimism now. We have achieved a certain degree of sophistication in this whole business of aiding the moral development of students; when we acknowledge failures and ineptitude, we do so with some measure of confidence.

Theoretical considerations

The principal scope of this paper is to point out areas in which the college can create an atmosphere conducive to moral growth. We no longer talk in terms of changing the values of students as though by some efficient cause; we talk in terms of assisting students to develop their own moral life. A number of elements have

³ Andrew M. Greeley and Peter H. Rossi, *The Education of Catholic Americans* (Chicago: Aldine, 1966).

⁴ Ralph Martin, Jr., "Letter from a Catholic College Graduate to the President," *Ave Maria* 103, No. 16 (April 16, 1966) 9.

become more clearly defined in recent years, partly through the assistance of empirical science, and partly through an evolving philosophy of education. We will speak of three of them before making some concrete suggestions and observations.

1) The relationship of knowledge to virtue within the context of higher education has undergone a rather intense scrutiny. We have, of course, long since abandoned the notion that knowledge is virtue—at least as a basic philosophical tenet. Yet, for many years a vocal segment of theoreticians in Catholic higher education held that knowledge was indeed the primary concern of the Catholic college, and that what took place in the realm of moral, religious, and spiritual development of the student was a by-product, however laudable. Thus Fr. Henle:

Since the college as an institution aims at the full development of human personalities, its objective includes the development of moral virtue and supernatural character. However, since the immediate objective of the teaching (and, in general, academic) activities of the college is understanding, knowledge, and truth, the development of character can be an objective of *teaching* only secondarily and indirectly (1) through the intrinsic influence of knowledge on character, (2) through the incidental effects of the teaching situation. The college may and indeed should promote character development through other activities (e.g., religious counseling, retreats, etc.) directly ordered to virtue.⁵

Happily, this point of view was rejected by an important meeting of Jesuit educators, convinced as they were that the objectives of Jesuit (and, indeed, of all Catholic) education includes directly the moral development of the student.

In the Jesuit view, education includes the development and perfecting of the total human being. Hence no education is complete unless it includes the intellectual, moral, religious, and spiritual development of the student. Thus, the moral, religious, and spiritual formation, which is of particular importance at the collegiate level, is an over-all and essential objective of every Jesuit college. To this formation all the activities and all the personnel of the college must contribute, according to their own natures and functions within the institution.⁶

Nevertheless, the force of tradition on Catholic campuses—or on

⁵ R. J. Henle, S.J., "The Objectives of the Catholic Liberal Arts College"; this paper, originally presented at a meeting of Jesuit Deans in Santa Clara in 1955, was reprinted in J. Barry McGannon *et al.*, eds., *Christian Wisdom and Christian Formation* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964); this quotation is found at page 29.

⁶ McGannon *et al.*, *ibid.*, p. 279.

any campus—is not to be dismissed lightly. Catholic higher education is heir to a legacy strongly oriented toward the knowledge-equals-virtue syndrome, though seldom stated with the cogency of Fr. Henle's complete argument. For the assumption was (and still is in many places) that the ethical principles learned in the regular deontology course will provide the student with sufficient ammunition and motivation to assure the leading of a moral life.

Both words—ammunition and motivation—are crucial. The first reflects the defensive polemicism which characterized the philosophy and theology in Catholic higher education for decades. Born of an era when Catholics were a disrespected and beleaguered minority, it was calculated to *prove*—first to the Catholic students and then to the enemy poised outside the walls—the reasonableness of the “Catholic position.” But now, in an era according respect to Catholicism, one questions the necessity of this apologetic-polemic approach.

As for motivation, the assumption was that the sheer lucidity of the ethical principles inculcated during course work should insure their acceptance. But, as Fr. Klubertanz points out, presentation of the principle is simply insufficient.⁷ Something more is required. The student must, somehow, be urged to live morally or, as we submit here is more important, be given the chance to develop and live a full Christian life within the confines of the collegiate environment.

2) Psychology and sociology have attested that students do indeed change values during the course of their years in college, that the college itself can play an important role in this regard, and that the peer group influence in this context is crucial. A word about each of these points is in order.

In his famous study, P. E. Jacob charged in 1957 that no evidence could be found for “significant changes in student values which can be attributed directly to the character of the curriculum or to the basic courses in social science which students take as part of their general education.”⁸ Yet, other more sophisticated studies show that Jacob's findings must be nuanced to a high degree. Newcomb's

⁷ George P. Klubertanz, S.J., “Knowledge and Action,” *ibid.*, pp. 38-68.

⁸ P. E. Jacob, *Changing Values in College* (New York: Harper, 1957), p. 5.

earlier study detected value change in students at Vassar⁹ and Plant's much more recent study indicates that college students show marked changes in the areas of dogmatism, ethnocentrism, and authoritarianism.¹⁰

In 1959, the American Council on Education sponsored a study which examined the role of the college in general upon the formation of character.¹¹ The implications of the report are important, for they point the way toward the impact of the whole institution on the student's moral development. Such elements as the college's expectations of students, the faculty's conceptions of the teaching role, the organization of the curriculum, the degree of student responsibility, the place of religious practice, and the effect of the college environment were analyzed, and all were found to have a distinctive role insofar as they had an effect on the student.

The influence of the peer group, however, may turn out to be *the* critical question. While Scott's study of fraternities and sororities proved little else than that homogeneously formed groups tend only to reinforce the values held by the group, the wealth of material contained in Sanford's monumental work shows the pervasive effects of peer group influence in many settings.¹² Once this still diffused evidence is gathered and evaluated, it may be that college administrators will have to give some further serious thought to processes of admission, taking into consideration factors other than academic potential to a much greater degree.

3) The third insight providing a basis for thought is the simple rediscovery of an old truth: students learn by doing. While this axiom was hardly denied by educators for some time, the assumption was that the "doing" would take place at a later time and at a place removed from the campus. It may have taken the catalyst of a Berkeley to reinstate this principle, although alert student person-

⁹ T. M. Newcomb, *Personality and Social Change* (New York: Dryden, 1943).

¹⁰ J. C. McCullers and W. T. Plant, "Personality and Social Development: Cultural Influences," *Review of Educational Research* (December, 1964) 599-610.

¹¹ Edward J. Eddy, Jr., *The College Influence on Student Character* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1959).

¹² William A. Scott, *Values and Organizations* (Chicago: Rand and McNally, 1965); Nevitt Sanford, ed., *The American College* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962).

nel administrators were aware of it prior to that maelstrom.

Fr. Ratterman, speaking to a recent convention group, stated the situation aptly:

. . . (It) is difficult to see how he (the student) will ever achieve not just the truth but the willingness to fulfill the responsibilities of truth unless he actively participates in his own education. His university experience must lead toward what amounts to a free commitment to specific personal and societal responsibilities. He must learn not just freely to accept truth but freely to live truth, and this precisely as a result of his university experience. This is the "whole man" developing. At a very minimum the university experience must include very significant self-participation and self-involvement. This places a tremendous responsibility on the student. But it places a perhaps even greater responsibility on the university to provide the means whereby students will become interested, involved, and active in the primary mission of the university. . .¹³

What is being called for, needless to say, is a different concept of the university; what is being called for is the construction of a climate suitable for moral growth, an end to the assumption that meaningful moral activity is something to be engaged in *after* the formality of college education.

Administration's contribution

With these points in mind, we would like to investigate six areas, seemingly unrelated, in which the college can strive to achieve what we have already termed "the climate for moral growth." It is not, nor intended to be, an exhaustive list; the choices are quite possibly conditioned by some of the more news-worthy areas of conflict currently under public scrutiny.

1) *The make-up of the student body.* Complete homogeneity is, in all likelihood, neither possible nor desirable. If student peer group influence is as crucial as the data tend to show, it would seem desirable to assure a measure of heterogeneity—as insurance against the stultifying effects of homogeneity (as Scott's study points out) and insurance for a flow of different points of view. In this regard, it might be well to take pains that a significant number of students in the Catholic college are non-Catholics. One is led to wonder if the words of *The Declaration on Christian Education* of Vatican II

¹³ Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J., "Background Considerations and Norms—Student Rights and Freedoms on the Catholic University Campus," speech delivered to the College and University Division of the National Catholic Education Association on 14 April, 1966.

are not indeed applicable here:

To this ideal of a Catholic school, all schools which are in any way dependent on the Church should conform as far as possible, though Catholic schools can take on forms which vary according to local circumstance. Thus the Church feels a most cordial esteem for those Catholic schools, found especially where the Church is newly established, which contain large numbers of non-Catholic students (No. 9).

Even secular schools, in their admission policies, have seen the wisdom of providing for wide geographic distribution; more recently have they become aware of the need for similar distribution through socio-economic classes. Since Catholic colleges no longer have to look to a protective function to justify their existence, it may be that the time is ripe for some bold steps toward achieving much more heterogeneity.

2) *The curriculum.* Mentioned above was the weight of tradition in the determination of theology and philosophy curricula. Something of the same ilk seems to be operative in the curriculum throughout the liberal education put forth in many Catholic institutions; it is traditional, often enough based on an outdated faculty psychology, and blissfully confident of its own power. Why have Catholic colleges been so slow to innovate? Why is it that the very first recommendation made by the recent Danforth Commission on Church-Related Colleges and Universities is for "a more experimental approach?"¹⁴ One might well investigate at this juncture the beneficial effects of off-campus programs during college years—even the ones which remove the student from the campus for a semester or a year.¹⁵ Such programs invite action, participation, *doing*.

In any event, what is called for is a fresher approach to the curriculum, an approach which may quite possibly call for a total revision of the treatise on liberal education. Moral growth is much more likely to be fostered in a climate which encourages mobility, adaptation, and experimentation.

3) *Control over students.* This is a subject that has been over-

¹⁴ Manning M. Patillo, Jr., and Donald M. Mackenzie, *Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1966), p. 51.

¹⁵ Cf. Samuel Baskin, ed., *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965). See especially Chapters 3 and 4.

worked in recent months; we would make one point here. The point has been reached at which it is acknowledged that students, as persons, do indeed have some rights. It is no longer possible for colleges and universities, especially Catholic institutions whose existence should call for witness to the dignity of the individual, to decide arbitrarily what rights students have and don't have—usually as ad hoc solutions to crises. What is called for now is some serious policy planning carefully delineating the rights and duties of the student body within the framework of the university community.

In recent months, the American Association of University Professors has made public a document stating what it holds to be the rights of students.¹⁶ Students in at least two Jesuit colleges have done the same thing. These moves should not be regarded as incipient revolutions, but rather as an attempt to work out a *modus vivendi* based on something other than authoritarianism and/or paternalism. Katz and Sanford have stated the facts somewhat brutally:

In the last eighteen months, one central fact has emerged: namely, that students have arrived as *a new power*, a fourth estate which is taking its place beside the traditional estates of faculty, administration, and trustees. What is more, the situation is irreversible.¹⁷

It is not, in the last analysis, simply a situation of power politics. There has simply come to be more of a recognition of the rights possessed by students, though it may have taken a few power plays to force this recognition.

If moral growth is to be fostered, the colleges would be well advised to formulate policy, and to involve students in the formulation. Growth simply cannot occur in a restrictive environment.

4) *Utilization of residence halls.* It is extremely difficult for this writer to comprehend how the goals of a university can be achieved with an entirely transient student body. Sociologist Charles Bidwell of the University of Chicago has long been concerned with this problem, and apparently feels that a residential college is in a far superior position to effect moral change.¹⁸

This contention is, of course, debatable; we cannot argue it here.

¹⁶ Cf. *AAUP Journal*, (Winter, 1965).

¹⁷ Joseph Katz and Nevitt Sanford, "The New Student Power and Needed Educational Reforms," *Phi Delta Kappan* 47, No. 8 (April, 1966), 397.

¹⁸ Charles E. Bidwell and Rebecca S. Vreeland, "The Residential College as an Administered Community," unpublished study, University of Chicago, 1962.

But what must be considered is this: a great deal of study has gone into the role of residence halls as a part of the learning environment, and it does seem that proper utilization of them will tend to accomplish much.¹⁹ There are now specialists in dormitory ecology; their studies indicate that much more planning must go into the construction of dormitory buildings in order to insure cohesive sub-groups. These sub-groups can be influenced by faculty members, especially when faculty members live in the dormitories.²⁰

In short, dormitory planning must be much more than utilitarian—and utilitarianism is the great temptation here. Administration's concern with residence halls must become much more than negative; they can be used.

5) *The personal element.* During the Berkeley demonstrations, one student was seen carrying a sign which read "I am a human being. Do not fold, spindle, or mutilate." With Catholic higher education almost universally facing the problem of bigness, caution must be encouraged lest a fallacy prevail. That fallacy contends that bigness itself is conducive to moral growth, for, as the argument goes, the student is forced to think and decide for himself.

It would be unrealistic, at least in the context of this paper, to urge Catholic colleges to curb growth in the interest of providing a climate for moral growth. What must be encouraged instead, it appears, is a policy which insures professional help to any student who needs it during the formation of his own value system. Specifically, the student personnel office must shed its police role and broaden its concern to include adequate psychological and psychiatric assistance for the students who need it.

This recommendation is not out of place in this paper, since we can no longer assume that only a small number of students require such professional assistance. The facts seem to indicate otherwise. And moral growth cannot occur satisfactorily in a subjectively unstable environment.

6) *The role of dissent.* Implicit in all this discussion so far has been the need for involvement, for activity and participation on the

¹⁹ Ralph C. Leyden, "Residence Halls as an Integral Part of the Learning Environment," G. Kerry Smith (ed.) in *Current Issues in Higher Education 1966* (Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1966) pp. 253-56.

²⁰ Howard R. Neville, "How to Live with Bigness," *Phi Delta Kappan* 47, No. 8 (April, 1966) 430 ff.

part of the students. But if, as some contend, a basic problem of apathy is to be overcome, what is to act as a catalyst? One might say that ordinarily dissent will serve this purpose, and that, moreover, among the present generation of students, dissent will not be found lacking. Max Lerner, for instance, maintains that the "revolutionary frame of our time" will guarantee dissent.²¹

If Lerner is correct, it would seem that the college's task is not to stifle dissent, but to utilize it. Moreover, a case can be made for the obligation of the college to *encourage* dissent. In the concrete, this means: the toleration (or even the seeking out) of controversial speakers; the toleration of student dissent when it is done within the context of law and order; the zealous defense of academic freedom within the university; in fine, a careful guarding against the closed mind.

Insofar as the university—at least the faculty and the administration—constitutes something of a vested interest, there is a natural inclination to view dissent as a threat. But, ultimately, what is to be feared? If students are temporarily disoriented owing to the apparent credibility of "unorthodox" opinions, are they not in the process gaining intellectual and moral stature? One must bear in mind Fr. John Courtney Murray's definition of the pluralistic society: men locked together in argument. It is within this milieu that moral growth will best take place, especially within the broader context of a free and pluralistic society.

By the way of summary, we will merely repeat that the college's principal task is to create a climate which will foster moral growth. Such a climate is not, we believe, a protective one; it is one in which students are encouraged to act, to think, to respond to stimuli. In all these areas, the college keeps a discreet surveillance, coming to the aid of the student whenever and however it can. But the student ultimately develops himself. The college merely makes it possible for him to do so.

²¹ Max Lerner, "The Revolutionary Frame of Our Time," in Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (eds.), *The College and the Student* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1966), pp. 8-22.

CHRISTIAN BROTHERHOOD AND MARRIAGE

The Open Circle: The Meaning of Christian Brotherhood. *By Joseph Ratzinger.* Translated by W. A. Glen-Doeple. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966. Pp. 128. \$3.50.

THIS BOOK IS A TRANSLATION of a 1958 address by Fr. Ratzinger to the Theological Congress of the Austrian Institute for Pastoral Work. Unfortunately, it shows its age somewhat. In addition, it seems questionable to translate what was originally a forty-odd page article in *Seelsorger* for that year into large print on small pages and publish it in a hard-bound edition for \$3.50 eight years later. It would have made an interesting and less expensive pamphlet about six years ago.

The first half of the book details the history in the Western and Christian traditions of the use of the term "brother" for other than one's male siblings. Ratzinger makes much of the Israelite consciousness of the Fatherhood of Yahweh for the sons of Israel. This, Ratzinger maintains, differs from the brotherhood of any other ethnic or religious group. The Enlightenment idea of brotherhood provides the author with a favorite whipping boy. It was not an advance, he claims, in the way it saw all men as brothers in the human race, but rather a degeneration into romanticism. Ratzinger goes on to make some interesting remarks about the relationship of Jesus and the Twelve which positively illumine the meaning of brotherhood in a Christian context. The gospel of Matthew records the saying of Jesus "You are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all brethren" (Mt 22:8). Christianity was (or was supposed to be) an end to rabbinism, an end to worldly master-disciple, ruler-ruled distinctions. Jesus does not call the Twelve "beloved sons" in the curial style that has won out in His Church, but rather instructs Mary Magdalen to announce His resurrection to "my brethren" (Mt 28:10).

The gospels preserve another notion of brotherhood in a wider sense than the brotherhood of the disciples. The great judgment parable of

Mt 25:31-46 equates "the least" of men with the brothers of Christ. Service done to these brothers is service done to Christ; here "brother" is the equivalent of "neighbor" in the Lucan parable of the Good Samaritan. Fr. Ratzinger notices here the similarity between the synoptic viewpoint and the Enlightenment ideal. "It is true that there is here an ultimate removal of barriers which one finds in so complete a form only in Stoicism and the Enlightenment. Nevertheless, there is in the gospel a Christological element in the idea of brotherhood which creates a quite different spiritual atmosphere from the Enlightenment ideology." True enough, but surely we must be reluctant to label the Enlightenment ideology as "empty romanticism" because it reaches a Christian ideal without Christ. The experience of Christians working with non-Christians for humanitarian aims must also be taken into account when evaluating "the Christian meaning of brotherhood." In the tiny, persecuted community which was the primitive Church we cannot expect to find all the elements of Christian meaning.

Five Christian attitudes

The second section of the book, "An Attempt at Synthesis," tries to deduce from the scriptural and dogmatic sources of the Christian tradition five Christian attitudes suited for the construction of an ethos of true brotherhood.

1) The Christian's sense of his brotherhood with all men is rooted in his sharing the human nature of Christ. Following Meister Eckhart's curious ethical reinterpretation of the hypostatic union, Ratzinger describes the Christian ethic as basically one of selflessness like that of the human nature of Christ. This does not seem to add much to our theological understanding except a rather colorless Christology.

2) The exclusivism and hierarchism that characterized the synagogue were abolished by Christ, or at least were intended to be; the primitive Christian community was marked for its "undifferentiated brotherliness" (surely an unfortunate phrase). Only God was to be addressed as Father, according to Christ's command (Mt 23:8-11). Priesthood and officialdom were to be swept away in the new covenant and replaced by *diakonia*, the service of the brethren. Human nature being what it is, this note of evangelical Christianity was soon obscured, leaving us with the quaint Byzantine-Baroque establishment of modern times.

3) Brotherly community is limited, according to Ratzinger, and here he posits the main difference between certain strains of Protestant ecclesiology and its Catholic counterpart (in 1958). Whereas many Protestants take an "eschatological, anti-institutional view of the Church," Catholics are committed to the concept of a closed brotherly

community. "Only this limited application of the idea of brotherhood is Christian; removal of this barrier was an essentially unrealizable ideal of the Enlightenment." Perhaps the Second Vatican Council's image of the People of God allows for a more open and fluid concept of the Church than Ratzinger's brotherly community. Lines of demarcation are not denied; they are simply not highlighted so sharply. Ratzinger's brotherly community is defined by a common Eucharist; *Lumen Gentium* stresses many sources linkage to the People of God.

4) While his treatment of the limits of brotherly community has become dated, Ratzinger's synthetic chapter on true universalism opens up new horizons. Much of this treatment is derived from Karl Barth's doctrine of election as interpreted by Hans Urs von Balthasar. Calvin's *praedestinatio gemina* is seen applied to Christ in a new sense: damnation and salvation, rejection and election are taken on by the incarnate Lord on behalf of man. Christ, the only just man, by taking on man's rejection, redeems man who is his brother in human nature. The antithetical pairs of brothers in the Old Testament and the brothers in the parable of the Prodigal Son all illustrate for Barth a great paradox. Rejection leads ultimately to election: the rejected man is chosen *in* his very rejection. This for Ratzinger gives a rationale to the Church's closed and yet open nature as a brotherly community. The Church is one brother seeking to serve, love and suffer for the other brother—in short, to redeem the other brother in the image of Christ.

5) In a rather weak postscript on the concept of "separated brethren," Ratzinger finds difficulty with the idea of more than one valid ecclesial sign of the saving mystery of Christ. He suggests, almost archly, that Protestant communities may be considered "sisters" of the Catholic Church. It is difficult to see what contribution Ratzinger is making by this preconciliar afterthought. Robert McAfee Brown, in his introduction to this volume, notes very charitably that it is at this point that "Fr. Ratzinger's suggestions can be supplemented by the actions of the Second Vatican Council." Brown then goes on to do just that in summary fashion—all of which raises the question as to *why* this book was published without considerable revision at this late date. One wonders if this is attributable to the same human instinct in publishing houses that divides up Rahner's substantial European volumes into fragmented booklets with different titles. Ratzinger's name, associated as it is with Rahner's in the authorship of *The Episcopate and the Primacy*, will surely sell this dated essay with its intriguing title. But let the buyer beware.

PATRICK J. RYAN, S.J.

Marriage, Human Reality and Saving Mystery, 2 volumes. By *E. Schillebeeckx, O.P.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965. Pp. xxxii + 416. \$7.50.

TEN YEARS AGO at a meeting of moralists Fr. Gerald Kelly characterized our traditional moral treatise on chastity as lacking consistency. He felt that it did not hang together, that it was a patchwork. The whole subject of chastity in marriage and outside of it needed reworking, he concluded.

The present impasse regarding contraception has made us all aware that something is indeed missing in our doctrine of marriage. The Holy Father, after two and a half years of reflection, aided by fifty of the best theological, medical, and demographic minds in the Church—who themselves could not reach a consensus—has been unable to speak out definitively on the subject.

The recent Council has reoriented our thinking in terms of responsible parenthood, the importance of conjugal love and of greater freedom for responsible decision by parents. The doctrinal problem of contraception is capable of solution. But the pastoral and more perilous question of the faith of the faithful will be with us for some time. How to help them see and accept a doctrinal development, not to mention change—but then development by definition involves change—without their loyalty to the magistry being shaken, here is the rub. For that matter the priest himself is no stranger to this crisis of conscience. Little wonder, when his seminary course was deficient in the epistemology of moral (would that we had remembered St. Thomas' judgment on the limitation of the secondary principles of natural law!) and his schooling preceded the appearance of current biblical theology on marriage.

The much larger picture

Accepting development and change in the Church's growing consciousness of moral truth requires an historical background from which development can be seen to emerge. Until recently the history of moral thought was not at hand for the theologian to reflect upon.

The problem of contraception, however, does not stand by itself. It is a detail of the much larger picture of marriage, the family, conjugal love, sexuality and the Christian vocation to image Christ's love for his Church. In the traditional moral presentation, the camera lingered too long and in close-up on contraception. As a result, the popular conception of chastity among Catholics according to sociologists has been: "Nothing before marriage; after marriage anything goes except contraception!"

Seen in its broader perspective the problem of marriage today is a multiple one. It involves the question of mixed marriages and the ex-

tent to which the Church can modify its legislation with a view to ecumenical rapprochement with Protestant Christians. Bishop Zogby's query at the Council needs to be answered. He asked whether the Church does not possess further powers to dissolve valid marriage for the relief of the innocent spouse abandoned with children by a wife or husband. No adequate study of marriage can dispense with celibacy, its counterpart. For marriage cannot be adequately defined without reference to eschatological sexual abstinence. Mountains of psychological data are at hand for the theologian with respect to difficulties experienced in marriage. The sociologist has much to say about the cultural forces tearing at the fabric of the family today but at the same time pointing to a deeper family unity than ever before realized in the history of man.

It is with this breadth of scope that Fr. Schillebeeckx, the renowned Dutch theologian, addresses himself to the subject of marriage in the present work. These first two volumes of his projected series go to the sources of any theology of marriage: Holy Writ and history, with the related behavioral sciences. From these sources respectively marriage emerges as saving mystery and as human reality. Volume I treats of marriage in the Old and New Testaments; marriage in the history of the Church is the subject of Volume II. A subsequent volume will present the history of moral thought in the Church on sexuality, to be followed in due time by a synthesis, a systematic theology of marriage and sexuality.

Scholar that he is, Schillebeeckx eschews what sometimes passes for history today, a survey of the writings of theologians and canonists on Christian marriage. This is an integral part of any genuine historical study, but it says nothing of the social context in which and to which the theologians and canonists were speaking. It omits marriage as an anthropological reality among Greeks, Romans, and their neighbors, among Visigoths, Celts, and Teutons. Yet it was just this human reality that was raised by Christ into the order of salvation. It was the secular rituals of marriage among these peoples that the Church eventually incorporated into her own liturgy.

What emerges from all this is a different reality than our present concept of it. During the first ten centuries after Christ the Church recognized that marriage came into being (and the sacrament was received) in the home with the exchange of bride and dowry. It was a secular reality. The Christian liturgy of marriage, which evolved only gradually, was not obligatory for Christians until the eleventh century and even then was not required for validity. The laws of the realm were the protection of marriage. The Church herself was not concerned with

marriage legislation, though churchmen composed lengthy pastoral treatises. Compare this state of affairs with the complex law of marriage in the Code of Canon Law!

The essence of marriage depended solely on the mutual consent of bride and groom. It was therefore independent of the authority of state and Church. Moreover, when the Church subsequently assumed complete jurisdiction over matrimony, her claim was not made *de jure*, in principle, but simply resulted from historical factors. This opens up possibilities for ecumenical agreement with Protestants regarding mixed marriages and the possibility of harmony with government in the touchy matter of the required civil ceremony in some countries. Can it be that both state and Church infringed upon the basic human right to marry, Schillebeeckx asks. May they intervene to render null and void the personal consent of the spouses on the basis of nonfulfillment of purely positive law stipulations as to the form in which marriage is to be contracted? The medieval view, conflicting with our own post-Tridentine one, held the consent as inviolable by state or Church.

It is a source of hope for the Jesuit in the pastoral ministry to speculate on the implications of this data for his work. What does it mean in terms of returning to the Christian community those who are married without benefit of the prescribed Tridentine form of marriage? Schillebeeckx does not answer such questions in the present volumes. They simply arise from the sources he here reviews. More ground remains to be surveyed in his series—before he can synthesize conclusions reached in the various stages of his research.

Nor has he marshalled all the historical data. His method is selective both as to the authors studied and the themes developed. To have done otherwise would have been prohibitive in terms of time and space. He has not, however, sacrificed accuracy or distorted history in so proceeding.

Sacred and secular

Turning to the scriptural data, here too marriage emerges from the pages of Old and New Testaments as a much more secular reality than post-Tridentine theology has given us to believe. Our thinking about marriage is largely in terms of its sacramentality. It is heavily theological, in the older sense of the term. Actually the more existential kind of theology Schillebeeckx gives us, a synthesis of the historical, anthropological, and sociological with the biblical data and the speculations of earlier theologians, is more properly theological than what formerly went by the name.

From the first pages of Genesis we find the definitive break with the sacral image of marriage characteristic of non-Judaic cultures. The model

of marriage is not Zeus and Athena, or their counterparts in other mythologies, consorting in their bridal bed on Olympus. The model of Old Testament marriage is situated squarely on earth, in Adam and Eve, later in the marriage of Hosea with Gomer, a religious prostitute in the fertility rites of Baal.

Schillebeeckx does not deny that this very human institution was also sacred. For the Israelite marriage was blessed by God. It was his creation, as was everything human. The emphasis, however, in this secular-sacral polarity was far more on the secular than in our own thinking. The author suggests that our evaluation be brought into line with divine revelation.

So much for the Old Testament. But does not Paul go far beyond Genesis? Does not the emphasis swing back to the sacred with his teaching that marriage for Christians is marriage "in the Lord" (1 Cor. 7:39)? Is not this the biblical basis for the sacramentality of marriage? If this line of reasoning is followed, Schillebeeckx says, we would have to regard slavery as a sacrament. For slaves too were exhorted to serve their masters "in the Lord." The meaning of the expression with regard to marriage is rather that this ordinary human phenomenon of two people sharing their lives was taken up into the sphere of salvation. They should conduct themselves in marriage as Christians.

Ephesians 5, however, does express a reality of marriage that far transcends a community of life by two persons. It establishes an essential connection of Christian marriage with the covenant relationship of Christ and the Church. This covenant is a marriage relationship. And husband and wife are called to this kind of redemptive love relationship which Christ has with his Body, the Church.

Here we have a fact about marriage which we have never really taught our people. What should be a potent dynamism permeating their thinking and feeling, guiding their decisions, is missing from their lives. Contrast the value of this Pauline teaching with the current preoccupation of Catholics with contraception. Yet, "The problem of not wanting children is not discussed at all in the New Testament." The problem may well not have existed in the apostolic age. Still the conclusion is inescapable, we have distorted the hierarchy of values in marriage as found in revelation.

Far more discoveries than the above are to be found in the present volumes. No Jesuit can afford to ignore them or the companion volume(s) to follow. Volumes I and II, by the way, are obtainable also in paperback, appearing as Sheed and Ward "Stagbooks" publications.

ROBERT H. SPRINGER, S.J.

JESUITS AND NORTHWEST HISTORY

The Jesuits and the Indian Wars of the Northwest. *By Robert Ignatius Burns, S.J.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1966. Yale Western Americana Series, 11. Pp. xv & 512. \$10.00.

FATHER BURNS HAS GIVEN US a detailed study which is at the same time fascinating reading. He begins with a brief survey of the area involved—the Pacific Northwest, which included parts or all of the present day states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana—in all, over a quarter of a million square miles. These are just the names; the reality was a vast unmapped and virtually unknown wilderness. The main features of the area were the Rockies and other lesser mountain ranges, and two main rivers, the Columbia and the Snake. The area was chiefly known, but somewhat inaccurately, as The Oregon Territory.

Fr. Burns then tells the role this area played in American history prior to the two decades which are his chief concern (1850-60; 1870-80). Many major figures, events and controversies flit briefly across the stage or pause to add a more important contribution: Presidents Monroe and Jackson, and also Jefferson who sent Lewis and Clark to explore the territory, John C. Calhoun, Marcus Whitman, the Hudson Bay Company, the 54°40' slogan which almost led to war with England. Although few white men had penetrated the area prior to 1840, the white man's influence had been felt in terrible fashion as his diseases ravaged the Indian tribes, "taking a toll more terrible than any Black Death known to Europe's history. Over two-thirds of the Indians of the Pacific Northwest simply disappeared."

The picture is a depressing one. Behind and after the diseases came disintegration of the morals and customs of the Indians as the slow trickle of settlers became a steady stream, and soon a flood. It was into this world where a whole society, an entire race of men, were (to use a current phrase) "being phased out of existence" that the Jesuit missionaries came to live among these Indians, to live for them, to suffer for and with them, and do all they could to help them.

For most of these Jesuits it was a completely new and disconcerting experience, a different world, a life of obscurity and of work that was often misunderstood and at times openly opposed by the white world they represented. They came from Europe and were truly an international mission: Italian, French, Irish, German, Belgian, Dutch, Swiss and Maltese. They came from many different European schools and some would return to educational work in other parts of the United States. One of them became famous and walked with the highest figures

in American History, Father Peter DeSmet. He dealt with men such as Generals Sherman and Rosecrans, Senator Thomas Hart Benton, Thurlow Weed, Kit Carson and President Lincoln. But DeSmet was the exception. For the rest—Fathers Joset, Giorda, Cataldo, Hoecken, Gazzoli, Ravalli, Menetrey and the many others—it was a life of hidden work.

The author studies in detail two eras and the Jesuit involvement in both. The first is the late 1850's and the Jesuits' work to prevent a widespread uprising and wholesale massacre of the still limited number of settlers in the area. The second is the final desperate revolt of the Nez Percés led by their gallant chief Joseph in 1877. The author tells how at a time when the odds and whole tide of history had turned against the Indians, the Jesuits again labored to minimize the death and destruction to both sides. In each of these studies Father Burns creates fascinating narratives which can only be appreciated by reading them.

Equally important as the recounting of a story that deserves and needs to be told, are a number of questions and observations which arises from this recounting. These latter focus on the meaning of certain themes in American History and their significance in the past and today; they are imbedded or implicit in the account given by Father Burns and help bring out the lasting significance of his labors.

The first of these is the terrible dilemma faced by the Jesuits. Quite often in their work they were suspected, opposed and interfered with by many different members of the white society and civilization from which they came. This was an age in America of strong xenophobia and anti-Catholicism, and the Jesuits would be especially suspect. They had come from one civilization and were attempting to work among a people whose whole society was being eroded or violently torn apart by the white man. The Jesuits saw what was happening and realized what this meant; the Indian and his way of life were doomed and there was nothing the Jesuits could do to stop this. The destruction was bound to be cruel and painful unless the men who were to make the decisions concerning the fate of the Indians were men of great hearts and great tact. But this was impossible since the problem was continually caught up in the rough and tumble of the politics of those decades. There could be brief delays to smooth the transition for the Indians, but these were rare. The voting populace of settlers was ruthless in its opposition and insatiable in its demands.

More than one Indian saw the result of this waiting and negotiating. They felt that one massive uprising might ward off the disaster and make their lands less attractive to the would be settlers. The cost would be a massacre of hundreds of white settlers, some innocent and some not so innocent, as well as many Indian lives. In all probability, the

result would have been the same no matter what the Indians did. But it was the unfortunate task of the Jesuit missionaries to try to prevent any such uprising, to try to quell and restrict any outbreak that did occur. For the Indians the choice was always death, slowly by disintegration or quickly in what to them would be a great and glorious cause. The Jesuits as pacifiers prevented this latter, and so their role became that of preparing an entire society and people for a death that would work its way over a period of decades.

It also becomes clear in this study that the white society which was supposedly bringing order and civilization to these primitives had some very strange codes of behavior. Treaties made with the Indians were things to be broken, and a solemn promise was a joke. Time and time again the Indians were promised that certain territory would be theirs forever—which meant only until some white settlers found something in the land that they wanted. Interestingly, Fr. Burns notes several times the sympathy that some of the military felt for the Indians and their cause. Not a few realized what was being taken from the Indian and what he was being left with, and simply remarked that if he were an Indian he would fight too.

Unfortunately most of the military shared the same prejudices and desires as the settlers. They certainly applied the same double standard; if a white man killed an Indian, that was one thing, but if an Indian killed a white man, that was a hanging offense. Again and again when some group of Indians was finally driven to rebel, the terms of peace would inevitably mean death for the Indians who had killed. It is to the Jesuits' credit that at times they were able to save some of the Indians from this fate by arranging for peace on more humane terms.

The story told by Fr. Burns begins with the era of expansion, the age of Manifest Destiny, and ends with the suppression of the revolt led by Chief Joseph who had endured much in his loyalty to the white man. The period covered has great significance since it centers around the Civil War which itself was fought, at least in part, because of the inhuman condition of one minority group in America. It is perhaps symbolic that as our story ends in 1877, so too this period is marked with the abandonment of the Negro people to a segregated life, with the rise of blatant and vociferous anti-oriental movements, and the large scale development of reservations for the Indians, or as they have been better called, "human zoos."

In summary this book depicts a side of American history that is too little known or taught among the American people. It is a part of our tragic inheritance, and we should be aware of it in our dealings today with the various groups we meet. It was America's claim that she was

bringing civilization and order and human values to a group of savages. Two quotations from Fr. Burns' book serve as an apt comment on this tendency towards self-righteousness.

In the 1880's the city of Spokane issued a promotional pamphlet which answered various rhetorical questions on the value of settling there. One such question was: "Have you any Indians and are they troublesome? It returns the reassuring answer: Only a few and they are not troublesome; all of them will soon be removed to reservations remote from us."

In contrast with this a Kettle Indian chief, Michael, wrote a letter after the mission among his people had been closed. The letter, addressed to the "Blackrobe head chief," apologized for the poor showing the Kettles had made as Christians and appeals for more priests with the simple words; "Our souls are as precious as those of the whites; Jesus Christ died for us as well." It is to the great credit of the Jesuits and other missionaries in the story that they answered this appeal with all that they had and were at a time when few were willing to admit the very basis of the appeal. It is their story that Father Burns has ably told.

THOMAS E. MORRISSEY, S.J.

SELECTED READINGS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

(Listing prepared and commented upon by Michael P. Sheridan, S.J., who has a Ph.D. in higher education from the University of Chicago.)

The Catholic college

Church-Sponsored Higher Education. *By Manning M. Patillo, Jr. and Donald M. Mackenzie.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. xix + 309. \$6.00.

This is the final and greatly expanded version of the report of the Danforth Commission on Church Colleges and Universities. The report is a thorough one, covering in detail those aspects of church-related institutions of higher education which differentiate them from others, as well as some topics equally applicable to all colleges and universities. Since the Danforth Commission was composed mainly of educators committed to church-related higher education, one might have expected something of a eulogy; but the Commission did no such thing. Problems are cited accurately and weaknesses are pointed out, just as significant progressive moves are singled out for commendation. Catholic institutions are cited for their peculiar problems, notably the proliferation of small women's

colleges and the poor financial support given them by the Church itself. The lack of innovative thinking regarding campus liturgical life is likewise brought forth as a problem area. If the conclusions and recommendations of the Commission are taken to heart, church-related higher education stands a chance of enjoying a more prosperous future than is usually predicted.

The Education of Catholic Americans. *By Andrew M. Greeley and Peter H. Rossi.* Chicago: Aldine, 1966. Pp. xxii + 328. \$8.95.

The highly-publicized "Greeley-Rossi Report" has been used by both sides of the dispute on the value of Catholic education, since its comprehensive nature allows one to extract data and conclusions either in favor of or hostile to the notion of Catholic education. And yet surprisingly few educators have taken the time to go through the entire work, relying instead on some painfully inaccurate press reports. Since the work is above all a scientific study of the effects of Catholic education insofar as they are measurable, it is not (nor was it intended to be) an apology for either position in the great dispute. Much of the data indicates strong points in Catholic education; much of it puts the weaknesses into painfully obvious perspective. In a final chapter, the authors do offer some interpretation of their data which is open to dispute; but it is essential to be familiar with the precise nature of the data cited. It is all in the book, and should be read *in toto* by any educator sincerely interested in his work.

Student personnel

The College and the Student. *Edited by Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman.* Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. xv + 390. \$6.00.

This collection of papers from the 1965 national meeting of the American Council on Education deals with the topic of the contemporary college student. In very recent years, the student and his environment have become the focus of attention not only for the general public, but also for social scientists. In the volume, some of the important names within this genus of sociological study are represented, especially C. Robert Pace and Theodore M. Newcomb. Historian Frederick Rudolph has contributed a singularly valuable paper tracing the historical development of the universities' concern—or lack of it—for the student. Other papers deal with academic freedom and the student; the presentation of E. G. Williamson and John L. Cowan is noteworthy. All in all some forty-six papers are collected, and almost every one deserves serious reading and consideration.

College Peer Groups. Edited by Theodore M. Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson. Chicago: Aldine, 1966. Pp. x + 303. \$7.95.

This book may well be the most important contribution to the literature on the college student since the publication of *The American College* in 1962. Newcomb himself is one of the pioneers in this increasingly important field of study, and his essay, "The General Nature of Peer Group Influence," is another important article for anyone familiar with these matters. The essay of Burton Clark and Martin Trow, "The Organizational Context," will be illuminating even to those who have not had the opportunity to read extensively in this literature. Prospective readers should be warned that some of the essays are extremely technical, dealing with research methodology. But even when these chapters are left alone, the lay reader will gain much by a careful reading of the rest of the book. The relevance of such studies is of obvious import for Catholic higher education, since Catholic colleges are much concerned with the student's personal espousal of a value system. And since the facts show that the student environment has a great deal to do with the formation of a personal value system, Catholic colleges will have to begin giving much more serious consideration to the campus environment. Thus, books such as this will become increasingly important for Catholic educators.

Proceedings of the JEA Workshop on Jesuit Student Personnel Programs and Services. Edited by G. Gordon Henderson, S.J. New York: Jesuit Educational Association, 1965. Pp. xii + 588. \$4.00.

It could well be that this set of proceedings will suffer the fate of many others, namely, resting undisturbed in the office of some Jesuit administrator. Or the title may lead some Jesuits to believe that it is material for those working in student personnel work only. Either eventuality would be tragic, for there is a great deal in the volume by specialists (both Jesuit and non-Jesuit) of interest to all educators. In particular, the papers by Dana Farnsworth, Andrew Greeley, Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J., and Robert J. McNamara, S.J. deserve reading. Here too the emphasis is on the problems of the student, with special attention given to the problems of the Catholic college student and even the Jesuit college student.

Student Culture. By Walter L. Wallace. Chicago: Aldine, 1966. Pp. xxi + 236. \$6.95.

This book is also concerned with the question of the student and his environment. It may be too technical for the reader without any background in the empirical social sciences, but it is significant enough to warrant an attempt. Such problems as grades-orientation, socialization

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

and fraternities, and aspiration to graduate studies are examined. In general, conclusions are not startling, nor are they always expressed in language sufficiently non-technical for the layman to grasp. But this should not vitiate the worth of the book.

Curriculum and faculty

The Contemporary University: U. S. A. Edited by Robert S. Morison.
Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966. Pp. xvi + 364. \$6.50.

This book originally appeared as the Fall, 1964, number of *Daedulus*, and as such it was noted in a bibliography published in WOODSTOCK LETTERS in Fall of 1965. However, with its publication in book form, four new essays have been incorporated, all of them good but two worthy of special note. "On Judging Faculty" by Stephen Orgel and Alex Zverdling is an excellent study of the always difficult problem of assessing the worth of a faculty, and "The Faces in the Lecture Room" by Kenneth Keniston is a good analysis of the types of students found in the contemporary university. Keniston's essay received a good bit of attention in the popular press; it is open to argument as any typology usually is but is nevertheless incisive. The four new entries justify acquisition of the book, even if a copy of *Daedulus* is already on hand.

An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. By Allan M. Cartter.
Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966. Pp. xvi + 131. \$3.00.

When the Cartter Study appeared during 1966, it very quickly made national news. And justifiably so, since it is the first attempt at a comparative evaluation of departments of instruction among American universities. In twenty-nine different academic disciplines, the departments of American universities are rated according to the quality of the graduate faculty and according to the effectiveness of the graduate program. There are many inherent dangers in an approach like Cartter's, and he is quick to acknowledge them. In fact, it is most important to insist upon a reading of his introduction before going into the body of the work so that sufficient perspective is gained. The showing of Catholic higher education in this study is interesting. Only a very few departments from Catholic institutions make any of the lists; this has already been interpreted in completely different ways. It may well be that fifteen years ago no Catholic school would have made it, and in that case some significant progress has taken place. Or it may be that the poor showing of Catholic higher education is cause for some serious thought.

The Reforming of General Education. By Daniel Bell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966. Pp. xvi + 320. \$6.95.

Good books on the subject of the college curriculum are rare; since Freeman Butts published his book *The College Charts its Course* in the 1930's (the book is now out of print) there have been very few good studies. Bell's book, which won the American Council on Education award this year for the most important book in the field of higher education, is concerned primarily with the curriculum reform at Columbia University. But his actual perspective is far broader, and the result is a book which is both interesting and instructive. The problems which faced Columbia have a certain universal aspect, and any university concerned with curriculum renewal will face variations of Columbia's difficulties.

The Emergence of the American University. By Laurence R. Veysey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965. Pp. xiv + 505. \$10.00.

There are only a few scholarly histories of American higher education available today; Veysey's is the most recent and probably the most scholarly. Little more need be said about it, except that scant attention is given to the development of Catholic higher education. This flaw is not, however, serious enough to discredit the entire work.

Two new periodicals have appeared on the market this year, both of them using newspaper formats. The first, *The Collegiate Compendium*, appears weekly during the school year and features articles reprinted from college student papers all over the country. While the layout and typography are poor, the paper gives the reader a good chance to find out what subjects are currently under discussion on the nation's campuses and to ascertain what the mood of college students is on these issues. (\$5.00 per year introductory; \$7.50 per year regular. P.O. Box 152, Darby, Pennsylvania 19023). Aided by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, Editorial Projects for Education has begun to publish *The Chronicle of Higher Education* biweekly from September through May and monthly during the summer. The paper is well put together, and offers straight reporting on the developments within higher education as well as on other matters having any import on higher education. *The Chronicle* appears to offer the best means of keeping up with pertinent news in the field. (The address: 3301 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21218. \$10.00 per year.)



FERDINAND C. WHEELER, S.J. (1885-1965)

SATURDAY, September 18, 1965, was the kind of autumn day alumni promotion offices dream about for their homecoming weekends. At Woodstock in the late morning hours of that day, a crowd of several hundred persons gathered around a freshly dug grave in the college cemetery. It was a typical Jesuit funeral. The surpliced group was almost universally stoic, the choir sang the Benedictus, and in a few minutes the brief, subdued rites had been completed. But to at least one observer among the mourners, it was not just a typical funeral; it was closer to say that it was the end of such funerals.

There are no calendar days in history when one age neatly ends and another begins, but if there were, this mild Saturday would have been one of them. For in burying Ferdinand Wheeler, we had buried the outstanding figure of an earlier Society—a pre-Conciliar, pre-Congregational Society that in a real sense stretched its roots back to the colonial days at St. Inigoes and Port Tobacco.

Beginnings

His family was among the oldest in Maryland, tracing almost as far back as the Society's origin on the Atlantic seaboard. In 1720 Benjamin Wheeler had already established himself sufficiently as one of the landed gentry in Prince George's County to have 2514 acres of land deeded to him in the then Baltimore County, nine years later to be incorporated as Baltimore City.¹ A century later, Leonard Wheeler, the great-great-grandfather of Fr. Wheeler, helped finance the Basilica of the Assumption for Archbishop John Carroll, an intimate friend who frequently visited the Wheelers. Leonard enrolled his son in the first class at the newly opened St. Mary's College on Paca Street. While there the second Leonard Wheeler became a very close friend of Fr. John David, a Jesuit professor at the College (actually a high school),

¹ Woodstock Archives, IIF 36 (382).

who later was named Coadjutor Bishop under Bishop Flaget at Bardstown, Kentucky. The two kept up their college friendship over the years, and Leonard Wheeler named a son after the Jesuit. This began a succession of John David Wheelers, including the son of the first-named who started work as a cashier at the Mechanic's Bank at Fayette and Eutaw in Baltimore. John David Wheeler was a persistent worker who set rigid standards for himself while not expecting the same of others. Once he spent three years in his off-time to find three cents that would not balance out on the books. He found it. Such determination carried him to better positions in the banking community. He became a general roving official for the First National of Baltimore, specializing in trouble-shooting situations. His biggest accomplishment was the fiscal rescue of the First National at Leonardtown in southern Maryland when that bank was on the brink of bankruptcy.

John Wheeler and his wife were then living on the western edge of the city in St. Martin's parish, a few blocks from where H. L. Mencken would later cavil as the Sage of Baltimore. There on October 12, 1885, a third son was born to them, the fifth of seven children. They named the boy Ferdinand Chatard, after his maternal grandfather, a well-known physician throughout Baltimore.

The next thirteen years happily passed for the Wheeler family of West End. Ferdinand attended St. Martin's school on Fulton Avenue, as his older brothers had before him. When he graduated from St. Martin's it was only natural to follow his brothers downtown to Loyola High School on Calvert Street. In September 1898, when the country was still jubilant about the outcome of the Spanish-American War, young Ferdinand settled into a first year desk at Loyola. He was growing rapidly. A picture survives from his sophomore year, showing him as a tall, lanky warrior in the school production of *Sebastian*. By his senior year he had decided to become a Jesuit. His older brother Dave had already entered the Order four years before. Early on the morning of August 14, 1902, Ferdinand boarded the train for the Jesuit novitiate at Frederick, Maryland.

Novitiate days

The novitiate had been at the western Maryland town since 1834, and his was the last group to enter there. Already ground had been purchased outside Poughkeepsie, New York, and the Frederick property had been sold for \$30,000.² By early January full-scale packing was the order of the day as the novices and juniors loaded railroad boxcars with

² The information about the move to Poughkeepsie comes mainly from the diary of John David Wheeler, S.J.

all the belongings and furnishings they intended to ship north. One of the boxcars was labeled "Explosives, Handle Carefully"!

The last night at Frederick, January 14, David Wheeler noted in his diary that the final reading at table had been from Fr. Rodriguez's treatise on *Modesty and Silence*: "If Julian the apostate had not been born the world would not have become so desolate." The next morning at 4:30 they were up to meet the train at Second Street. At Philadelphia, a broken axle was fortunately discovered by accident, and they made the rest of the trip without incident. As evening came on, they sang hymns in the juniors' cars while they approached the long bridge at Poughkeepsie. With snow on the ground and the temperature below freezing, the scholastics disembarked from the train and walked almost three miles up the pike to their new home. Some of the faculty rode on sleighs.

They found an unfinished St. Andrew's awaiting them. Dave noted nonetheless that "The house is wonderful and surpasses our expectations." A few days later Ferdinand's enthusiasm might have been somewhat checked after he received the first *culpa* in the infant history of the house. The circumstances are not recorded.

But these were happy days in general for Bro. Wheeler. His master of Novices was now Fr. George Pettit, who had been converted by his landlady in Brooklyn. Bro. Wheeler was obviously deeply influenced by the men who were his first spiritual directors. Sixty years later he would still quote his novice masters, particularly Fr. O'Rourke, whom he had had at Frederick, on their ideas concerning the Society and the spiritual life. Even this early he reflected his father's intense capacity for work and his inner toughness against the grinding obstacles of daily living. In a sermon he gave on Ignatius at the end of his first year in the Society he preached of Ignatius what he certainly desired for himself: "Not a life of sluggish inactivity, nor the neglect . . . of human faculties, but a life whose only aim was God—where no thought of self-interest, self-seeking or personal advantage ever marred the holocaust he had made of it, a life the current of whose activities was always in one direction—the spread of God's kingdom."

Yet even in the novitiate the Wheeler stroke of humor and feel for the human situation were already there—or perhaps better, were still there despite the hothouse existence. In one of his first retreats he noted about his high resolves: "All this sounds easy in retreat—how hard in practice! Do your best—it will be bad enough."

The Society is everything

But if Fr. Wheeler set high ideals for himself it all centered around his basic love for the Society. On a personal note, I remember distinctly

a day of recollection he gave to us at Blakefield in his next-to-last year. At a time when the province was becoming acutely aware of a vocational crisis in declining applicants and departing scholastics, he found it very difficult to conceive of reasons why a person should want to leave, not because he didn't see the bald spots on the structure, but because his love and commitment to the Society was so fundamental and consuming. He spoke as earnestly as I ever heard him, urging us to "burn the bridges behind us," and give ourselves completely to what we had been called to.

He was one of those rare people who apparently never did look back. In none of his writings is there any indication that he ever had serious doubts. He had made his decision and now he fully intended to live it. For the rest of his life, he could sympathize with those who had such problems, could be greatly concerned about them, but whenever someone left, one suspects he believed it a disaster, sometimes fathomable, more often not. A year before his death he wrote: "Personally in my seventeen years with Ours in the training period I suffered many shocks—or disappointments. Many whom I approved, whom I looked on as solid and sure of their calling, quit, withdrew. . . . Why? I have never learned, never been able to pinpoint the hidden fault."³ To him a vocation was forever. In that same letter he advised that he would reject everyone who did not have a deep certainty of his calling, "almost as if born to it." His own experience was apparently so convincing that he could set down so high a criterion.

Along with this overriding conviction went a total loyalty to the Society. In trying to describe what constituted the effective, above-average Jesuits he had seen, he also wrote in 1964: "To him the Society is everything, only two things have any value in his estimation: the Church and the Society as the Servant of the Church. Therefore he has great love and affection for the Society—all of Ours—anywhere. He lives, breathes, works for the Society in any capacity and with all his talents—no reservations."⁴

Belgium and social change

He spent three years at St. Andrew's, making his first vows on August 15, 1904. In 1907 he was sent to the College of St. John Berchmans in Louvain to study philosophy. What could have been three isolated and trying years in an alien community far from the customs of St. Andrew's and even farther from the milieu of Baltimore, turned out to be three

³ Rough draft of a letter sent in February 1964 to a Jesuit doing research on the psychological testing of candidates to the Society.

⁴ *Ibid.*

productive ones which helped open his eyes to the wider dimensions of the world. He was fortunate in having a rector who was especially kind to Americans and in having Fr. Vermeersch as his spiritual director. He became involved in the social work which Jesuits were doing in Belgium; then as now Europe was generally ahead of this country in its social thinking and practices, both in ecclesiastical and government circles. It was perhaps his Belgium experience which first exposed him to the concept of social change and all it involved, a concept which would become more and more pressing as the century spurred on. In an article in the 1910 edition of *WOODSTOCK LETTERS*, Mr. Wheeler described the various programs in operation, including forming unions of the industrial and agricultural populations, starting co-operative savings banks or dairies, insuring livestock, running evening schools for workers, opening libraries, etc., It was very much like the work that the mid-western Progressives were doing at this time in their non-political operations. But the whole effort in Catholic Belgium was to win back the workingman who, unlike the immigrant in America, had not stayed in the Church. He often visited the community social centers, either to give religious instructions, to lecture, or simply to be there.⁵

Back to America

Then it was back to America in 1910 to teach at Brooklyn Prep. After four years there, he moved north to Worcester as a classics instructor at Holy Cross. In June, 1915 he returned to Maryland to begin his theology at Woodstock, where he would spend eighteen years as a theologian and official. It was a place he grew to like very deeply. The war years were spent in making final preparations for the priesthood. About the only bit of his writing which remains from those years is a brief jotting he made one Christmas. "Our Lord," he thought, "should be a reality in our lives like [*sic*] Santa Claus was when we were children." There was always much of this simple childlike trust in Christ and acceptance of Him, even while having a very hard-nosed attitude about other realities in life.

Finally on May 18, 1918 he was ordained by Cardinal Gibbons at Woodstock. A year later the war was over and Fr. Wheeler was back on the Hudson for his tertianship at St. Andrew's. The following June he finished the course of training, something he always held in great respect. Seventeen years had passed since Ferdinand Wheeler had left Baltimore for Frederick.

Ferd was the third Wheeler to become a priest. Dave and Tom had

⁵ "Social Work of Ours in Belgium," *WOODSTOCK LETTERS*, 39 (1910), p. 365.

preceded him, the former as a Jesuit and the latter as a diocesan. Dave spent most of his post-ordination years at Holy Cross where he died in 1935; Tom went on to serve as Pastor at the Shrine of the Little Flower in Baltimore. A third brother, Louis, was also a Jesuit by this time and would become the fourth priest in the family in a few years. Frank, Ferd's closest brother in his St. Martin's days, had married and eventually moved west to Kansas City. The two girls, Rachel and Helen, also married. It was a fiercely independent but close-knit family. That they were all strongly different and that they were widely separated for most of their long lives only seemed to tighten the bonds.

The two worlds of Jamaica

Fr. Wheeler's first assignment took him far from Baltimore. He was to be Headmaster at St. George's College in Kingston, Jamaica. The College was really a high school-upper grammar school complex, since the curriculum was based on the Cambridge system. In place of the normal Greek courses of the period there was a heavy emphasis on mathematics with arithmetic and algebra being taught for five years and geometry for four years. In addition there were scripture courses.⁶ This experience with a different and more advanced educational system likewise had long range broadening effects upon Fr. Wheeler's thinking.

In 1923, he volunteered for the difficult missions of Savannah-la-Mar. This covered an area of seven outposts, which were reached by horseback. It was a depressed area, according to any index. In that year the missionary wrote to his friends in the States:

There is a cry of wailing going up to heaven from this mission—and it pierces the heart of God. It is the cry of hundreds of children baptized as Catholics in their poor little homes in the valleys and on the mountain side; but now they have no school in which their faith is taught, they have no church in which they may receive the sacraments. With long periods of drought, crops have failed, and in some parts of St. Elizabeth's poverty is appalling; the people have been kept alive by Government appropriations.⁷

From those Jamaica days, he kept one sermon delivered on New Year's Eve in 1922. Fittingly enough, its topic is suffering. He saw a great deal of it during those years, yet his message to his people could still be: "Trust God in season, out of season, trust God in good and ill, be grateful to Him for His care of us, rely on His goodness and God will never forsake you." Those words could not have come easily amid such circumstances as prevailed in pretourist Jamaica. But such words must

⁶ David J. Moran, S.J., "St. George's College," WOODSTOCK LETTERS, 55 (1926) 50-56.

⁷ Woodstock Archives, IIF 36 (382).

have struck home because he was beloved by the natives. Bishop John McElenry, later asked him to return to help untangle a difficult situation among a group of native nuns. That the situation turned out favorably is evidence that he was deeply respected among the native Catholic population. It was also borne out by the number of native vocations that were attributed to his incentive. In fact, he was at one point under serious consideration as a possible bishop for the island.

The Blakefield years: Part I

After seven years in the Caribbean, he returned in August, 1927 to serve as minister at St. Ignatius' in New York and at Woodstock before being named rector at St. Ignatius' in Baltimore. Loyola High School was still part of the parish, but already plans were being considered for moving the school out of the downtown area. Loyola College had moved out to Evergreen a few years before. In fact, St. Ignatius' already possessed property in northern Baltimore, to be used for a future Loyola High. Nevertheless, Fr. Wheeler was at Calvert Street only a short time when he became convinced that the high school should move farther out than the acquired site. What he had in mind was a country-day school set-up with a large campus that would provide unexcelled facilities for students.

Over the protests of many influential voices in the province, he began searching for such a site. He finally came upon one slightly over a mile from Towson. He loved to tell the story years later of his first visit to what was then the Jackson estate. It was a raw, overcast day as he drove up to the former Governor's mansion. He was admitted to the drawing room where the Governor's widow heard out his possible interest in the property. The old lady was rather non-committal. She seemed somewhat amiss at the prospect of her estate becoming a Catholic school. But she consented to show him the property and as they walked through the rose gardens and looked south from the colonnaded porch over the rolling lawns along Joppa Road, the possibilities of the place began to materialize in his mind. This was just what Loyola High needed.

Convincing the powers of the province of the same need, however, was a further story. It seemed a terribly remote location. There was no public transportation within a mile of the place. It would cost a great deal of money simply for the grounds, not to mention the building. The prospect of raising money during a depression hardly seemed substantial. Why not be satisfied with the Homewood location that the province already owned?

If there was anything that Fr. Wheeler was, it was persistent. He kept to his insistence on the Jackson site. The George Blake and Thomas

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

O'Neill families came up with the benefactors to realize this plan. The Blake sisters financed the building the O'Neills purchased the land, and by 1934 the upper classes had moved out to Blakefield, the new name for the thirty-seven acre campus. Actually, Fr. Wheeler always thought that the grounds should have more appropriately been named for the O'Neills, even though he later became very close to the Blake sisters.

Whether the move to Towson was a sound one is still a debatable question. It is true that the high school drew students from a wider geographical distribution when it was downtown. It is probably also true that the location has given Loyola somewhat the reputation of a "rich boys' school." But it is fair to point out that moving schools from the downtown areas to the suburbs has become the general pattern in American private education and in this regard Fr. Wheeler was twenty years in front of the field. Secondly, there is no doubt that the Blakefield campus boasts one of the most attractive high school plants in the country, offering almost unlimited facilities. Today, in a more social-minded age, it is close to major expressways so that it is both accessible from all parts of the city and only minutes from social apostolates in the inner city. In general, it seems that his vision has proved true.

Minister at Woodstock

By 1936 Loyola was beginning its second building at Blakefield as Fr. Wheeler's term as Rector concluded. For the second time he was returning to Woodstock as Minister. He was obviously pleased to be back. Many of the scholastics who had been under him as Philosophers were now on the other side of the house as Theologians. To mark the occasion of his return, there were first class haustuses for both the Theologians and Philosophers, certainly a rare reason for a celebration in the annals of Woodstock.⁸ In some ways he was most at home at Woodstock, perhaps because of its manorial set-up and patriarchal hierarchy. He liked nothing better than being a father to Ours. In a paternally governed Society he represented its finest conception of a superior. As one who lived under him commented at his death: "He seemed the embodiment of those young days at Woodstock."

He was honestly concerned about every man under him. At times it probably seemed he was too concerned. Every morning he was on the corridors, checking to see what was going on. He had an extraordinary memory. It was said that he knew where every piece of furniture in the house belonged and could immediately spot an article out of place. At night he always seemed to know what time every car came in and who was in it. One man who knew him well then has said: "He couldn't

⁸ Minister's Diary, September 30, 1936; October 4, 1936.

bear not knowing what was going on, but he didn't do anything about it." He simply felt it his responsibility for the men under him to have his hand on every situation so that no one got hurt—either the individual or the community. Fr. Wheeler started out with the uncluttered conviction that each scholastic under him was a son to be worried about and cared for, to be corrected and encouraged as the situation demanded. He was paternal, but never high-handed. He would call down an individual, then go out of his way later to let him know that nothing remained on the boards. If he failed, it was a failure of excess.

No one was more a man for others than he was. If someone was hospitalized in Baltimore, he made the fifty mile round trip every day to see them. He was constantly worrying about how many were coming down with the flu or colds or whatever it might be. The pages of his diary tell of numerous incidents in which his concern for scholastics is apparent, whether it be health problems or family troubles or whatever. Every week he would delight in recording how many were out on picnics or walks. Whatever he did, whether it was blessing the swinging bridge which the scholastics built over the Patapsco or sitting by a theologian after an appendectomy or worrying in his diary over the mother of a philosopher who had disappeared during a flood or tracking down an illegal radio—to him it was all the same.

The great isolation

These were the days of the Great Isolation at Woodstock. Scholastics seldom got off the grounds except for trips to the doctor on Thursday. Nor did the world come to Woodstock. The Georgetown and Fordham Glee Clubs gave annual concerts at the College. There was an occasional movie. March 1, 1937 was long remembered as the day Hillaire Belloc came to Woodstock. The venerable English author lectured on "Catholicism and Civilization" for an hour, remarked that the view was the most breathtaking he had ever witnessed, then left for Washington shortly afterwards.⁹ Seen against this monastic existence, Fr. Wheeler's fatherly bearing toward those under him was the natural part of a much larger pattern. What is more important is not that he assumed such a role, but that he lived it so well.

One of his yearly highlights at Woodstock was Christmas. Laurel Days were still in vogue and all the preparations for Christmas obviously gave him great satisfaction. In his last years at Blakefield he would find Christmas one of the loneliest days of the year. A younger man would have suggested that he visit some friends or relatives like everyone else, but to the Wheeler mind, this was not how Christmas in the

⁹ *Ibid.*, April 1, 1937.

Society should be spent. To him the ideal Christmas was always the one shared by a large community. He was really very sentimental about it. His first Christmas back at Woodstock, he noted in the diary on January 2: "Saddest day of the year—the taking down of decorations—and rain, rain, rain."

The highpoint of his Woodstock year was always Ordinations. This he thought should be the time when the community should be at its altruistic best. Every year a massive cleaning operation began to get the old place into perfect shape for the sacred ceremonies. Task forces were minutely organized to scour the grounds, wash windows, set up temporary sleeping quarters, polish floors, wipe down corridor walls. It wasn't just a matter of making the house presentable for visitors. Every spot in and off cloister had to be inspection-ready. It was not a fetish for cleanliness, but rather a simple gesture to those being ordained. As he pointed out on one of his worksheets, "our tribute to the ordinandi consists in preparing the house for their ordination. In a few years others will be doing the same for those who follow." It hurt him whenever he found out that some people did not take part in the project.¹⁰

There were certain days which he especially connected with the Society. One of these was ordination. Another were jubilee celebrations. He wrote effusively about the Triple Jubilee celebration of Fr. John Brosnan in October, 1939, declaring that it was the "greatest show Woodstock ever had." That a man had served the Society for so long gave him great satisfaction.¹¹

Despite the confining atmosphere of Woodstock, his vision never stopped at its gates. Alluding to the Spanish Civil War during a retreat in the late Thirties, he cautioned that "Many a . . . Christian has discovered in these tragic months the inestimable value of a religion which meant little to him when it cost little but which has meant everything in the days when it has demanded everything." In 1940, the scholastics registered for the draft. In November of that year, they were given permission to listen to the Roosevelt-Willkie election returns until 11:30 P.M. with an accompanying note from the Minister. "No victrola please. Just the returns, if any, on the radio. No singing. No piano." Then the typical Wheeler compensation after some negative remarks: "Light haustus at 9:30 P.M."¹²

On December 8 he tersely noted in the official diary: "Congress declared war on Japan at 1 p.m. [sic] today." The next day there were

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, June 15, 1938.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, October 12, 1939.

¹² *Ibid.*, November 5, 1940.

many rumors afloat that enemy planes had been sighted in the area. The community listened to President Roosevelt's broadcast that evening.

The Scranton interim

On July 7, 1942 Fathers Wheeler and Coleman Nevils stood waiting for a taxi at the train station in a humid Scranton. They had come to administer the University with which the Society had just been entrusted by the Bishop. The school had long been a losing proposition and with the war on, the future looked even worse. They moved into the Scranton Estate, which was now merely a magnificent shell. Only a few items of furniture had been left behind by the city's leading family. Things in general were rather chaotic. The accelerated wartime session had already begun. Fr. Wheeler's first task as minister of the new community was to furnish and renovate the quarters. Many layers of peeling wallpaper had to be scraped off. Plastic utensils from a five and dime store were the only ones available. Somehow he managed to track down a refrigerator which had not been frozen by government regulations.¹³

A larger problem was the general condition of the University. There were too many scholarships being given out by a bankrupt school. Tuitions had a disturbing tendency to go unpaid. The college buildings were shabby or inadequate. Slowly an improvement program began, even though they never knew how many students they would have the next day nor where the next lumber was coming from for their building improvements. Two years later Fr. Wheeler wrote: "Just how we succeeded in getting materials and persuading officers to let us do it in this age of priorities will always be a wonder."¹⁴ Needed repairs and additions were made and for the first time the University was operating at a favorable economic balance. What put the new administration across was its trust in the future of Scranton. "It acted like a tonic on the citizens," he wrote. "Business men not of our faith welcomed us gladly and enthusiastically and openly proclaimed that our coming to Scranton was the greatest thing that had happened in years for Scranton's good."¹⁵ That the first Jesuits there could have given risen to such a conviction may well be greatly responsible for the University's current position as a major economic factor in the city.

¹³ Ferdinand C. Wheeler, S.J., "Scranton University: The Beginnings and First Year," WOODSTOCK LETTERS, 73 (1944), p. 109.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

Rector at Woodstock

Once the community was established at Scranton, Fr. Wheeler moved downstate the following year to become rector at Wernersville. Then in 1945 on the feast of the North American Martyrs he was read in as the sixteenth rector of Woodstock. With the war having ended a month before, the whole community celebrated his installation at a special dinner. The Woodstock orchestra serenaded with a program including "It's a Grand Old Flag," "Boogie-Woogie Concerto," and "Could It Be You?"¹⁶

Little had changed at Woodstock in three years, except for the German prisoners of war who were working on the farm and in the kitchen. Fr. Wheeler as rector was probably less successful than he had been as Minister. Some thought the fault was that he was still acting like a Minister; others found him too easy on the scholastics. In this latter regard he was more than likely ahead of his time in superior-subject relations. Not only did he anticipate later developments by believing that local superiors should handle their own problems but he was coming to see that the individual eventually has to be responsible for his own actions. He would later tell a group of scholastics: "In the Society, no one is going to carry us along on his shoulders; we have to walk and stand—on our own feet."

Yet in many ways he was still the benevolent father, personally bringing a bottle of wine for a group cleaning the pool, going on picnics with the philosophers, ruling out television as a waste of time, standing by a theologian who had gotten into personal difficulties. But he could be tough when the situation arose. Once a foreign student repeatedly refused to obey an order and challenged him to do anything about it. The next morning the scholastic was not only out of the house but on his way out of the country as well.

He looked distinguished now with fine shocks of white hair pressed back by rimless glasses. Although sixty, he was still as robust as ever. He continued to wear two reminders of an earlier age, his neck-watch piece, which he tucked inside his habit, and high-buttoned shoes. None of this kept him from showing up in the kitchen on holidays to relieve the help by washing the dishes himself. Nor did it prevent him from being personally interested in the welfare of the brothers in the community. In many ways he was an aristocrat who wasn't afraid to fit into any situation.

Not only was he far-sighted regarding the brothers. He proposed lifting cloister from portions of the house twenty years before it finally

¹⁶ Minister's Diary, October 18, 1945.

took place. In 1947 he traveled to Hagerstown with a minister and a rabbi to speak on Brotherhood week. Still he could have his blind spots about certain things and once his mind was made up, nothing short of the provincial was liable to shake him. The television question was one such spot. Even here he started out with a good idea: that most of the programs were trash.

His health was good during those years. There was only that one sleepless night in April, 1951 toward the end of his second term when he wondered what was causing so much pain. Twelve days later it was necessary to remove his gall bladder. He returned to Woodstock a few weeks later where hundreds of Jesuits and a band greeted him with flourish.

For most of the fifties he was again at St. Ignatius on Calvert Street, becoming rector there in 1952. It was here that he first gained his interest in baseball. Ironically enough it was probably television, as much as the fact that the Orioles were now back in the major leagues, that created this interest. For the rest of his life he was an avid fan. It gave him increasing relaxation to smoke his pipe and watch or listen to games at night. Once or twice a year he would go out to Memorial Stadium. Even in his next-to-last year when heart attacks had weakened him a great deal, he took in a night game with some of the regents. When he announced that he wanted to sit in the upper deck, the scholastics wondered how soon they would be carrying him out, but he headed straight for a private elevator, got out on the upper level and led the way to a lower-row seat. Then he proceeded to smoke his pipe for the entire nine innings, except for a seventh-inning stretch with a cigar. The non-smoking scholastic next to him felt he had sat through a double-header.

Blakefield years: Part II

His last assignment was fittingly to Blakefield. For seven years he was spiritual father for the scholastics. He continued to work at a staggering rate for a man well over seventy. Besides the community at Blakefield, he gave monthly exhortations to various convents in the area. It would have been a prudent enough measure to pull out some old talks he kept in his files. But he labored over the texts, usually beginning with extensive rough drafts. Some of his best talks came in these last years.

He continued to stay in contact with those he had come to know during the past seventy years. He was forever writing letters. Although he could no longer drive, he seemed to be out on the road every day, visiting shut-ins or old friends. One dying Jesuit had asked Fr. Wheeler if he would occasionally visit his sister who lived in Silver Spring. Until

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

he was too weak to travel anywhere, he faithfully made the trip to see the sister.

Every Saturday he would go down to St. Ignatius to hear confessions and be available. I remember one Christmas week driving him around northern Baltimore to deliver Christmas gifts—they had been given to him originally—to several old people in need. How much he sent to how many people probably only he knew.

Inside a folder of notes on the role of a Spiritual Father, he had penciled the words: "Availability-approachability." His door was always open and he was always in his room at night. He was a good listener. He claimed that he no longer understood the new generation but he likely understood better than most men thirty years younger. Most of all, however, his genuine interest in anyone who walked in his door still came through. His memory had not left him. You could mention that your sister expected a difficult birth and weeks later he would tell you he was saying a Mass for her.

"Enthusiasm is the spirit of our age," he commented at the end of the fifties, "and we need men of enthusiasm."¹⁷ He greeted Vatican II as a welcome sign for the future. His life-long trust in both the Church and the Society, together with his experiences abroad, enabled him to accept the notion of change graciously. Change is of the essence of life, he said in a talk in 1963, but changes must only be in external things, not in "our interior spirit of love and loyalty to the ideals of the Church and of our Society." He gladly endorsed the liturgical innovations. He read with approval the new religion texts for high schools. He thought that younger men should somehow be represented at provincial congregations. But he had little sympathy with those who questioned authority. In an exhortation he pleaded:

Stop blaming the Society, stop blaming the courses we had, the training we got. Stop blaming the professors who taught us. Cease blaming superiors who ruled us; put the blame exactly where it should be put. Put the blame on yourself and your own continued failure to get on the job and do it.¹⁸

The trouble with those who constantly carped about conditions in the Society, as he saw it, was that they "become shrivelled and . . . end up retarded Jesuits, half-destroyed, underdeveloped, inept in God's service."

On the Tuesday before he died, Fr. Wheeler mentioned to a scholastic who had stopped by to see him that the Society had to change and that the changes the Society was undergoing were good. But he

¹⁷ Exhortation given in 1959.

¹⁸ Undated exhortation, most probably given in 1960.

steadily believed that the basic institutions of the Society could not change without the Society ceasing to be what it was meant to be. He once heard that some religious groups were asking for non-Jesuits for their retreats because certain Jesuits had given them "some sort of spiritual diet—absolutely alien to the Exercises of St. Ignatius. We gain nothing when we give up our system," he went on. "We fail when we do not live it. We become so much sounding brass."¹⁹

The end

Gradually, as failing health almost imperceptively cut down on his activity, he found another tension developing besides that of change. He wanted to continue to make a contribution in the house but felt less and less capable of it. He would talk about getting someone else to give the fall triduum while really wanting to give it himself. The same was true of his outside activities. He began to feel more and more outside the mainstream of the community's activity. Then in September, 1964, he suffered a severe heart attack. He had previously been having occasional blackouts. After several weeks in the hospital, he returned home, looking scarcely the worse for the long convalescence. Christmas week seemed to bring him back even stronger. That Saturday night he sat in the recreation room at haustus with his nephew Tom and a few others, reminiscing on earlier days in the Society in his gravely humorous fashion. The next day while he was watching the Colts-Browns championship game on television, he was stricken again. This time it was decided that only by attaching a pacemaker to his heart was there any hope for his living a normal life for any time. He finally consented to the operation.

He lived for approximately seven months afterwards. He never experienced any more blackouts but his general system apparently could not adjust to the artificial stimulant within him. He slowly got weaker and weaker. He continued to send letters but now they had to be dictated. The day before he died, he was semi-conscious when a group of scholastics from Woodstock came over to see him. When he heard "Woodstock," he raised himself partly up, pointed a bony arm at a pile of books on his desk and said, almost as though he were still rector, "take those books back to Woodstock."

That night he called for his pipe and household matches about three o'clock in the morning. Less than an hour later he died. In one month he would have been eighty.

One Jesuit who knew him well has said that Father Wheeler's great-

¹⁹ Undated exhortation.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

est gift was that he was all things to all men. Perhaps this was his weakness as well as his strength. What will possibly be most remembered about Ferd Wheeler is his love for the Society. The patriarchal, tradition-oriented, rule-centered Society that he symbolized is giving way to one that is heading into a future that is still largely unknown. But if the Society of the Space Age and *The Secular City* can continue to produce men of Ferd Wheeler's type, the resilient faith that he forever kept in her future will have been well put.

R. EMMETT CURRAN, S.J.

WOODSTOCK

LETTERS

SUMMER 1967

VOLUME 96 NUMBER 3

INTRODUCTION

In seeking to articulate the significance of community life, many Jesuits have asked: are we a family? an army? bachelors living in common? Edward F. Heenan, S.J., a graduate student at Boston College, and Francis X. Shea, S.J., a professor of English at Boston College, discuss this problem in terms of small communities.

John G. Milhaven, S.J. teaches moral theology at Woodstock. Charles J. Donnelly, S.J., a fourth year theologian, evaluates the problems and difficulties which foster instability in a theologate.

In 1961, after Sigmund J. Laschenski, S.J. (Maryland Province) had been assigned to the Catholic Major Seminary, Rangoon, he wrote an account of the Burmese mission in WOODSTOCK LETTERS. Again, six years later, he records his mission experiences, explaining why non-Burmese Jesuits have been expelled from that country.

John L'Heureux, S.J. (New England Province) is the author of *Quick as Dandelions* and *Rubrics For a Revolution*.

Few would deny the significant role Jesuit spirituality has had in the Church during the past four hundred years. St. Ignatius bridged the medieval and modern world: his spirituality is not rooted in either period. Ignatian spirituality is characterized by a certain balance which does not impose obligations and restrictions on the individual Jesuit. Since the time of St. Ignatius, General Congregations have passed legislation concerning the prayer life of the Society. Otto Karrer's book on St. Francis Borgia discusses Borgia's influence on the prayer-life of the Society. We are grateful to George W. Traub, S.J., and Walter J. Bado, S.J. for translating a section of Karrer's work.

The Fall Issue of WOODSTOCK LETTERS will be devoted mainly to the topic of religious obedience.

CONTENTS

SUMMER, 1967

INTRODUCTION

- 295 A QUEST FOR RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY • *Edward F. Heenan, S.J.*
- 302 SMALL COMMUNITIES IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS • *Francis X. Shea, S.J.*
- 308 THE WORD: FOR PRIEST AND POET • *John L'Heureux, S.J.*
- 318 CONFERENCE ON ECUMENISM IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS • *Augustin Cardinal Bea, S.J.*
- 330 SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT DURING THEOLOGY • *John G. Milhaven, S.J.*
- 335 THE THEOLOGATE: A CRITIQUE • *Charles J. Donnelly, S.J.*
- 340 BORGIA'S INFLUENCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRAYER-LIFE IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS • *Otto Karrer*
- 365 EXILE FROM BURMA • *Sigmund J. Laschenski, S.J.*

HISTORICAL NOTE

- 389 REMINISCENCES OF FATHER PATRICK DUDDY, S.J. • *R. Emmett Curran, S.J.*

REVIEWS

- 394 XAVIER SPECIALIST • *Robert E. McNally, S.J.*

SELECTED READINGS

- 400 CATECHETICS: A LOOK AT THE NEW TRENDS • *Daniel J. Fitzpatrick, S.J., Kenneth J. Hezel, S.J.*

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

WOODSTOCK LETTERS solicits manuscripts from all Jesuits on all topics of particular interest to fellow Jesuits: Ignatian spirituality, the activities of our various apostolates, problems facing the modern Society, and the history of the Society, particularly in the United States and its missions. In general it is our policy to publish major obituary articles on men whose work would be of interest to the whole assistancy.

Letters of comment and criticism will be welcomed for the Readers' Forum.

Manuscripts, preferably the original copy, should be double-spaced with ample margins. Whenever possible, contributors of articles on Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit history should follow the stylistic norms of the Institute of Jesuit Sources. These are most conveniently found in Supplementary Notes B and C and in the list of abbreviations in Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. W. J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 609-16.

STAFF

Published by the faculty and students of Woodstock College. Editor: Edward J. Mally, S.J. / Managing Editor: Patrick H. Samway, S.J. / Associate Editors: Robert C. Collins, S.J., James P. Jurich, S.J., R. Emmett Curran, S.J., Michael C. Reilly, S.J., Edward F. Salmon, S.J., Raymond A. Schroth, S.J., Richard A. Blake, S.J., Peter D. Fordi, S.J., Richard P. Kane, S.J. / Book Editor: Kenneth DeLuca, S.J. / Business Manager: Paul L. Horgan, S.J.

A QUEST FOR RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY

for effective and creative lives

EDWARD F. HEENAN, S.J.

IN EVERY AGE there are certain pivotal words which by their use and constant redefinition mark the distinctive and important channels of thought in that particular age. These words reflect the temper of a collective mind, and by means of their symbolic value, both condition the outcome of thought and become the initiators and elicitors of further thought. In medieval times such words as "family," "guild," "church," and "group" must have been of particular significance. In the 19th century the key words would have been "individual," "progress," "reason," and "freedom." Finally the words which best typify today's complexity and ambivalence might be demonstrated by the popularity of two sets of words denoting opposing concepts. Words such as "alienation," "insecurity," and "disintegration" exist alongside a profound regard for the cultural values of "status," "membership," "fellowship," and "community." The apparent juxtaposition is enlightening because it reveals the fact that presently community is referred to in terms of a cure for an excessive, debilitating, and almost suicidal individualism. Our culture seeks a balance between the community and the individual. In general, during the Middle Ages the cultural commitment seemed to have been heavily on the side of an all-embracing community without a great deal of recognition or concern for the individual and his freedom. In the 19th century the opposite extreme prevailed: emancipation of the individual from an irrational

status. At the present time we seem to be poised near the center of the continuum. While we have a residual commitment to the value and dignity of the individual, we also realize the salvific value of community.

A practical concept of community

If business, medicine, education, the military, and mass media might be used as indicators for today's society, the concept of community and the quest for the actualization of that concept are taking a new and unique form. In the small specialized task groups of large corporations, in the adept special forces units in the army, in educational and medical research teams, and in television programs such as "Mission Impossible," we are being exposed to a new type of community, a new solution to the antithesis between the individual and communal life. The reason why such small communities are unique is that in each case the individual is integrated into the community at the apogee of his creativity and individuality. Each of the members of the group is selected as a unit in the system because he has something distinctive to contribute to the group and to the achievement of its goal. The members are all specialists in a particular area and, therefore, are dependent on other members for the supplementation of their own speciality. In short, the perennial tension between the individual and the community is today resolved in small primary groups composed of specialists, who in the fulfillment of a specific task achieve a certain type of community with a minimal submersion of individuality.

Religious community

In religious life the key words which are currently bouncing off the recreation room walls are "self-fulfillment" and "community." Such words indicate a nexus between religious communities and the present day ethos implicitly reflecting the same dichotomy found in the more extensive community between the historical emphasis on the individual and the need for an intricate web of personal relationships supporting and enhancing his life and work.

If there is a need for community, and a quest for its attainment implicit in the present emphasis on community in religious life, there is also an inherent indictment of the present conception of religious community which seems to be existing on the theological

concepts of another generation. In fact, I think that local religious communities of active religious orders labor under certain sociological impediments, and the major one is that they are simply too large. It is a sociological fact that any group having more than twenty members necessarily splits into a number of sub-groups. Such fragmentation can produce a semblance of communal life with each of the sub-groups having at least one representative in another sub-group resulting in an accidental form of unity, but it is a unity in which nobody directly participates.

Fragmentation also leads to the lack of a clearly defined attainable goal towards which all the members might strive, and, in some instances, can result in the alienation of individuals and entire sub-groups from the rest of the community. Another consequence of this division and individuation in religious communities is that it can induce a type of nostalgia in its members. It is not a nostalgia for the adventurous spirit of earlier times, but a longing for the supposedly greater community and moral certainty of preceding generations. The final symptom of the communal vacuum in a large community is the growing appeal of a pseudo-intimacy with others, a kind of pathetic dependence on the superficial symbols of friendship and association founded in a craving for affection. Accompanying this is a faint realization that this is neither intimacy nor affection. These are all remedial techniques as well as symptoms of a community which is too ponderous and too large to tend to the basic needs of all of its members. The end product is often a lack of any substantial unity in a religious community that does not provide for a meaningful life experience.

Two main functions

But simply to reduce the size of religious communities will not bring about a viable community life. To attempt to apply the small group notion of community to religious communities, we must further take into consideration the two most important functions of any religious community.

The first function is a supportive one. The religious community should be a family, an in-group, or a primary group involving not only the opportunity for intimate face-to-face contact with every member of the community, but making such opportunities a neces-

sity. The supportive function of community life must provide for the psychological refreshment of every individual; it must provide him with membership, status, and develop his emotional endowment. It is only in this sense that a religious community can be correctly called a family, the model for all primary and supportive communities. The supportive aspect is the only communal function remaining in most large and diversified communities, but since any community with more than twenty members is too unwieldy for adequate face-to-face interaction on a daily basis, such a community over-taxes the supportive ability of any single member and of the community as a whole. The result is often the craving for affection and the reliance on tokens of friendship.

The second more important function of any religious community is that primary task function toward which the community *as a community* strives. Especially in this matter of single goal-orientation and goal attainment the large religious community is deficient. In a small community the primary function or goal of the community is of the greatest importance for the maintenance of the community. It should be defined as something which is attainable but which is not able to be attained unless the community, by means of the interdependence of the talents of its individuals, seeks the goal as a community. The goal can vary with the type of community and its particular apostolate, but in every case it should be something immediate and specific enough to inspire and motivate the individual member.

Small task-oriented communities

It is my belief that the future of religious community in America requires a tighter and more consistent but smaller community organizational structure. The religious community in the future can, on an experimental level, become a small organizational team. This team should be composed of an uneven number of people to insure against any psychological ostracism or alienation concerning decisions of importance to the unit. This means that all provisions should be taken to see that no member of the community is constantly holding or defending a position to which all the rest are opposed. Likewise every member of the unit should be a specialist in some way. He should be integrated in such a way that his in-

dividual talents are fully used. In fact, these talents should be integrated so that if they fail to exercise or to perform their specialty, the primary function of the community cannot be attained. This provides an internal psychological control against anomic operations and insures at least a minimal level of effectiveness.

In regard to the primary task function two things should again be stressed: first, the goal of the community should be clearly defined in the minds of all of the members, and secondly, the members must be given some norm for determining the relative position of the communal goal and for knowing when they have achieved it. With respect to the latter statement we must again emphasize that the goal should be attainable, at least in part. This means not defining the goal of a community as, for instance, "the service of the poor," but being much more specific about who the poor are and how they are to be served.

In regard to the range and scope of activity of such communities, I would call attention to the fact that in some cases the small task-orientated community could be a highly skilled team of specialists with each member holding a doctorate degree as a union card. But that would not be a necessity for all communities. In some, a member's specialty might be the fact that he has "a way with people," and in this case his personality is his unique contribution to the community and the achievement of its primary function. In another, it might simply be that an individual knows the language or has a good grasp of the customs of the people with whom the community is dealing. In short, the task-orientated community allows for a high degree of specialization, but it does not demand that it be academic specialization.

I also feel that in a community with a well-defined and tangible primary function, the supportive function necessary for the success of community living would be more natural and more effective than it has been in the large community. In fact the effectiveness of small task groups, as far as providing and nurturing emotional support is concerned, has already been tested in military life. Such small highly specialized primary groups are at the foundation of military organization, and are also the reason why soldiers perform so well in a combat situation. It seems then that active cooperation towards the attainment of a common goal is the foundation of the supportive function in any small task group.

Possible difficulties

I might recognize and anticipate problems in this small group theory of community by stating that it is neither my intent to restrict a discussion of religious community solely to the natural and sociological level nor to bypass the difficulties which such a system of communities might engender on the level of government. In the first case I have limited myself to the sociological level and excluded consideration of the theological level. A theologically viable community must be built on a sociologically sound community structure. I feel that the theological aspects of small community living could only serve to enhance the community's efficiency and motivation, and to facilitate the achievement of its goal.

I am also aware of the fact that living in a small group presents many difficulties. It is for this very reason that I would insist that the period of time spent in early religious formation be utilized for the training of aspirants to the religious life in group living, and especially for socializing the individual to that role which he will later play in a specific community.

I would recommend that each community have a spokesman rather than a superior as such, and that this spokesman be a different member chosen periodically to represent the community to the centrally located superior or group of superiors. Many problems of government can be postponed, however, if religious orders experiment with small task-orientated communities at the present time. But in the end a decision will have to be made between an efficient form of government and an effective community life, because the two are inextricably linked.

Conclusion

Finally, I would like to summarize some of the advantages of small task-orientated communities. First, they provide naturally for primary or deeply personal group interaction both because of the number of members in the community, and also because of the frequency of contact among the individual members. Another advantage is that small communities limit the amount and likelihood of psychological sanctions within the group. They provide a better psychological atmosphere in which the individual religious

is to live, while at the same time the dependence of individuals upon one another for the achievement of their primary function provides built-in secondary controls to insure the cooperation and performance of all individuals. It makes the community function as a community. Finally, small communities will be mobile. They will be able to remain in one place as long as their work endures, but when it has been successfully completed they have the opportunity to move to another situation. I think that as a corollary the value of a mobile community is especially relevant because of its attraction to those young men and women who aspire to the religious life.

At the present time not even the concept and practical application of religious community is beyond the limit of legitimate inquiry into religious life. Since the local community is so important in the integration of the individual into the religious order whose livelihood is God's work, we cannot afford to be remiss in our quest for an efficient, practical, and acceptable type of community which will give some meaning both to the concept, and to the life styles of those individuals who work it out in practice.

Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor recognized the value of religious community when he said:

"So long as man remains free he strives for nothing so incessantly and painfully as to find someone to worship. But man seeks to worship what is established beyond dispute, so that all men will agree at once to worship it. For these pitiful creatures are concerned to find not only what one or the other can worship, but find something that all will believe in and worship; what is essential is that all may be together in it. This craving for community of worship is the chief misery of every man individually and of all humanity from the beginning of time."

Our existence in religious life is for the purpose of overcoming such individual misery, and to develop a community of worship in our apostolic endeavors. That fact highlights the importance of our quest for community. In this sense community furnishes both the rationale for our living together in religious life and for our apostolic commitment.

SMALL COMMUNITIES IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

*a place to live
and "feel at home"*

FRANCIS X. SHEA, S.J.

THE ACHIEVEMENT of "community" is obviously important for the health of the Society. It cannot be any longer presumed that, because Jesuits living under one roof have behind them a history of Jesuit living and a record of tradition and custom, we automatically have Jesuit communities. Indeed it can be argued that to the degree that the present Society is unhealthy (lack of vocations, unhappiness of the men, defections, etc.) the measure of its illness can be related directly to our failure to achieve community.

One of the presumptions behind the efforts within the Church at *aggiornamento* and the Society's efforts at renewal, is that life within the Church and within the religious cloister is palpably affected by secular conditions. Now, perhaps, no feature of contemporary secular society has been more observed, researched, speculated about, or deplored, than the phenomenon of changing community concepts. Talcott Parsons, for example, attempts to structure the entire academic enterprise of sociology around the polar concepts of community (*Gemeinschaft*) and society (*Gesellschaft*) which he derived originally from Toennies.

The presumption such researchers make is that community and society are distinctive theatres of human action which, in the conditions of modern life especially, are becoming more and more

distinctive. For our purposes, there is no pressing need for accurately reflecting the disciplined articulation these concepts receive in a man like Parsons. Let us review, then, in a layman's translation, one of the features which have been assigned each of these theatres of action.

Community and society roughly correspond to private and public life. Action in the private (community) sphere is characterized, first of all, by a tone of affection and emotion, which is for the most part neutralized when the human being acts in the public or societal sphere. We see this in our own immediate circumstances best, perhaps, in the lives of our lay professors. While not presuming anything in the concrete, one may be permitted to argue that some of them, on some occasions, after some certain provocations, do argue with their wives and may even spank their children. On evidence less presumptive, we can all attest that departmental meetings sometimes feature raised voices and thumped tables. It is in assessing the difference of texture and tone between those two instances of anger, private and public, that we can assess the difference in level and quality of the emotions proper, on the one hand, to community and to society, on the other.

In the conclusions reached by the majority of research done today on the relation between these two theatres of human action, it seems clear that society, the public arena, is increasing its demands and the extent of its influence. The behavior proper to society is more frequently and more peremptorily commanded. The conditions of life call for more and more "professionalism," as it is called in English. This quality has many features, of course, but is saliently characterized by action and word bleached of emotion; the abstract anger of the departmental meeting is an instance of the limit it allows to emotion.

Enclave of privacy

In reaction, perhaps, to this imperialism of the public sphere, men have grown very jealous of and anxious to protect their dwindling private lives. Community, in a retreat, is fiercely defended. A further presumption, for which a majority of social researchers would claim evidence, is that a final confusion between these two theatres of action, an absolute phasing out of the private

by the public would result in individual and societal sickness. Not to understand and accept that community behavior is stylistically and substantially different from societal behavior, not to understand and accept the proper times and places for each, is to initiate destructive reverberations in a man or in a group which can shake them to pieces.

I submit two observations about life in the Society which could serve I think, as hypotheses for research: (1) we, like the world around us, have experienced an increasing demand for professional, public, or societal behavior; (2) since for the most part we live in large communities, we are less and less able to preserve an enclave of privacy, of that protected emotional expression which characterizes community in the narrow sense. I suggest that such research would prove that we suffer all the divisions, both individual and corporate, that social psychologists would predict for us. We are confused intellectually about the expectations of those we live closest to. We are, in consequence, emotionally inhibited and congested in our dealings with one another, and unable to act spontaneously and generously with either each other or the world of externs.

I think that research would prove these generalizations to be factual. But I am sufficiently convinced of their validity to be willing to forego the comfort of academic security. I submit that the malaise of the Society is palpable, that therapy is immediately needed, and that the prescription is, at least largely, obvious, and it parallels the needs of society at large: to distinguish community from societal behavior and to protect, if need be savagely, community from society. In the concrete, this means that we must increase the number of small communities.

When persons (especially *men* with their competitive personalities) are gathered together in large numbers for a long period of time, it becomes inevitable that a certain formality of relationship and procedure be established. It is not otherwise possible for them to coexist without destructive friction. For Jesuit life this simply means that there is no retreat from societal behavior as long as the individual Jesuit lives his life of survival and nurture in a large community. The strongest emotions are connected with the radically biological conditions of life: food, physical protection, sex,

and shelter. When the Jesuit professional lives out the biological conditions of his life without being able to indulge in legitimate expression of his strongest emotions, he is necessarily inhibited in precisely those ways that can wreak psychological damage. It goes without saying, of course, that I am not speaking here of gross self-indulgence. By his commitment, a religious is dedicated to the inhibition of certain dramatic biological emotions. But it is precisely for this reason that he must find it possible to elaborate and express many legitimate areas of emotion without feeling pressures of threat from his equals and superiors in an overly elaborated societal structure. He must, in the words of the decrees of the 31st Congregation, have a place to live where he "feels at home."

Size of community

The proposition which I wish to make is simply this: no Jesuit should be asked to live in a community which demands that he adopt constantly and without respite the wooden, abstract, and heavily polite behavior proper to the public arena. I submit that this means that no Jesuit should be asked to live in a community larger than ten or fifteen. Actually I pick these numbers quite innocently of any empirical support and, perhaps, more for their mathematical ease of handling than for any provable insights into the conditions of community life.

Say we take the number ten. I would propose that the ideal community of ten Jesuits reflect both the age spread and the professional spectrum of the Jesuits in a given locality. The 31st Congregation suggests that "as far as possible" a man's place of residence and his theatre of work be separated. I suggest that what is needed is more than a geographical separation and that the full extent of the possibility called for demands a total separation of the conditions of work and domestic life. In a community of ten, one could hypothesize that there would be two to three Jesuits retired or semi-retired, four to five "earners" who are employed in a variety of tasks (college teaching, high school teaching, parish work, administration, etc.) and two or three Jesuits in training. The earners would be employed in some active work either sponsored by the Society or not, but from which they take a professional

salary and bring it back to their community. A part of this would go to the central treasury of the province to be used for the support of the schools in which Ours are educated, for the novitiate and tertianship, for hospitalization of the sick, and for the expenses connected with the professional running of a province. Another portion of the earners' salaries would go to the immediate care of the community in which they live, and a third portion to their individual professional needs (car, library, etc.) which would be worked out in each case with the provincial and explicitly understood by all the members of the community.

Poverty and cash

I suggest with some trepidation that while this particular recommendation would, in the eyes of some, radically change the nature of our understanding of the vow of poverty, it, nevertheless, might be advisable to reserve a certain portion of the earners' professional income for their own free disposal. In a society in which the definition of fundamental worth has, in fact, been related to the "cash nexus" it can legitimately be questioned whether it is wise or even possible by a wooden interpretation of the vow of poverty to leave a man, so completely as we do, without an objective scale of self-evaluation. I am not arguing for the individualistic interpretation of the cash nexus but rather, quite the opposite. I am arguing that we find some way for a man to assess his own contribution to the common cause. If he is allowed to determine freely the disposition of some portion of his earnings, he might even be moved to contribute to charity.

I am quite well aware of how radically this proposal of small community living, especially as I propose it here—reflecting the age and employment spectra of the Society—strikes at many presuppositions upon which present life in the Society is organized. The fundamental principle of organization of community life in the Society at present is that a community is established to serve a given work. The work, be it school or parish, is larger and more important than any of the men engaged in it. The men, their talents, and their efforts, serve a work chosen by the wisdom of superiors to be worthy of their service. The most obvious problem that this arrangement creates is a lack of flexibility. A work once established

by the choice of a few, perhaps now dead, superiors, demands the constant superintendence of Jesuits who may see little or no worth to the job they are doing. In our era of such accelerating change, it seems clear that no secure basis for the full employment and realization of the talents of the men of the Society can be found, except the perception in the concrete of who these men are and what talents they possess.

The motivations for which a man joins the Society can be expressed in their simplest and most general fashion as "a desire to live for God." It is not possible for a man situated in a modern, technological society to live at all without taking into account that radical bifurcation of the conditions of life which we have seen the sociologists analyze as these two stylistic theatres of action, community and society. If we are going to make it possible for the Jesuit to live for God in the modern era, we must make it possible for him to live effectively and without confusion in these two separated theatres of action. In order to propose one possible way in which the demands of a total living for God can be achieved under modern conditions, I have proposed the small community. I have tried to indicate not only the advantages of the small community but also the fundamentally new demands it makes upon our present arrangements. I do not suppose that I have exhausted the implications of small community living and by no means do I insist that the radical nature of the adjustments I foresee are uniquely desirable, let alone inevitable. With all earnestness, however, I do urge that we consider the advantages of small community living, that we undertake immediately a series of observed experiments in small community living, and that we begin now to think out the implications which might be involved in our adopting on a massive scale for the entire Society the small community design.

THE WORD:
FOR PRIEST AND POET

creation out of love

JOHN L'HEUREUX, S.J.

It was ripening September
when whimsy seized the
Father, but with infinite

forbearance he did not
create till April. Eternal
ripeness has no need for

apples. It was this: light
out of pure light streaming
loving the light and light

loving, breathing between
them Spirit, not lovers'
kisses but lovers' hearts

the two a oneness—all one:
seed flower and fullness.
This loving overflowed

exploding in that first
epiphany a rainbow, pattern
for creating lesser worlds,

thought word reflection
 Adam bride and child
 poet sorrow and song.

PATTERN FOR CREATING lesser worlds. The Father's love of the Son and the Son's love of the Father eternally spirates the Holy Ghost; from a superabundance of love God created through his Son, Jesus Christ, everything that is and saw that it was good. Creation out of love: this is the eternal pattern for all creations—man and wife birthing their child, the poet evolving his poem, the priest breathing Christ into bread and wine and the souls of men. As the Father created through his Word, so do the poet and the priest create through words.

This essay, another futile attempt to bring order out of chaos, is a random look at the words of poet and priest to see how they are alike and how they differ, to see the ramifications of the word in the lives of poet and priest. We are asking, I suppose, if it is possible for one man to be at the same time completely committed to both God's word and his own. It is too facile to say that where God gives a charism he gives as well sufficient grace. Does the charism of the priest leave room for the grace of the poet? The word of God was given as a sign of contradiction.

The difference between loneliness and solitude, dullness and stillness, science and wisdom, problem and mystery, mere talk and the living word, is not a difference of quality alone; it is one of spirituality and spiritual involvement. Loneliness belongs to the composite being man, whereas solitude is more proper to the soul alone, less restricted by the limitations of the flesh; it is spiritual and ethereal. And so of the other disjunctions. I do not mean to say that the soul is Platonically trapped in flesh, depending for its freedom on how completely it can escape the body. Only soul and body together in perfect harmonious union can experience the depths of mystery; the thick of soul remains forever in the arid province of the merely problematic. I do mean to say that the richer the experience, the more deeply will the soul be involved. Witness Christ, the Word made flesh. But we shall come back later to the experiencing of Christ; we are speaking here of different kinds of words and the extent of spiritual involvement they imply.

Poet, prophet, philosopher

There are many kinds of words. The prime analogate of all words is, of course, the Word of God, the Word who *is* God, the Son of the Father. Then there is the philological word, the written or spoken medium of communication. There is the psychological word, the simple apprehension of the direct universal, so Scholastics say. There is the word of the Scriptures: *eructavit cor meum verbum bonum*, a use of word in neither the purely grammatical nor the prophetic sense; word as inspired prayer. There is the word of the prophet, *dabar*, the word that symbolizes and effects, the word not only inspired but commanded. The prophet's word is not his own. He speaks the word spoken *through* him. His involvement with it is total. The imagery and symbol, the music and vituperation are his own; but the *verbum*, the vision for whose transmission he exists, is from another. The prophet's word is closely allied to the poet's.

The word of the poet exists somewhere between that of the prophet and that of the philosopher, since the poet is at once less irrevocably committed than the prophet and more personally involved than the philosopher. The poet does not serve as medium through whom the word is spoken; unlike the prophet, he forms his word with image, symbol, music in such a way that the poem is the objectification of his own particular experience, not a warning of the wrath to come. Oversimplifying, we may say that the poet's word is conceived in sensation, enwombed in imagination, brought forth in intellection: its birth as a poem requires overt concentration and the organizing force of reason by the poet. The philosopher's word is more purely logical, less purely intuitional than the poet's. The prophet reasons only insofar as the urgency of his mantic deliverance allows; the philosopher reasons closely on reflex universals; the poet reasons obliquely on sensitive particulars.

Mention should be made too of the difference between the words of poet and of scientist. Because of the connotational value of the deliberately ambiguous word, poetry can say two or more things at the same time, can strike home on several levels. Science specifies. By careful choice of denotative words, words of one dimension which exclude possibility of misinterpretation, science achieves communication. Its words are unambiguous; their meanings uni-

vocal. Poetry on the other hand deliberately chooses words of varied connotation; by refusing to specify, it achieves something larger than communication—communion. In communion there is invariably a large measure of mystery. The poet's word then is too personal and too rational to be that of the prophet, too sensitive and too intuitional to be that of the philosopher, too ambiguous and too multi-dimensional to be that of the scientist. The poet's word is uniquely his own.

The word of the priest is akin to that of prophet and philosopher and poet. Like the prophet he is a father to his people. Like the philosopher he teaches. Like the poet he heals. The analogues are arbitrarily chosen, it is true, since it would be equally valid to say that, like the prophet he heals, or like the poet he teaches, or like the philosopher he is father to his thinking children. The point is only that the priest is related to the others; he must to some extent be prophet and poet if he is to be a true priest. The priest's word consecrates and liberates. Only the priest can breathe words upon bread and wine and transubstantiate them to the body and blood of Christ. Only the priest can say to a sinner "I absolve you" and know he is truly absolved. Like the prophet, the priest deals with God and with a frighteningly real world; like the poet and in a far more compelling sense, he frees that world and makes it new. For the priest is the medium of God; God acts in him far more evidently than he did through any of the ancient prophets; God speaking through the priest does not tell of the future, he creates the present. This is my body. This is my blood. I absolve you. With such a gift, with such alarming proximity to the begotten Word, the priest is equipped and obliged to speak of it with far more eloquence than the poet, to bring alive in his even-Christian the Christ waiting to be born there.

Reality for poet and priest

All of this brings us to the operational areas of poet and priest: the real. The symbol of the vine and the branches is too often cavalierly dealt with: we are in Christ as the branches of a vine belong to the main stem and, though the main stem may grow straight up, it is rooted in earth. Christ is rooted in flesh. He took on the body of a man, hypostatically united to his divinity, and that same body of human flesh and blood sits now at the right hand

of the Father: our pledge surely of the salvation of mere flesh. Christ is man and will have us share in his divinity. And so flesh is good, drenched in his blood and redeemed by it, part of the real world where poet and priest operate. For too long poet and priest have been divorced from, or at any rate too little caught up in, the mysteries of the goodness and the evil of flesh.

I shall illustrate what I mean. The *Columbia Spectator* recently reported on a poetry reading by the Beat poet Allen Ginsberg, given at Columbia University before a mixed audience of several hundred. Author of *Howl*, *Gasoline*, *Kaddish*, author and star of the Beat movie *Pull My Daisy*, Ginsberg began his reading "sitting on a yellow prayer mat, removing his shoes, and singing 'Hari Krishna'—a song brought back from India. . . . Ginsberg sang: 'Peter Orlovsky will you come out and help me sing to these poor people? Are you in the bathroom?' A man with shoulder-length blond hair and a drooping pocketbook (Orlovsky) appeared briefly and surveyed the audience. Ginsberg read from 'The Change' . . . a poem that cannot be completely understood at first hearing, but which is nevertheless very moving and pornographic, in that it produces strong physical sensations of nausea, heat & desire. Ginsberg's subject is primarily his own body, and its contact with other bodies, and as he read 'The Change' he pointed to that section of himself which he happened to be discussing at the time. Peter Orlovsky, who read later, began by taking off all his clothes except for a black pair of bikini underpants. . . . Orlovsky read from a poem published in a New York literary magazine. The poem is built up, extremely cleverly, on love notes typed on a bedside typewriter between Orlovsky and Allen Ginsberg."

The immediate reaction of priest or poet is revulsion. In this doleful little performance one sees the lamentable fall of poetry from its high estate mirroring perfectly the decline—indeed, the landslide—of contemporary moral values. Ginsberg and his crowd have sublet the province of the soul in return for 'kicks'; they have exchanged poetry and its concomitant discipline for exhibitionism-cum-license. But they have recognized a truth kept secret for some time now. Poetry does have something to do with life and with living; we may find it hard to accept Beat notions of poetry and *a fortiori* their more distressing notions of life, yet the fundamental

truth remains true no matter who speaks it—if poetry is not quickened by the human voice speaking of an encounter with the real, then it is nothing. We protest perhaps that the experience of Ginsberg can scarcely be considered an encounter with the real; or if it is the real, it is a reality so distorted by the subjective and the untruthful and the induced schizophrenia of the loveless that it is undeserving of the name of truth. Ginsberg has mistaken activity for art and bravado for performance. He is a hollow man, one more to be censured than pitied. His exhibition at Columbia, however, does have the merit of shocking us into awareness that poetry deals with life and the living, and that only the life lived honestly has value—whether for poet or for priest.

The truth of poetry

As the function of poetry is to speak truth, so the poem itself is significant in proportion to the completeness of its conformity with the original experience and the profundity of that experience which has become the poem. This is the identity of word and experience at which the poet constantly aims; how and why he does so we shall consider later. This identity of word and experience must be the priest's as well; on a different and far more exalted plane, he must speak the word of Christ. He must experience Christ profoundly, become him insofar as this is possible in our limited condition, and express him not only in consecrating and absolving but in every word that passes his lips, in what he *is*. He must as flesh speak the word of Christ to flesh; it must be a living word spoken to a living people in terms they can understand, in tones they can recognize as love. He must, ultimately, be able to touch a Ginsberg as well as an Eliot; Christ did not come only to the well-washed. If the function of poetry is to speak truth, the function of the priesthood is to speak Truth. If the poet must become his poem to surrender it, so the priest must become Christ to give him up to a largely Godless mankind.

It is possible for a poet to become a priest. Whether he can continue to function as a poet is quite another question, one which must be answered on the operational level: what poetry does, what the priest does, and why.

In his superb essay "Priest and Poet" Karl Rahner speaks as knowledgeably of the poet's word as he does of the Word of God,

saying that "the finite and the formed, the proportioned and the enclosed, proclaim as such, precisely through their good finiteness, the infinity of God"; it is the poet's work to free these finite things. Rahner presents in just a few sentences the whole purpose and craft of poetry.

Poetry frees things. Poetry tells the truth. It is small wonder that every poem in some sense is an attempt to recreate the universe, to repeat that creating action of God by which all things have come to be.

Poetry frees things. The word of the poet is that which sets things free, finite and proportioned things, formed and enclosed things, free in such a way that their infinity shines through them. A poem must do this to justify itself: set free an experience which is too complex to be contained in the purely denotative symbols of science. The correct words liberate one another so that fish is no longer merely fish; it is "my God, fish!" But without the necessity of an exclamation point. Wisdom, and hence truth, rarely uses exclamation points. If "fish" needs liberation, *a fortiori* an experience of love or hate or wonder. And how express a combination of love and hate together? With the true word. Poets rarely stumble into true words. For a poet, complete fidelity to and complete honesty with words is the *only* way to achieve a poem; not prayer and fasting, not the drugged exploration of the unconscious, only fidelity and honesty to words will do. Fidelity and honesty comprehend a good bit: years and years of practice with words, courage to destroy something beautiful because it does not fit this particular poem, the humility to remain quiet when you have nothing to say. But out of this verbal discipline grows the ability to free things by revealing them in the light of forever.

Poetry tells the truth. The quickest most effective way for a poet to destroy himself is to sell his birthright for a pot of message. The poem that inculcates virtue, that wrings a lesson out of rhymed piosities, has ceased to be a poem. It is a visual aid. Poetry tells the truth the way all real art tells the truth, by presenting what *is*. Unfortunately the truth is not always pleasant; men steal and fornicate and do not love—that is unpleasant. Poetry which says such unpleasant things can be far more true, however, and in that sense far more beautiful than a poem which is doctrinally flawless but without a soul.

Christ as priest-poet

It takes no effort of the imagination to see the relevance of what I have been saying about poets and poetry to the larger problem of the priest and the Word of God. Rahner looks forward with the kerygmatic longing for the parousia to the time when the priest-poet shall reign triumphant in this post-Christian world. I cannot imagine such a day.

Christ is of course the archetype of priest-poet. Himself the Word of God, he is the perfect symbol of God and speaks the word not only of creation but of salvation. The priest forever repeats in his own imperfect fashion the perfect actions of the Word of God. Precisely by his anointing as priest, the priest creates and saves, repeats the primitive encounter with God by administering the sacraments.

I should like for the sake of concrete example to revert to the poet for a moment. A poem cannot come into existence except through a poet who, by his special charism, is in this one respect at least a rather special individual; but more than a poet is required, namely, a poet with a degree of accomplishment in his craft—one who has long practiced fidelity to the word. Without craftsmanship (which operates *ex opere operato* whether the poet is churning out a real poem or merely something falsely dressed up as a poem), the poem can never be realized at all. The point is obvious: only a priest can confer most of the sacraments; only a priest can celebrate the Eucharist, the sacrament of our closest personal encounter with Christ. Someone special is required, someone with the sacred charism.

Back to the poet. With craftsmanship, the poem may or may not be realized depending on a genius tempered with words. The greatness of the poem depends finally on (1) the profundity of the experience the poet is liberating and (2) the degree to which he himself has grasped the experience—not *qua* experience but *qua* word: the word of the poem, the word which *is* the poem. Again the application is obvious, at least once a small distinction has been made. We are dealing with an entirely different order of existence now, one in which it is true that Christ uses even the weakest instruments, that the efficacy of the sacrament does not depend upon the sanctity of the minister, that a truth is still true

even if it is spoken by a liar. But, and Rahner also points this out, it makes a considerable difference to the good of the Church whom he represents if the priest acts out of love or out of indifference. The Church stands always behind him; "always he stands and acts in its sphere of existence." The priest *should* express the word of God with his Christian existence because the Church *must* do it. Insofar as the priest has practiced fidelity to and honesty with the Word and insofar as he has absorbed the overwhelming impact of encounter with the Word will he be successful in communicating the fullness of the Christian experience. The priest must explore depths before he can reveal them.

A priest-poet today?

Rahner awaits the coming of the priest-poet. I do not think we shall see him, although it may be he has been among us in every priest who was also a saint and because those men walk tall we failed to notice him. Casual perfection is an evanescent thing; it rarely surrenders itself to empirical analysis.

For the priest-poet to be realized, there must be some point of intersection between the charisms of priest, of poet. That point of intersection is as necessary as it is unlikely. The poet is rarely if ever called to the priesthood. He tends to be egocentric, morbidly self-concerned, with a dedication to words and writing which precludes the larger dedication to any cause. It sometimes seems to me that the psychic force of a poet flows not only on a different plane altogether but indeed flows in the opposite direction; the psychic force of a priest must bend upwards, of a poet inward. How does a poet-priest reconcile these urgent drives without becoming in his conduct at least a benign schizophrenic? And how does the poet who is priest castigate a world gone mad with self-indulgence, for that of course is the ancient office of poets—to flay the hide of illusion from the complacently mediocre? The priest must love that world gone mad, he must cure it with the care of Christ. Finally there is the contemporary mode of writing. The most viable, perhaps the only viable, poetic focus today is irony. We are still trapped in the half-light of Cartesian dualism; the extermination camps of the Second World War have robbed us forever of at least the first half of the concept of man as noble

savage; existentialism and absurdism of the present moment have exposed the meaninglessness of a loveless generation. Confronted by the mass rape of the American Negro and the cultured inanity of the diamond and liquor advertisements of the *New Yorker*, we realize the hopeless inefficacy of indignation or amusement; only the two-edged knife of irony can cut the conscious mind. It is true that the ironic stance is something more than a disembarassing gesture. It is a confession of concern under the mask of humor, a symptom that all the heart's children are not yet comfortably tucked abed. But the mocking tones of irony are not suited to the priest's voice of love. I do not see how one man can be a significant poet and at the same time a dedicated priest.

I should imagine that when a genuine poet becomes a priest, he ceases to function as a poet. For one thing he would have less personal need for poetry; creating and making new with Christ can, I imagine, easily supplant the agony and dissatisfaction of those isolate hours with the smoking lamp and the bitten pencil. I should imagine also that when a priest becomes a poet (an unlikely event), he functions only minimally as a priest. And this for the two reasons I have earlier adduced: (1) the poet sees everything in relation to himself and as a priest he cannot do this, and (2) the emotional strain and the ironic voice of a contemporary work of art drive the poet in any direction but prayer, and prayer must be the priest's daily bread.

But these reasons do not go to the heart of the matter; undoubtedly the real cause of the rarity of priest-poet is something much deeper, much less definable. It is perhaps that having discovered Christ at a profound level, the poet-priest has no need to free things and to tell the truth about them. It is enough for him to contemplate what he sees; his poetry is love. And then, of course, the rest is silence.

CONFERENCE ON ECUMENISM IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

AUGUSTIN CARDINAL BEA, S.J.

YOU KNOW THAT THE FATHERS OF OUR SOCIETY, especially St. Peter Canisius, at the conclusion of the Council of Trent, actively promulgated the decrees of that Council in various lands. Today, with the close of the Second Vatican Council, we are clearly not concerned with the formal promulgation of its decrees; rather there is a great urgency that we strive to make such far-reaching and profound decrees known, understood, and that we help to put them gradually into practice. In a special way, this ought to concern the life and work of priests, through whom the mystery of Christ in the Church is especially realized, lest the Church be found to have received the grace of God to no avail (2 Cor. 6:1). It is quite clear that, in this matter, our Society has a special task not only because of her closer relationship with the Church and the Roman Pontiff, which is a sacred inheritance handed down to us by our holy founder and by our predecessors, but also because of the reputation and influence which, by the grace of God, the Society has in the Church. It is certain that many of the clergy and the laity, almost everywhere on earth, look to the sons of the Society, and draw their inspiration from our way of thinking and acting. Our Society, with the favoring grace of God, can contribute powerfully to this post-

This address was given before the fathers of the 31st General Congregation on October 29, 1966. It was translated by George B. Gilmore, S.J. The words emphasized are those of the author.

conciliar action, and for the love of God, for Christ and for the Church, our Society ought to be in the front ranks.

These considerations are especially relevant to *the ecumenical apostolate*. There is even greater urgency here because we are concerned with a task that is rather difficult and rather new, in which the example of leadership in word and deed is particularly influential. And so I am thankful to Very Reverend Father General for the invitation which gives me the occasion not indeed of participating in the General Congregation, for in my present status I have neither active nor passive voice, but rather of permitting me to fulfill as far as I can what the Church has entrusted to me, the promotion of Christian unity.

What therefore do we intend in this meeting of ours today? I have not come to exert any influence in the affairs of this legislative session of the Society. I know that you have already prepared a specific decree on ecumenism to be promoted in the Society, that you have subjected it to examination and have approved it. Very Reverend Father General knows that I purposely put off this meeting to a time following your discussion of this matter. It should also be clear that I do not intend to explain those principles of ecumenism which the Second Vatican Council set forth. You have presupposed a knowledge of these principles in your own discussions of this matter. Rather we shall strive to understand these principles more profoundly in the light both of theology and of the work of the Church, and then to apply them concretely to the life and the apostolic work of the Society. I consider the work of the Society in this area to be of great significance for the Church. The difficulties involved in ecumenical work often show lack of foresight, as often happens in other areas of human endeavor. Some people would begin imprudently by concentrating on the external aspects of the problem, by promoting dialogues, prayers, the reading of Sacred Scripture with our non-Catholic brothers, translating and publishing non-Catholic literature, and similar innovations. It is quite necessary that the Society not only outdistance others in prudence but also emphasize the knowledge and use of internal and supernatural channels, "from which must flow all outward effectiveness in the goal set before us."¹

¹ Cf. *Constitutiones et Regulae Societatis Iesu*, Part X, 2.

Questions and answers

Let us begin by asking ourselves how, in what ways, down which roads the march of Christian unity should be directed. The answer to these questions will give us the best clues for bringing about this unity.

1. The first answer to our question lies in *the ecumenical movements of these last few years*. We can say of the Second Vatican Council what St. Luke says of Christ our Lord: "He began to act and to teach" (Acts 1:1). Before it set forth the principles of ecumenism, the Second Vatican Council demonstrated by clear example over a long period of time how we ought to act toward our non-Christian brothers, and how we ought *to live that unity* which already exists between us. Not to mention other issues, we should recall that significant participation which the delegated observers had in the deliberations of the Council. They attended the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass daily with the Council Fathers; they studied the same documents without exception; they also met with the Council Fathers outside of the Council Chamber and discussed the problems of the Council and many other questions. In this way the observers acquired a direct knowledge of the life and doctrine of the Church, and in turn transmitted it to their own churches. The Council Fathers likewise experienced with a deep awareness the problem of the division of Christians and began to understand more accurately the numerous churches and communities. In the past, some of the Fathers had known little of these churches and communities, and indeed some had known nothing whatever of them. Finally, among the Council Fathers and the observers, and through them among their churches, closer bonds developed. These bonds seem destined to last beyond the time of the Council, and to be further deepened with the passage of time. Great results of this presence and participation can be seen even now in the churches, but the full fruit will appear and be appreciated only after several decades.

Principles for action

2. The Council taught by clear example over a long period of time how we ought to conduct ourselves towards our non-Catholic Christian brothers and how we ought to deal with them. The

Council also lucidly presented *theoretical principles* for our action.

a) First the Council solemnly enunciated a course of action which looks to the whole Church: "Concern for restoring unity pertains to the whole Church, faithful and clergy alike. It extends to everyone, according to the potential of each, whether it be exercised in daily Christian living or in theological and historical studies."² This principle is extremely important and cannot be overemphasized. Its profound justification, according to the Council's *Constitution on the Church*, lies in the fact that *the whole people of God*, which is the Church, "is used by Christ as *an instrument for the redemption* of all, and is sent forth into the whole world as the light of the world and the salt of the earth" (Mt. 5:13-16).³

b) The *means* by which this grave responsibility of all members of the Church is to be fulfilled, is not primarily and principally this or that action alone, sermons, dialogue, intercooperation, and the like. It is *the whole Christian life*, as has been mentioned in the text cited above. Specifically we should know and *live in practice* with our separated brothers *that unity which already exists between us*. As an explanation of that unity the Council sets forth the effect of the holy sacrament of baptism, by which non-Catholic Christians are also organically united with Christ. Through baptism they become adopted sons of God and our brothers in Christ, and "they are brought into a certain, though imperfect, communion with the Catholic Church" (*UR*, No. 3). The values which are to be found among these brothers of ours must be recognized: "the written word of God; the life of grace; faith, hope and charity, along with other interior gifts of the Holy Spirit and visible elements" (*UR*, No. 3). Moreover "the brethren divided from us also carry out many of the sacred actions of the Christian religion. Undoubtedly, in ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or Community, these actions can truly engender a life of grace, and can be rightly described as capable of providing access to the community of salvation" (*UR*, No. 3). Therefore "these separated Churches and

² *Decree on Ecumenism (Unitatis Redintegratio)*, No. 5. Hereafter cited as *UR*.

³ *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)*, No. 9.

Communities, though we believe they suffer from defects already mentioned, have by no means been deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation which derive their efficacy from the very fullness of grace and truth entrusted to the Catholic Church" (*UR*, No. 3).

This teaching has been solemnly recognized by the supreme authority of the Church and must also be accepted by us with the fullness of faith. Such knowledge and esteem for our non-Catholic brothers, which proceeds from our own faith, must be emphasized and spread among the faithful entrusted to us before, and more than, any specific knowledge of individual churches. This specific knowledge, especially of churches with whom we live each day, is certainly necessary; but that knowledge which proceeds from faith is more fundamental and is even more necessary for all and for rapport with all. Such knowledge gives a solid foundation to our relations with our separated brothers, and ought to move us to respect them sincerely in Christ, to reverence, to love, to help them and to cooperate with them in various areas according to the decrees of the Council. In this way the separation which exists between us and our separated brothers can gradually be overcome. We know from history that there was a certain long process of mutual alienation, through ignorance, prejudice, antipathy, and so forth, that preceded the formal separation both of the Oriental Church in the 11th century, and the separation in the West in the time known as the Reformation. Those formal separations only constituted final acts of another process which had lasted through centuries and had steadily deteriorated. Today the Church intends to initiate and promote the opposite process: those who have become brothers through baptism should recognize one another in Christ, they should respect one another, they should love in truth and in action, even though among them for a time full unity be lacking.

Since the Council, as we have seen, imposes the concern for restoring unity on *all* the faithful, there is also a certain general mobilisation of all Christians for the gradual preparation of unity in a concrete way. You know that this pursuit of unity in Christ already exists, to be lived and manifested, in relation to the separated

Oriental Churches. In spite of the partial separation and even with the denial of certain dogmas such as the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, the search for Christian unity has progressed to the point that the Council has permitted that the sacrament of Penance, the Eucharist, and Extreme Unction be administered to the Orthodox who seek the sacraments in good faith. Since these churches have the true priesthood and the true sacraments, Catholics are allowed to seek the sacraments from their priests, when a Catholic priest is lacking or where it is extremely difficult to get to a Catholic priest.

c) We are striving to live the unity which already exists between us and our Christian non-Catholic brothers. This ecumenical practice is already *bearing outstanding results at this moment*, even though there are no conversions of individuals, and before the final goal of perfect union is attained. *Insofar as it touches our non-Catholic brothers*, we effectively help them to live what they have received from their predecessors, and which they believe in good faith. They lack many means of grace which are to be found in the Catholic Church alone. Nevertheless, with the help of what they do have by the merciful gift of God, they can live in and through Christ, which is the end both of the redemption of Christ and of the preaching and work of the Church, as well as the *raison d'être* of the apostolate of the Society. We know that the best way of knowing the will of God is actually to follow the will of God in those areas where we are sure of his will. Moreover this is a better way both for these brothers to find the way to the fullness of unity in the one Church of Christ, and so that perfect unity itself might gradually be realized.

At the same time this ecumenical practice brings *enormous advantages to us Catholics ourselves*. We must proceed prudently and with moderation here. The situation is not to be falsely conceived as if through this spiritual "exchange" with our non-Catholic brothers, the Catholic Church would first discover some truth which she did not yet possess in the sacred deposit entrusted to her by Christ the Lord. On the other hand, the Catholic Church herself, by the exercise of this exchange, can more clearly and more distinctly understand and set forth truths already possessed by her. This has often happened in the Councils, when in the Church disagreements arose concerning this or that truth of the faith. The

Council's *Decree on Ecumenism* does not hesitate to assert that, because of the separation, "the Church herself finds it more difficult to express in actual life her full catholicity in all its aspects" (*UR*, No. 4).

Other results of ecumenical action look to *individual members* of the Catholic Church. It is unfortunate that Catholics themselves often do not live that fullness of truth and grace offered them by the Church, "as a result the radiance of the Church's face shines less brightly in the eyes of our separated brothers and in the eyes of the world at large, and the growth of God's kingdom is retarded" (*UR*, No. 4). A desire for unity should effectively stimulate the faithful to live the vocation to which they are called *with greater fidelity*. They should *tend toward sanctity* (*UR*, No. 4). Therefore the Council solemnly admonishes: "There can be no ecumenism worthy of the name without a change of heart. For it is from newness of attitudes, from self-denial and unstinted love, the yearnings for unity take their rise and grow toward maturity." The Council deduces in practice: "We should therefore pray to the divine Spirit for the grace to be genuinely self-denying, humble, gentle in the service of others, and to have an attitude of brotherly generosity toward them" (*UR*, No. 7). You see, Reverend Fathers, that ecumenism, if rightly understood, is an exceptional instrument of our apostolate and an outstanding means of pastoral action.

The need for prudence

3. Let us immediately specify that in living and manifesting that unity which already exists between us and our non-Catholic brothers, *certain due limits must be observed*.

a) Never should it be forgotten that those brothers, either as individuals or as communities, minimally enjoy that unity "which Jesus Christ wished to bestow on all those whom He has regenerated and vivified into one body and newness of life, that unity which the Holy Scriptures and the revered tradition of the Church proclaim. For it is through Christ's Catholic Church alone, which is the all-embracing means of salvation, that the fullness of the means of salvation can be obtained" (*UR*, No. 3). It would be wrong to reject all communion with these brothers, for they are truly our brothers in Christ and we have many things in common with them.

But it would be wrong also to forget those areas where they suffer defects in unity, doctrine and government.

b) These same defects constitute a difficulty for ecumenical action, and they clearly *impose limits* and *demand great prudence*. So easily, for example, someone might think that, for the good of unity, some sacrifice must be accepted, some compromise related to doctrinal divergencies must be admitted, or at least those differences should be passed over in silence. The *Decree on Ecumenism* gravely admonishes: "It is, of course, essential that doctrine be clearly presented in its entirety. Nothing is so foreign to the spirit of ecumenism as a false conciliatory approach which harms the purity of Catholic doctrine and obscures its assured genuine meaning" (*UR*, No. 11). This sincere exposition of doctrine clearly must be made "in ways and terminology which our separated brethren too can clearly understand" (*UR*, No. 11), not polemically, but rather we must proceed, preserving the love of truth, "with charity and humility." Although sometimes one must also mention differences, it is not necessary that one always begin specifically with these differences.

Another danger to be prudently avoided in ecumenical action is rash, unprepared involvement in initiating dialogue. Such dialogue would not profit others and would make a mockery of such action. It could perhaps even shake the faith of the unprepared one who initiated it. This also could be said for example of those who with insufficient prudence translate the books of non-Catholics or strive to make them known, or without sufficient preparation institute prayers or the reading of Sacred Scripture in common with non-Catholic Christians. Therefore the Council generally admonishes: "This most Sacred Synod urges the faithful to abstain from any superficiality or imprudent zeal, for these can cause harm to true progress towards unity" (*UR*, No. 24).

These few remarks on the difficulty of ecumenical action should suffice. Let us note that a better method for avoiding dangers and using prudent zeal is dependence on those whom the Holy Spirit has appointed to rule the Church of God (Acts 20:28). This dependence clearly is not exacted solely to avoid dangers. Ecumenical action is an essential part of the pastoral labor of the Church and therefore is subordinate to the authority of the holy

pastors. Since ecumenical action is dependent on the will of the hierarchy, only in this way can it respond to the will of God and of Christ and therefore be fruitful and efficacious. It is unnecessary to explain here, in the area of prudence and dependence on the authority of the Church, that our Society according to her proper spirit, ought to give outstanding example in the Church.

4. Have we touched upon all the elements by which the progress of unity can be effected? Obviously not. One thing remains, a principal area, *union with Christ* and with his Divine Spirit, the spirit of unity. The *Decree on Ecumenism* solemnly and profoundly teaches that the most Holy Trinity is the source of our unity: "This is the sacred mystery of the unity of the Church, in Christ and through Christ, with the Holy Spirit energizing a variety of functions. The *highest exemplar and source* of this mystery is the unity, in the Trinity of Persons, of one God, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" (*UR*, No. 2). From this doctrine the Council itself deduces this *practical conclusion* in the form of an exhortation: "Let all Christ's faithful remember that the more purely they strive to live according to the gospel, the more they are fostering and even practicing Christian unity. For they can achieve depth and ease in strengthening mutual brotherhood to the degree that they enjoy profound communion with the Father, the Word, and the Spirit" (*UR*, No. 7). I do not think this doctrine of the Council needs explanation. We are concerned with nothing else than the application to our apostolate of the doctrine of the Redemption and of our total dependence on divine grace. Rather, it seems that a certain *serious consequence* must be stressed, which is derived from this: the great importance in the promotion of Christian unity of the *truly Christian life of all the members of the Church*, their desire for uniting themselves to Christ, and obtaining true Christian sanctity.

Never, Reverend Fathers, will we sufficiently inculcate in the faithful entrusted to us, how much they are able to do in this way towards the promotion of Christian unity, and how much they ought to do through their love for Christ, the Church, and mankind. Just as members of the body of Christ are an instrument which the Lord uses for effecting the redemption of the human race, so

also even more are the faithful a specific instrument which he uses to promote and to perfect the unity of those who believe in him.

Jesuit spirit

5. This discussion of ours should make it clear how much the ecumenical apostolate *is connected with that concept of the apostolate* which is in our *Constitutions* as an application of Catholic doctrine itself. Clearly the Church, through the Council, is not so much demanding new things from us, but rather new applications of our apostolate and a rather new way of conceiving what our predecessors have done and what we ourselves are doing. We are concerned with a certain more complete method of considering in Christ, our non-Catholic brothers, a method of working for their good and of dealing with them.

Because we are concerned with a method which is rather new, it is clearly necessary that the sons of the Society *gradually acquire this frame of mind* and learn to use this method. It may be proper, therefore, to add something on the process of teaching Jesuits the correct concept and exercise of the ecumenical apostolate.

a) Clearly it is of great importance here that from *the novitiate* the scholastics as well as the brothers be profoundly imbued with the ecumenical spirit according to what we have just said. Let them gradually learn what has happened in this area in the Church, that they might know and help these undertakings by their prayers and by their holy desires and sacrifices. If superiors and masters of novices think it helpful and they consider the situation carefully, they should even arrange some contacts with non-Catholic Christians.

b) This formation, specifically during the time of the novitiate, should be further pursued in the time of studies. *The study of theology* is especially important for the scholastics. I am not so much thinking here of new courses to be added in class, but rather of *a spirit* with which the whole theological formulation ought to be imbued. The *Decree on Ecumenism* asks that: "Instruction in sacred theology and other branches of knowledge, especially those of a historical nature, must also be presented from an ecumenical point of view, so that at every point they may more accurately

correspond with the facts of the case" (UR, No. 10). The Decree adds this reason for this position, which is also its explanation: "For it is highly important that future bishops and priests should have mastered a theology carefully worked out in this way and not polemically, especially on what concerns the relations of our separated brothers with the Catholic Church" (UR, No. 10). The study of theology, pursued in this manner, is patiently anxious to clarify even today's opinions not as the opinions of "adversaries" but as the opinions of our brothers in Christ. Doubtless such a study of theology emphasizes a true knowledge of these brothers. It prepares our priests, without the burden of many special courses, to be able to deal with these brothers with the best knowledge of the situation according to truth and charity. The Decree immediately adds that it is "upon the formation which priests receive that the necessary instruction and spiritual formation of the faithful and of religious depend so very greatly" (UR, No. 10). The study of theology made in this manner will bring much to the furthering of the ecumenical movement, and this should be a great consolation and a stimulus to those who discharge the office of teaching.

c) There is no reason why I should follow out the applications of this doctrine to the apostolate of the Society. I know that you have already done excellently in this regard, and I do not think it is my responsibility to urge you further. This one recommendation I would like to make: *we are not so much concerned with the multiplication of new undertakings* but rather that the apostolate of the Society, specifically preaching, publications, and education, be imbued with this new spirit for that general "mobilization" which the Church has begun with the *Decree on Ecumenism*. We must move it forward day by day and we must make it effective. Otherwise, if anyone should have any doubts and questions in this area, he should propose them right now.

[Pause for questions from the audience]

I conclude: sometimes, because of the many difficulties of ecumenism, a question is asked. In the face of such great division of Christianity (for example, at the World Council in Geneva there are more than two hundred churches or ecclesial communities),

what gleam of hope is there of actually effecting unity, especially after so many centuries of division and separated lives?

Let us first *respond* with another question. When the Lord sent forth the apostles to preach the Gospel, was the state of affairs any better, or in a human way of speaking, any more hopeful? The apostles, nevertheless, with great courage and with great faith in Christ began to preach, with the greatest results. In the same way we ought to effect the beginnings of unity, and all the more because the Lord in these last few years has performed moral miracles towards the promotion of the ecumenical movement. It is our responsibility to promote that same movement by prayer, sacrifice, and by our apostolate, and not to wish "to know times or seasons which the Father has fixed by His own authority" (Acts 1:7). By the very fact that "we walk by faith, not by sight," (2 Cor. 5:7) and because "we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience" (Rom. 8:25), our work is not less but more meritorious, and even more efficacious, although sometimes we must believe "in hope against hope" (Rom. 4:18) "And hope does not disappoint us, because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us" (Rom. 5:5). These are the final words of the *Decree on Ecumenism*; they are to a certain extent the final reason for the Christian life; they are equally the final reason for ecumenism.

SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT DURING THEOLOGY

a realistic appraisal

JOHN G. MILHAVEN, S.J.

IT SEEMS TO ME there are at least three facts that bear characteristically on the spiritual development of the theologian. First of all, he is, inasmuch as anybody is, a man physically and psychologically. This is obvious to one who has taught in a philosophate and theologate, has known the same person as a philosopher and theologian. The theologian is heavier. In part, the cause is simply age. At the present, our theologians are twenty-six and up. A more profound cause is that most of our theologians have had the achievement, freedom, and recognition that goes with regency. By living and acting, they have answered for themselves questions that the philosopher asks. They have passed a point of no return.

Secondly, the theologian, critical and solidly entrenched, is drawing near to the priesthood, or is exercising the first year of it. Far more than in the past, these years press on him as the narrowing circles drawing him into becoming a priest forever. He tends to question and tries to assay all that happens in the light of the center to which he is moving.

This paper was presented to the Assistancy Conference on the Total Development of the Jesuit Priest, August, 1967, at Santa Clara, California.—Ed.

The first and second facts interpenetrate. The theologian moves towards the priesthood as a man and not just as a "young man." He moves to the priesthood as one who needs a woman and children, a family, in a way the philosopher, unsure of himself and looking for his first "Thou," did not dream of. Moreover, he knows he has the ability to create and live in such a family. He moves to the priesthood as one who has the need and ability to take responsibility, i.e., to take risks in order to create and produce, to be responsible for what he brings about. When he was younger this was a need in order to get going. Now it is a need in order to stay alive; he cannot live without responsibility and consequences in his hand. Similarly, he has the need and ability to build, to bring into existence something that stands and holds, no matter what pain, patience, or planning it requires. With all this, he knows he can lose. He has learned how the inertia of others can block his work. And so he has a living cynicism, criticism, and cruelty. What I have just described is often, perhaps always, as it is with most men, what he does not have enough of, but now sees clearly and wants lustily.

Thirdly, he is a man of the last third of the 20th century, and, therefore, action and life come first, and all prayer, studies, intellectual reflection, talk, and social structures, have to arise out of living and acting, and return immediately to them. This is why much that is to be recommended for the spiritual development of the theologian lies outside the usual area of spirituality.

These three facts combine, intertwine, and lead in a unified way, it seems to me, to some practical conclusions. First of all, in general:

1. The theologians want to and should grow peacefully in the realistic, questioning, never-fully-at-rest-faith, that is the only faith an educated adult today can have in Jesus Christ and is the only faith a priest can, in honesty, labor to communicate with his brothers, his people.

2. The theologian wants to and should grow in the believing appreciation of how God's word gives life to people here and now in all the varied situations that exist. Today, I submit, this is the only way he can work back to the appreciation and reverent love of God.

3. Now bringing the shoulders of a man and illumined by God's word, the theologian wants to and should grow in living his love for the people he can meet. This means tough, heavy, daily, and demanding work. His prayer will be mostly a distilling of this life of love; his studies an intellectual attempt to understand and plan it.

4. Because he is a man of our times, he cannot be helped much by laws, rules, direction, and communal structures, but yet needs very much the help of others just to live his life. What he needs is not authority or structures, but a living community life, friendship, encouragement, criticism, at-homeness, that is through and through a life of faith in Christ, leading to the apostolic communication of that faith.

Recommendations

Secondly, the above general conclusions, based on the theologian's manhood, growing priesthood, and contemporary pragmatism, lead to some particular recommendations:

1. For the spiritual development of the young man, as well as for his future work, the theology courses should bear directly on questions of contemporary living and provide insights that can enrich that living. This depends on what the professor chooses to say concerning questions such as the otherness of God, the pervasiveness of sin, the meaning of salvation, the uniqueness of Christian love, the "experience" of Christian faith, the efficacy of the sacraments (e.g., the value of frequency of reception), the humanness of the Church, etc. Not all teaching in the theologate can or should be directly translatable into Christian living, but the teaching on the whole should. This should determine both the choice of relevant questions and the aspects the professor has the faith, courage, and love to take up. (See *Documents of the 31st General Congregation*, Nos. 9, 23.)

2. There should be a meaningful liturgy, where the adulthood, individuality, and spontaneity of the worshippers have play. This may mean a great deal of small group liturgies. Granted the present compromised state of liturgy regulations, this will surely mean a liberal application of *epikeia*, higher laws, *gravia incommoda*, etc. Superiors should recognize the far greater good

that positive law can hinder here and should exercise leadership.

3. Freedom in prayer and forms of prayer must be encouraged. The *collatio* can be most helpful, but experience has shown that it needs the right circumstances and preparation. Here, as in so many of these practical questions, the breaking down of the theologate community into small groups (perhaps twenty or so) is called for. (See *Documents of the 31st General Congregation*, Nos. 9, 32.) On the other hand, the theologian must find his own individual way to stand daily in awe and fear and love before God, *solus cum solo*. This is so difficult for religious men today, that the greatest freedom in seeking ways should be granted, while superiors and retreat masters must remind him often how indispensable this is to his life. Precisely because personal prayer for a man of today can arise only out of Christian living and acting, there is a great danger, before the pull of action, to let the prayer, the conscious turning to God, fade away. In this respect, the fathers and brothers of the community, inasmuch as they stand out as men of God's presence, can be a powerful aid to the theologian.

4. Since the prayer and spirituality of the Jesuit today is so much a reflection and distillation of his acting and living, it is indispensable that during theology a student have constant encounters with and experience of the world going on outside the seminary: this cliché must take concrete form in his dealing with non-Catholics, women, lay scholars of his specialty, Catholic families, people in need, etc. This is usually the best way for him to find God in all things, to be able to withdraw for the prayer mentioned above. For the same reason, he should be consistently given opportunities for being responsible for others with Christ's light and love, e.g., teaching, caring for the mentally retarded, working in the inner city, helping out in reform schools, and discussing the intellectual problems of laymen. As we said above, there should be a fruitful interaction between the theology he studies and these experiences and responsible activities. In his life as a whole, God's word and love is central, and continually demands the living of it and the reflection on it through studies, prayers, and discussion.

5. The community life, in particular, the presence of and contact with the fathers and brothers, can contribute mightily to the spiritual

development of the theologians (and of the fathers and brothers). Intermingling at meals, haustus, and recreation provides many "spiritual conversations" and the kind of exchange of experience and points of view that help the spiritual life enormously. This is an opportunity for the fathers to give an example of what our Lord taught about humility and fraternal equality, by doing away with all distinctions in community life between the fathers and the rest of the community. Fortunately, the democratic temper of our times, the criticism of class distinctions and the privileges of authority, can encourage and aid such a movement back to simple Christian living. That an older priest insist, because he is a priest, he deserves a more honorable and comfortable way of life can obscure the spirituality of the priesthood of the young man.

6. Similarly, since community structures are being found frequently to be ineffective and are being more and more limited, there is a growing need of the individual for the support and direction of the community as a living whole. For example, a community service council, elected by and from fathers, brothers, and scholastics, can aid, e.g., in providing channels for inter-communication, in promoting prayer and the apostolate, and in criticizing lack of consideration in community life. Here again, though, the small community is indicated as furthering the lived "togetherness" of a few men strengthening and enlightening each other in their lives, e.g., by their common decisions. Along the same lines, the spiritual development of the theologians must include their progressive recognition of and loving patience with the sinfulness and humanness of other members of the community, particularly of superiors and professors. Once more, the small community could be realistic, eyeball-to-eyeball living of this peaceful patience and humble brotherliness that we need badly and that befits us as sinful men who believe in Christ's love for us.

7. Superiors can help the spiritual development of the theologians by making it clear that their (the superiors') reaction to requests is not principally fear of untoward consequences, tempered by resignation to the need of keeping subjects happy. Superiors' attitude should be a confident "yes" for the future, realizing the need for change, not being afraid to make mistakes, being assured that God is not dead. Superiors should realize that they can initiate

action, even before subjects urge the matter. The dynamic vision and leadership of superiors and the consequent outstanding work of the men of the province can be one of the strongest positive influences on the spirituality, just as, at times, the inertia, formalities, happy muddling in the province is the major discouragement to the prayer of the scholastic. To give himself to his spiritual life, the theologian needs the confidence that he belongs to a company of men, who have no special interest in propping up old structures or seeking novelties, but are, in fact, by word and act, saying the word of God right through to the hearts of the various people living in the area, e.g., the socially underprivileged, the politicians, the artists, etc. This may seem a far step from the spiritual life of the scholastic, yet it seems to me to be the most potent factor.

* * *

THE THEOLOGATE: A CRITIQUE

a student's view

CHARLES J. DONNELLY, S.J.

WHEN THE MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES comes to Woodstock College during the next academic year to make its evaluation, it will be presented with a variety of reports written by the students and faculty of Woodstock. The following is a phenomenological report concerning some of the factors which seem to contribute to student instability and difficulties. An initial consideration in such a report is the changing definition of the priestly vocation. The average student entered the organization about ten years before coming to Woodstock College. During the past ten years the image of the priest has changed much more than during most other ten-

year periods. Some feel that the Jesuit's image, and therefore his training, should reflect less of an intellectual emphasis, and more of an action-oriented thrust. It is hard for an institution like a college to be sure this is not a fad or an escape, and even when a movement is seen as genuine, an institution cannot change as quickly as an individual does. A college, especially, is naturally slow to modify academic emphases. The inevitable institutional lag, even while progress is being made, leads one to predict a two-dimensional conflict situation which contributes to student instability and difficulties. On the one hand, the individual may feel that he must either break out of the institution, or alter it himself in order to realize his image of the priest. The second alternative is more creative and Woodstock is taking some steps which encourage the students to participate in renewal from within.

On the other hand, since the institution is evolving to meet the new image of the priest, the conflict can work the other way around. A student may not be able to alter the image of the priest he had some years ago when he entered. In this case the institution's progress is experienced as a change which will prevent him from realizing his image of himself as a Jesuit.

In either case, some degree of instability is to be expected as a result of incompatibility between the rate of institutional change and the dynamics of the student's personality. If, as seems to be the case, both types of anxiety are present in the student body, and a relatively small number are being forced to handle it by withdrawal, the college is then in a better position than it would be if just one type were found. The present situation indicates that Woodstock gives sufficient flexibility for both groups to cope with the difficulty rather than forcing one group or the other to adapt completely or leave.

Regency experience

A second factor concerns the recent past of the average student before coming to Woodstock. The fact that the regency experience is interposed between philosophy and theology studies tends to make theology a regressive situation. Regency was generally the first time the Jesuit had any real responsibility, his first adult (teacher, not student) role, his first Jesuit experience in the city and the rich

experiences offered there, and his first opportunity for a normal social life. Theology involves some regression in all of these areas. There is little active and satisfying responsibility; the role expectations are generally the same as during philosophy and quite different from those of the regency (e.g., where faculty were peers they are now, to a degree, segregated and superior). The regency location was a source for a rich variety of experience while the theology location is quiet, rural, and without rich experience. Social life is much more homogeneous, mainly with fellow Jesuits. The progress which made regency valuable is stopped and the behavior which was typical before regency is expected to be reinstated.

Here too, Woodstock is taking steps to respond to the situation. Students are often asked to take part in College and Society decisions, but for most, it is a rather remote part. Many handle this difficulty by taking on some adult responsibilities, developing a social life and seeking rich experiences outside of the College context. This is healthy adaptive behavior and is permitted by Woodstock. However it would be better if more opportunities in these areas could be offered within the College context, for the atmosphere of the College would be significantly enriched. The solution is probably to move Woodstock to a new context where it can integrate more areas of experience into its own life.

The theology situation is oriented toward a reward which is central to the student's life: ordination. However, this reward does not demand any effective involvement of the student and has no differential influence on his behavior until the end of third year at the College. The reward, then, is too distant to be operational with any real strength. To the extent that the priesthood is an operational goal it is often seen, as noted above, in terms of an image which is not consonant with academic emphases. The solution, once again, is usually to move outside of the College context to obtain satisfaction. Woodstock is beginning to take this into account by building some pastoral activity into the academic system.

It happens not infrequently that a man enters the Society, perhaps just out of high school, and uses the early years of training as a moratorium to solve problems of identity. Frequently the conflicts are worked out during these early years; the regency experi-

ence, especially, when the man experiences his competence on a variety of levels, serves as a matrix for the formation of a new identity. The new identity may not be compatible with expected roles in theology. Or, it may simply be incompatible with the priesthood. Here we would expect a man to leave, and that decision would not necessarily imply failure on the College's part.

A more general consideration is the lack of consequence which is associated with most behavior at the College. There is very little feedback received by the students on academic and other levels of college experience. For instance, it makes almost no difference whether a student passes or fails. There is virtually no external reward or punishment associated with an exceptional student doing exceptionally well or his just passing. If an individual defines the meaning of behavior in terms of effects, much of the academic work of the College communicates no meaning to the student. Granted there may be long-term effects in terms of greater or lesser priestly effectiveness, but since the definition of the Jesuit in primarily academic terms is questioned by some students, and since in any case the ordination to priesthood is so far off, priestly effectiveness is not a high motivation factor. Much of this lack of consequence is made up for by the many activities outside Woodstock. These are important because they maintain the continuity of the (adult) regency role, offer social experience, and rather clear feedback in terms of consequences and felt competence. It is tempting to suggest also that many of the "protests" and "committees" are, in part, attempts by the individual to have a similar effect within the College environment. It would be better to associate consequences with the behavior that Woodstock demands of the student. The College might well take some steps to make this possible.

Competence is central in another student difficulty. The homogeneous background of the student body, and isolation from collegiate and inter-collegiate competition, does not allow definition of self in terms of others. The students can neither adequately judge their own competence, nor find it evaluated in the ordinary comparisons with other students and colleges. High prestige colleges are then seen as the epitome of competence. Since students do not compete successfully with any of these, many experience

insecurity, and their attempt to redefine the priestly vocation is further reinforced. Attempts at redefinition will be better matched with reality when more of reality is experienced.

Conclusion

The theme of redefining the priestly and Jesuit vocation runs through a number of the above points. It is clear that it would be a mistake to try to prevent redefinition. However, it would be just as much of a mistake to assume that reflections on this problem will lead to a new image which is appropriate for all. However, we can say that Jesuits must experience freedom and responsibility. Within certain boundaries, the student must be given the responsibility and opportunity to define himself as a Jesuit priest along three main lines. Each man is expected to have a certain amount of intellectual sophistication, a certain manner of priestly holiness, and a degree of involvement in the action of the Church in the world. Further weighting of each of these values in a Jesuit's life must be the individual's responsibility. His criterion will be his understanding of himself as a Jesuit priest. The function of the College is to provide a matrix where not only the minimum along all three lines is achieved by all, but to provide a matrix within which a man can develop himself differentially according to the weights he has assigned to each of the three values in his priestly commitment. Concretely, this implies the need for a wide variety of courses, both academic and action-oriented; a corresponding variety in faculty background and interests; and flexibility in program arranging. It also has obvious implications for the policy on library acquisitions, college regulations, etc. In most of these areas, the College is taking appropriate (if overly late) initial steps.

BORGIA'S INFLUENCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRAYER-LIFE IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

points, preludes, and colloquies

OTTO KARRER

HERE WE COME to the most interesting part of the internal history of the Society of Jesus. It is a subject as intriguing to the scholar as it is demanding of discretion and a sense of responsibility on the part of the narrator. For as the problem takes shape, it seems to point to a critical confrontation of the two most important personalities in the history of the young Order; and even in the present "historical era" there are few who know how to distinguish between a historical question of fact and a personal judgment of value.

To understand the problem itself as well as St. Francis Borgia's position with regard to it, it seems necessary to describe the intrinsic interconnection of developments from the time of Ignatius to that of the third Jesuit generation.

I

First of all, as regards a so-called "method" of prayer, it may well be an important piece of historical information for present-day critics of "Ignatian" spirituality to learn that a specific type of prayer (along the lines, say, of the method of meditation drawn up by Fr. Roothaan) was neither prescribed by Ignatius him-

From *Der heilige Franz von Borja, General Gesellschaft Jesu (1510-1572)* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1921), pp. 249-274. Translated by George W. Traub, S.J., and Walter J. Bado, S.J.

self nor introduced into the Order during the first thirty years of its existence.¹ While it is true that in his Exercises Ignatius employed, among other methods, meditation (application of the understanding to analysis of a religious truth); and was the first to work it out systematically, still he never intended elevating it to a permanent way of praying, to a kind of official method of prayer for the entire Order. That would have meant throwing up barriers to the natural dispositions of the individual and to the guidance of divine grace; and here Ignatius the mystic would have been untrue to himself. Insofar, then, as charges from the circles of mysticism are directed against an alleged "Ignatian method," they miss their target. "In order to assure everyone what was suited to him, Ignatius showed himself just as flexible with respect to the kind of prayer as he was unbending in limiting its duration."²

The sources are entirely clear on this point. In the *Constitutions* we find the terms "vocal" or "meditative" prayer or simply "prayer;"³ and they are set side by side as of equal rank, so that the individual, to be sure, under the prudent direction of his superior or spiritual father, "may seek devotion" in accordance with his natural dispositions, his degree of spiritual development, and "the measure of grace imparted to him by God." According to the text of the *Constitutions* and the testimony of such important witnesses as Nadal and Canisius or of such scholars as Astráin, Bouvier, and Aicardo,⁴ Ignatius looked upon the half hour of prayer prescribed

¹ A. Astráin, S.J. *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España* (Madrid, 1902-1925), II, 441 f. P. Bouvier, S.J., *Note historique sur les origines de l'oraison mentale* [written in 1903 and "approved" by Father General Martin in the same year (he saw in Bouvier's essay an all too rare source for acquiring a better understanding of the spirit of St. Ignatius, but indicated that Bouvier's findings should not be allowed to call into question the long-established practice of a full hour of mental prayer), this essay was finally published under the title "Les origines de l'oraison mentale en usage dans la Compagnie" in *Lettres de Jersey* for January, 1923, and reprinted as a separate fascicle later that year at Wetteren, Belgium; translators' note].

² H. Fouqueray, S.J., *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France, des origines à la suppression (1528-1762)* (Paris, 1910-1925), I, 478.

³ *Cons*, P. 4, c. 4, n. 3, d. B; P. 6, c. 3, n. 1.

⁴ *MonNad*, IV, 323. O. Braunsberger, S.J., *Beati Petri Canisii epistulae et acta* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1896-1923), V, 296, 316, 846. Astráin, *op. cit.*, II, 441 f. J. Aicardo, S.J., *Comentario a las Constituciones de la Compañía*

for the scholastics early in the day as a time to be occupied in vocal or in interior prayer; and in this connection he urged on occasion that the superior show a broadminded readiness to consider the needs of the maturing religious.⁵ The attempt (whatever its source) to appeal to St. Ignatius as the sovereign witness for an intellectual method of prayer, or indeed for any exclusive method at all—to see in him an opponent, for example, of so-called mystical forms of prayer—would be to ignore the living example of the man himself.⁶ Such an attempt seems possible at all only in an age when the letters of Ignatius were more or less a lost heritage.

He writes, for example, on September 11, 1536, of “two kinds of prayer,” discursive prayer and “another,” of which “the other” is the better. For

every kind of meditation in which the understanding is engaged wearies the body. There is, however, another kind of meditation, orderly and restful, which is pleasant to the understanding and offers no difficulty to the interior faculties of the soul, and which can be made without interior or exterior expenditure of effort. This method does not weary the body but rather helps to rest it.⁷

The point is obvious. Granted, Ignatius does not say a great deal about such matters, least of all when he is giving instruction to beginners or groups. Indeed, if one is to characterize anything as “genuinely Ignatian,” then it is precisely that he does not give any general (group) instruction at all regarding “higher prayer.” In his view the interior life is something which, like all forms of life, pursues its development according to inner laws, and the higher the form of life and its development, the less it can be encompassed by general rules. For this reason, he believes, the spiritual director must always remember that “there can be no greater mistake in

de Jesús (Madrid, 1919–1932), II, 405 f. Bouvier, *op. cit.*

⁵ *EppIgn*, VI, 90 f.; XII, 126.

⁶ See Ignatius' *Spiritual Journal* in Torre, *Constitutiones S. J., latine et hispanice* (Madrid, 1892), pp. 349 ff. [English translation by William J. Young, S.J. (Woodstock, Md.: Woodstock College Press, 1958).]

⁷ *EppIgn*, I, 108. [Karrer often seems to be paraphrasing, rather than translating, his sources. Therefore, our translation has usually been made, not from his German, but from the original Latin or Spanish; or we have used an already published English translation. For this passage, cf. *Letters of St. Ignatius Loyola*, selected & trans. Wm. J. Young, S.J. (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1959), p. 24. *Tr.*]

spiritual matters than to want to direct others as oneself."⁸ Ignatius emphasizes this point because of his own experience. In the first two years after his conversion, he says, he ran after anyone and everyone who was reported to be specially favored spiritually in order to see whether the interior life of the person in question was perhaps akin to his own and whether two people were therefore alike. But at last, he adds, he gave up; there was no one whose example he could apply to himself without modification.⁹

Finding God in all things

Certainly, the Exercises contain the three ways or degrees,^{9a} as Nadal faithfully shows.¹⁰ But in accord with the purpose of the Exercises the more elementary are presented explicitly, the higher in embryo. One must always keep in mind that the Exercises stand at the threshold of religious life—which of course is not to suggest that even the most advanced cannot learn from them again and again. But they are essentially a foundation, and therefore what Ignatius has to say to his sons and companions in his letters and *Constitutions* is not a mere repetition of the Exercises. Rather, Ignatius' attitude toward the training of young Jesuits is oriented around that sublime motif which should be ringing in their ears at the close of the Exercises (the Contemplation on Love): *hallar Dios en todas las cosas*—to find God in all things!¹¹ This practical attitude embraces an entire theory—not of presumptuous mystical aspirations, but of simple faith and awe before the omnipresence of the "divine majesty:" *oratio continua*, "continuous prayer" (to speak in early Christian terms). Nothing so characterizes Ignatius'

⁸ *SdeSI*, I, 278.

⁹ *SdeSI*, I, 341.

^{9a} I.e., the purgative, illuminative, and unitive. *Tr.*

¹⁰ *MonNad*, IV, 673. In the *Schweizer Kirchenzeitung*, Lucerne, Dec. 20, 1920, Paul de Chastonay gives a fine treatment of the wide range of possibilities which the *Exercises* actually provide for the most diverse kinds of prayer.

¹¹ As the most recent commentary on the *Constitutions* points out (Aicardo, *op. cit.*, I, 925); cf. *Cons*, P. 3, c. 1, n. 26; see also various letters of St. Ignatius to scholastics of the Society. [Karrer points out that Aicardo's *Commentary*, which began to appear after his book went to the printer, substantiates what he has to say about the prayer-life of the Society—especially II, 304 ff., 345 ff., 386 ff.]

innermost thought and desire as the fact that whenever in his letters he has anything spiritual to say to his brothers in religion, he appeals to this leitmotif of active and yet profoundly and genuinely mystical love of God. On occasion, to be sure, he turns against pietistic extravagances and expresses his reservations about private revelations and similar phenomena¹²—phenomena which are obviously not mysticism. But he does not utter such words of caution without at the same time expressing the wish that his sons may be filled with that genuine fervor which loves “God in all things” and “all in Him,”¹³ so as to make every act one of reverence for God—a prayer. That he set the greatest store by this is attested also by his closest friends and by all who lived with him.¹⁴

Without a doubt one of Ignatius’ most beautiful letters is that of September 20, 1548, addressed to Francis Borgia, then Duke of Gandia and Jesuit incognito.¹⁵ Here he expresses his joy over Francis’ spiritual zeal, but at the same time finds it necessary, in view of Borgia’s predilection for severe asceticism, to sharpen the latter’s eye for the incomparably higher value of “spiritual gifts:”

those gifts (he says) that are beyond the reach of our own powers, which we cannot attain at will, since they are rather a pure gift of Him who bestows them and who alone can give every good. These gifts with His Divine Majesty as their end are an increase in the intensity of faith, hope, and charity, joy and spiritual repose, tears, intense consolation, elevation of mind, divine impressions and illuminations, together with all other spiritual relish and understanding which have these gifts as their objects, such as a humble reverence for our holy mother the Church, her rulers and teachers. Any of these holy gifts should be preferred to exterior and visible manifestations, which are good only when they have one or other of these higher gifts as their object. . . . We know that without them all our thought, words, and actions are of themselves tainted, cold, disordered; while with them they become clear and warm and upright for God’s greater service.

The letter was, of course, written to St. Francis, and as every student of Ignatius’ letters is well aware, the personality of the addressee strongly influenced both their tone and spirit. For this reason, decisive value attaches to the passages which were meant

¹² *EppIgn*, XII, 632 ff.; *SdeSI*, I, 251.

¹³ *Cons*, P. 3, c. 1, n. 26.

¹⁴ *SdeSI*, I, 278.

¹⁵ *EppIgn*, III, 233. [*Letters*, trans. Young, p. 181.]

for all or at least for groups. As already noted, they avoid specifics; but the spirit, the general direction, is nonetheless clear.¹⁶

We come first upon a statement of Nadal's which startles us because of its boldness:

Ignatius himself told me that he found God in contemplation whenever he surrendered himself to prayer, no matter in what way, nor did he have to follow a set rule and order but rather went about praying in a variety of ways and sought God in a variety of meditations. . . . This ability to find God in all things and in every way was, we realize, a privilege granted above all to Father Ignatius; but we also believe that this privilege has been granted to the whole Society. We are confident that the grace of such prayer and such contemplation is offered to all of us in the Society, and we assert that it is bound up with our vocation.¹⁷

Compare with this the letter written at Ignatius' order to the scholastics of Coimbra, June 1, 1551:

Our Father prefers that one try to find God in all that one does, rather than devote a long time to prayer. And this is the spirit which he desires to see in the members of the Society; that if possible they do not find less devotion in any work of charity and obedience than in prayer or meditation. For they should do nothing except for the love and service of God our Lord.¹⁸

Finally, we may read that other passage addressed to scholastics in which they are urged to make a practice (over and above Mass, self-examination, and the morning half hour of prayer) of "seeking our Lord's presence in all things, in their conversations, their walks, in all that they see, taste, hear, understand, in everything they do, since it is true that His Divine Majesty is in all things." And this way of "meditating," whereby one finds God in everything, is, Ignatius thinks, easier than the other and prepares us for great visitations of God without our having to pray for long periods of time.¹⁹

¹⁶ It would certainly be an event in the field of ascetical-mystical literature if the unpublished "Treatise on the Union of the Soul with God and on Mystical Love—by our holy Father Ignatius" (cf. *PolCompl*, II, xv) should prove to be authentic. The judgment of the *Monumenta*, indeed, is: "Ex stilo suppositivus videtur."

¹⁷ *MonNad*, IV, 645, 652. [The translation here is a compromise between Karrer's paraphrase and the original Latin text. *Tr.*]

¹⁸ *EppIgn*, III, 502. [Translation in *Finding God in All Things*, trans. Wm. J. Young, S.J. (Chicago: Regnery, 1958), p. 8.]

¹⁹ *EppIgn*, III, 510.

Such statements could easily be multiplied. And significantly, nowhere do we find a passage which changes the meaning and spirit of the above texts. One feels it everywhere (and everything we know in any way about Ignatius attests to it): this *hallar Dios*, this "finding God," was Ignatius' innermost personal life.²⁰ Religious idealist that he was, he could bequeath to his followers only the highest norms. That is the tragedy of all great founders of orders.

II

From this the sublimest viewpoint within true Christian mysticism—and only from this viewpoint—can we understand Ignatius' decision regarding the amount of time for prayer in his Order.

We are in a position, first of all, to see why, in the *Constitutions* and in his letters, he did not prescribe one and the same thing for all classes or for all circumstances. For the "professed" and for the "formed coadjutors," he did not want to set up a general rule regarding either time or method. *La discreta caridad*, that is, the personal needs of the individual grounded in the love of God was to determine—always with the apostolic goal of the Order in mind—the amount of prayer, study, and ascetical practices in accordance with circumstances. For all of this is only the means for the service of souls. Here is the fundamental principle that Ignatius in the *Constitutions* sets at the head of the chapter on the various apostolic activities of the Jesuit:²¹

In view of the age and long period of testing required before men can be admitted to the rank of professed or formed coadjutor in the Society, it must be taken for certain that they will be spiritual men—men so advanced in the way of Christ our Lord that they can run along in it as fast as care for their health, external works of charity, and obedience permit. Therefore regarding prayer, meditation and study, or the discipline of fasting, vigils, or similar severities and penitential practices, it does not seem necessary to set down any regulation other than the one which mature charity will dictate to each one—provided, however, that the confessor, and in cases of doubt the superior, be consulted.

In the basic provisions regarding the prayer-life of the Society, which Nadal as visitor drew up for the Spanish members immediately after conferring with Ignatius, we read:

²⁰ Cf., e.g., *SdeSI*, I, 367, 472; the *Spiritual Journal*.

²¹ *Cons*, P. 6, c. 3, n. 1.

All must make this the goal of their prayer and spiritual life in the Lord: to find God in all their apostolic endeavors and occupations, taking the way of the spirit only, accustoming themselves to activate the spirit and devotion in all tasks, and making use of the afterglow of meditation and its habitual attitude—as much as the weakness of our nature will allow. . . . The Society regards it as an imperfection to have to withdraw much in order to pray.²²

And in a similar instruction:

The fondness and propensity for prayer, which inclines to unnecessary withdrawal and solitude, does not seem to be the prayer proper to the Society, but rather that which inclines to the exercise of one's vocation and apostolic labors.²³

Most characteristic of all, however, is the statement of Ignatius himself:

If he (Ignatius) had his way, all his spiritual sons would be like the angels, who no longer have any concern for themselves but, ever keeping God in mind, are totally preoccupied with the salvation of men.²⁴

How Ignatius interpreted his fundamental prayer-principle in practice is clarified by the fact that no letter of his is known in which he recommends longer prayer. On the contrary, many of his letters set limits to drawn-out prayer and point in the above-mentioned direction, where prayer and work become, so to speak, one. In all this, of course, the spirit of prayer was taken for granted. Ignatius faced a zeal on the part of his followers that needed to be reined in rather than spurred on. Thus the scholastics of Alcalá had to cut their time of prayer in half. Ignatius urgently pleaded with Fr. Francis Borgia (still Duke of Gandia) to do the same. The provincial Araoz had to reduce his prayer time by two-thirds—not to mention, among others,²⁵ Oviedo and Onfroy who, as early as 1549 (that is, nine years after the founding of the Order), alleged that a reform was necessary and insisted that it was to be brought about by means of longer periods of prayer. They rested their claim on heavenly revelation—which scarcely got very far with Ignatius.²⁶

²² *MonNad*, IV, 671.

²³ *MonNad*, IV, 673.

²⁴ *SdeSI*, I, 515 [here the translation is based on Karrer's paraphrase rather than the original Latin]; cf. *AnalBoll*, July 7, p. 580.

²⁵ Cf. Astráin, *op. cit.*, II, 440.

²⁶ *EppIgn*, XII, 650 ff.

So much, then, for the formed members of the Society.

The living presence of God

For the scholastics Ignatius had specified, in addition to daily Mass, a total of one hour of prayer, of which the first half was to be given to vocal or mental prayer in the morning, the second half to the two examinations of conscience.²⁷ The first half hour, corresponding to the hour of meditation today, was in general supposed to be devoted to the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin or other vocal prayer (for example, the breviary or rosary) or, at the discretion of the spiritual director, also with mental prayer when a scholastic or brother showed the proper maturity for it.²⁸

These were the requirements laid down for India as well. Beyond them, no visits in common,²⁹ no litanies³⁰ or other periods of prayer in common,³¹ were allowed—any more than the chanting of the office in choir.

But would not the life of prayer be bound in the long run to suffer under such conditions? As a matter of fact, both men more realistically inclined (like Nadal) and those more monastically inclined (like St. Francis) entertained such misgivings. Ignatius had to justify himself, and his defense consisted in the reiteration of his ideal:

Over and above the spiritual exercises assigned, . . . they should exercise themselves in seeking out the Lord's presence in all things, . . . since it is true that His Divine Majesty is in all things by His presence, power and essence. And this kind of meditation which finds God our Lord in all things is easier than raising oneself to the consideration of divine truths which are more abstract and demand something of an effort, if we are to keep our attention on them. But this method is an excellent exercise to prepare us for great visitations of our Lord even in prayers that are rather short. Besides this, the scholastics can frequently offer to God our Lord their studies and the efforts they demand, seeing that they have undertaken them for His love to the sacrifice of their personal tastes, so that to some extent at least we may be of service to His majesty and of help to the souls for whom He died. We can also make these exercises the matter of our examen.³²

²⁷ *Cons*, P. 4, c. 4, n. 3.

²⁸ *Cons*, P. 4, c. 4, n. 3, d. B; cf. *EppIgn*, XII, 126.

²⁹ *MonNad*, IV, 572.

³⁰ *SdeSI*, I, 307.

³¹ *EppIgn*, VI, 90; VIII, 95.

³² *EppIgn*, III, 510 and elsewhere. [*Letters*, trans. Young, pp. 240-241.]

More concise and even more characteristic of the Ignatian spirit is the following passage from a letter to Gaspar Berze in India:

There is even less reason for long periods of prayer there (in India) than here. In activity and in study, the mind can be turned towards God; and when we direct everything to the service of God, *everything is prayer*. Hence, all the members of the Society should be persuaded that when exercises of charity very often take from them *the time of prayer*, they are not for that reason the less acceptable to God than during prayer.³³

The observation of Fr. Gonçalves, minister of the house at Rome, bears this out in a remarkable fashion: "In spite of all this (that is, even though Ignatius was opposed to prolonged prayer), he praised prayer highly, especially the prayer that consists in living in the presence of God." We see, then, how completely consistent was Ignatius' understanding of the length and the method of prayer.³⁴

III

We come now to subsequent developments. These were bound to take place. For if it is true that, as the Order grew in numbers, some of the members found Ignatius speaking a bit "over their head," then at least in cases where the training of the young religious did not accord with his ideas, certain adjustments were sooner or later inevitable. What direction such adjustments would take is clear. Who was responsible for them is, in the end, unimportant. If Francis Borgia's personality and ascetical training had long before marked him as a man of peculiar qualifications, and if these were to play a decisive role precisely at a time when the situation was ripe for them, then, despite everything, we can look upon this meeting of the man and the hour as providential.^{34a}

³³ *EppIgn*, VI, 91. [*Finding God in All Things*, trans. Young, p. 11.]

³⁴ *SdeSI*, I, 278. Regarding the method of "acquisition," Ignatius does recommend frequent recollection, but not forced recollection, which debilitates the nervous system. On the contrary, "finding God in all things" means for Ignatius, from the very beginning, release from tension; like a peaceful looking, it involves receptivity rather than force. In addition to God's grace, we may add, it depends to some extent upon temperament, mode of occupation, and the like.

^{34a} On the use of this term (see also p. 25 below) to describe Jesuit decisions and actions, see John O'Malley, S.J., on "Jesuit Authenticity" in *Woodstock Letters*, XCV (1965), 103-110, especially 107-108. *Tr.*

The beginnings of what was eventually to be a change of course reach back to the time of Ignatius himself. Many members of the Order in Spain, especially those belonging to the spiritual circle of Gandia (Francis' own), failed to find in themselves that entire and perfect harmony with the Ignatian interpretation of the apostolate and of spiritual freedom which they would have desired. They admitted that they felt a certain uneasiness in defending the asceticism of their founder against the reproaches of older religious orders.³⁵ When Nadal came to make his visitation, they found him not entirely unsympathetic toward their views. On his return to Rome, Nadal argued their position with Ignatius in order to gain some concessions at least for the petitioners themselves. "The vehemence with which I argued the case [recounts Nadal] displeased Ignatius; yet at the moment he said nothing. The next day, however, he sharply rebuked me in the presence of the most respected fathers, and from then on he did not make much use of my services."³⁶

Never [said Ignatius]

would anyone dissuade him from holding that one hour of daily prayer was sufficient for someone in studies, provided he practiced abnegation and self-discipline; for such a man prays more in a quarter hour than a selfish, undisciplined person in two hours. Still, when anyone experiences desolation or is undergoing some interior crisis, he can be permitted longer periods for a while.³⁷

According to Gonçalves, who was present at the encounter between Ignatius and Nadal, Ignatius betrayed "both in his facial expression and in his speech such resentment and unusual agitation that I was amazed. . . . His concluding remark was: 'A truly self-disciplined man needs only a quarter hour of prayer to be united with God.'³⁸

This took place in November, 1554. After Ignatius' death the First General Congregation convened and with it came a new attempt to regularize the Order's prayer life. St. Francis himself, as noted earlier, delayed in proposing the extension of the period

³⁵ *SdeSI*, I, 250; Aicardo, *op. cit.*, II, 387.

³⁶ *MonNad*, II, 32.

³⁷ *SdeSI*, I, 278 f.

³⁸ *SdeSI*, I, 250 f.

of prayer.³⁹ But like-minded friends of his did bring the matter up for discussion. Nevertheless, the assembled fathers decided that for the time being "the *Constitutions* are to be observed and no further prescriptions are to be made in this area" (Decree 97).

In keeping with this decision, Nadal, after accompanying the General of the Order, Laynez, on a visit to the college in Paris, left behind the following regulations for daily order:

4:00 A.M., rise; 4:30, bell for the beginning of prayer; 5:00 A.M., bell for the end of prayer; in the quarter hour before 11:00 A.M. all will make the examination of conscience . . . however, priests who have celebrated Mass are not thus obliged . . . similarly, those who have received Holy Communion may pray in some other way during this time on Communion days.⁴⁰

In 1563, in an instruction drawn up for Fr. Olivier's visitation to France, Nadal explained that on the day of confession further examination could be dispensed with. In the same instruction he takes issue with the custom introduced in France of making a visit in common to the Blessed Sacrament after meals.⁴¹

Only one further item is noteworthy in the interval between the First and Second General Congregations. In Spain a continuous hour of prayer was retained despite the *Constitutions* and the General Congregation—a situation for which Borgia was responsible.⁴² Consequently, the Second General Congregation had to deal with an established custom in three or four important provinces.

The Second General Congregation

By imperceptible stages the majority in the Second General Congregation changed its position on the pending questions of ascetical training. This was not so much due to the direct influence of ideas and movements outside the Order, although at times some members did appeal to these.⁴³ Nor was the change due only to the fact that the training of the young religious in the most firmly

³⁹ *MonBorg*, III, 345, 355.

⁴⁰ Bouvier, *op. cit.*; cf. Fouqueray, *op. cit.*, I, 479.

⁴¹ *MonNad*, IV, 572.

⁴² This is clear from Borgia's new prayer regulations. In Spain its purpose was only to confirm what was "already customary in those provinces" (Letter of Oct. 9, 1565, to Fr. Valderrabano in Toledo [**Regesta Hisp-Port*, 1564-66]; similarly **Acta Congreg. Prov.*, 1568, 1571, pp. 291 ff.). [***indicates an unpublished MS. source in the Jesuit archives.]

⁴³ *SdeSI*, I, 250.

established provinces took place under Borgia's influence and lay partly in the hands of persons who considered Ignatian spirituality as simply a new patch on an old monk's-habit.⁴⁴ For even those who lived according to the mind of Ignatius tended to lose some of their assurance and conviction in face of the actual situation. In any case, "the superiors of the Society believed they noted more and more how the ideal—so dear to Ignatius—of continual union with God and of purity of intention which he expected his sons to realize in all their activity was hard to attain for the vast majority, unless the spirit renewed itself day after day in long periods of meditation."⁴⁵

Given such a situation, there was understandably a sense of urgent expectancy regarding the position the Second General Congregation would take. On July 2, 1565, Francis Borgia was elected General, and it did not take long for the controversial question to be brought up. Still, several days of discussion elapsed before the assembled fathers could agree upon the following formulation for Decree 29:

After several days of discussing the pros and cons of extending the time for prayer laid down in the Constitutions (P. 4, c. 5), the Congregation finally agreed that Father General could, after prudent consideration, add what he thought was proper in the Lord; but in so doing he should take persons and countries into consideration.

The minority, representing the northern countries, apparently hoped that the latter proviso would protect it from a general regulation.

Already on October 5, 1565, exactly one month after the close of the Congregation, St. Francis' new set of regulations for prayer was promulgated in the provinces.⁴⁶

To begin with, it is to be noted that the difference from the old regulations lies not so much in a prolongation of the time to be given to prayer as, more important, in the uniformity of the obligation imposed upon all, including the professed.⁴⁷ We can

⁴⁴ Bustamente, the first novice master, comes to mind; read *EppMixt*, V, 48 ff., 118 ff. (*Cartas de S. Ignacio de Loyola* [Madrid, 1874-89], V, 432; *LittQuad*, III, 531). Astrain, *op. cit.*, II, 135 f., 267 ff., 447 ff.

⁴⁵ Fouqueray, *op. cit.*, I, 479.

⁴⁶ Printed in *MonNad*, IV, 250¹. Astráin, *op. cit.*, II, 441³.

⁴⁷ Letter of Oct. 9, 1565, to Fr. Valderrabano in Toledo (**Regesta Hisp-Port*, 1564/66).

rightly presume that the Congregation discussed the matter, even though the sources are silent in this regard. In any event, we shall have to admit that the lives of individual religious at this time did provide reasons for this step. At the same time we need not deny that with this move a fundamental Ignatian principle was abandoned and the way opened to further general regulations for the spiritual life.

In contrast, the change regarding the length of time for prayer seems slight. The half hour of morning prayer—the term “meditation” continues to be avoided—was lengthened to one hour over and above Mass and the examinations of conscience. However, outside Spain this hour did not, for the time being, have to be continuous. In Italy, France, and Germany, one quarter of the hour was at first shifted to the evening and added to the examination of conscience. But when the honest Germans admitted to the Visitor, Nadal, that they usually fell asleep during this period,⁴⁸ the General took this as an opportunity to enforce the continuous hour of morning prayer that in the meantime had also been introduced in Rome and elsewhere.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, it seemed wise to proceed cautiously here and there. Even as late as 1571, the Visitor in Tournai ordered the Provincial to see to it that a whole hour be spent in morning prayer by his Province as by the others, “provided he thinks he can carry this through without causing friction.”⁵⁰ The Ignatian tradition remained most alive in the Rhineland Province, which submitted a petition for the “restoration of the *Constitutions*” in the next two General Congregations (1573 and 1582), though without success.⁵¹

To fulfill in some measure the requirements of the decree concerning the care to be taken for personal and local needs, St.

⁴⁸ *MonNad*, III, 388 f., 471.

⁴⁹ *MonNad*, III, 487, 514.

⁵⁰ **Call. Visit. 1560-1609 (1564-1616)*, p. 91, n. 14. Unless the daily order edited by R. de Scoraille (*François Suárez* [1913], I, 98) was inserted into the manuscript of the *Hisp. Ordinationes 1566-1592* by error then even Portuguese and Spanish scholastics (Coimbra, Alcalá, etc.) had retained their half hour of morning prayer beyond the time of Borgia.

⁵¹ B. Duhr, S.J., *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge*. (Freiburg, Munich, Regensburg, Mainz, 1921-1928), I, 571. Aicardo, *op. cit.* II, 400, 404. Decree 5 of Congr. IV.

Francis stated that if anyone had to be dispensed "because of poor health," the *Constitutions* gave superiors the authority to do so. But he took the opportunity to add that "here in Rome, in regard to the amount of time to be spent in prayer, scholastics are not readily dispensed."⁵²

The province visitors

In the other measures, too, which Borgia took to regulate Jesuit spiritual life, one cannot but notice the circumspection and prudence with which the Saint proceeded. We come upon prescriptions regarding the recitation of the rosary, the Office of our Lady, the litany of the saints and similar private or community exercises of piety, which little by little increased the previous "prayer load" and at times changed the character of the original spiritual orientation of the Society.

First of all, in regard to the hours of the Blessed Virgin and the rosary, we have his answer of 1571 to the Visitor of Sicily, which changes earlier prescriptions as follows: "Scholastics who have devoted the entire morning hour to mental prayer may recite the rosary at a separate time apart from the remaining one and a half hours; in addition, the stronger ones can be granted permission to recite the Office of our Lady."⁵³ Yet both Office and rosary—

⁵² Braunsberger, *op. cit.*, V, 306. On the other hand, it was in accordance with the mind of Borgia that Claude Matthieu, on the occasion of the visitation of Rodez in 1571 (**Gall. Visit. 1560-1609 [1564-1616]*, p. 65) and Toulouse in 1572 (*ibid.*, p. 115), could rest satisfied with a half-hour of meditation on feasts and communion days. But perhaps this involved only a local dispensation, just as a less strict practice regarding the breviary was permitted at least at times north of the Alps. True, a statement from Rome, addressed on November 21, 1567, to the rector of Mainz, points out: "the hour of morning prayer and the two-fold examination of conscience do not include the office, which we are obliged to recite by reason of Holy Orders" (**Ordinationes et Responsa Praep. Gen. 1553-1580*, p. 168); and a half a year later, Nadal prescribes in Antwerp as follows: "Priests should, even apart from the office, keep to the time of prayer, and indeed for one and a half hours as in Italy" (*MonNad*, IV, 253). But in Ingolstadt the same visitor Nadal states that after a half hour of mental prayer priests may go on to the breviary (*MonNad*, IV, 253). And years afterward, Oliverio Manareo was so sure that Borgia and Mercurian had given the very busy priests and scholastics in the northern provinces permission for a half hour of prayer that this practice was quite apparently justified.

⁵³ **Decreta Congr. et Responsa Praep. Gen.*, p. 153 f.

evidently in remembrance of Ignatius' earnest counsels—were to remain a matter of personal devotion,⁵⁴ except in cases where priests were obliged to offer Mass for a particular intention; then the non-priests were, on their part, to recite the rosary.⁵⁵

In keeping with the traditional custom of the Society, the daily celebration of the Mass was at first also left up to the devotion of the individual. Ignatius himself, because he would have been all too strongly affected by the fire of devotion, generally limited himself to celebrating Mass on Sundays. As late as 1551 he still considered it proper if, because of studies or similar duties, one rested content with saying Mass every other day.⁵⁶ Borgia likewise tended at first to look upon and recommend daily Mass as a praiseworthy, but not obligatory, custom.⁵⁷ Even in this he was a step ahead of the times in view of the usual practice in the rest of the Church. But by 1571 he had already authorized superiors to impose penances upon those subjects who failed to say Mass.⁵⁸ When the new Mass rubrics drawn up by Pius V aroused some opposition north of the Alps even among Jesuits, the General ordered the Upper German procurator to admonish those concerned as follows: "Our Father desires that the ceremonies be observed just as they stand in the new missal—and indeed all of them, and even more of them, if there were more, and with all diligence!" There follows a list of particular rubrics which were to be observed according to the Roman rite.⁵⁹

When in 1566, at the time of the Turkish threat, the same Pope prescribed processions and litanies, the General wrote to the provinces: "We consider it our duty to participate with the means proper to our vocation. Therefore, the litany of the saints is to be recited daily at some given time."⁶⁰ After the peril had passed, St. Francis was reluctant to do away with this recitation of litanies. As a result, on September 13, 1567, he ordered all provincials to retain the practice of reciting litanies in common and to have them said

⁵⁴ *MonNad*, IV, 586.

⁵⁵ See, e.g., Braunsberger, *op. cit.*, VI, 214, 638.

⁵⁶ *EppIgn*, III, 507, 509.

⁵⁷ Braunsberger, *op. cit.*, V, 548.

⁵⁸ **Decreta Congr. et Responsa Praep. Gen.*, p. 5.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁶⁰ Braunsberger, *op. cit.*, V, 279 f., 371.

for one or other important intention. From time to time he himself specified the intention.⁶¹ In December, 1570, it still seemed to him "that the needs of the Church demand that the litany of the saints be retained."⁶² As late as 1590, the special needs of the times—obviously every age has such needs—were still emphasized in 1590 by Aquaviva, though it had been pointed out to him that a custom expressly rejected by Ignatius even for special intentions⁶³ was threatening to become law with the passage of time.⁶⁴

When on the occasion of an official visit to Toulouse in 1572 Claude Matthieu, acting in harmony with the intentions of the General, directed superiors or confessors to prescribe for each individual the amount of time to be devoted to spiritual reading, at least on Sundays, feast days, and days of recreation,⁶⁵ one can readily enough see here something pertinent to the advancement of the spiritual life. But when he added "and in accordance with the custom of the Society they are to wear the rosary on their cinctures," he was appealing to a custom which came into existence only after Ignatius' death. True, wearing a rosary on one's cincture is in itself insignificant, an external matter, but the reference seems symbolic of the spirit which was at work. Ignatius avoided even in externals all that smacked of monasticism; "he did not wear the rosary on his cincture, but rather left it in his room," as one of the old sources tells us.⁶⁶ But like the monks of old, St. Francis wore the rosary even on journeys. For example, one account of the time says that during Francis' visit to the French court in Lent, 1572, the Queen Mother, Catherine de Medici, asked him for the rosary on his cincture to keep as a "relic."⁶⁷ We shall see later how, in the matter of the religious habit, Borgia tended to bypass

⁶¹ **Regesta Germ-Gall-Polon, 1565/67*, p. 122; Duhr, *op. cit.*, I, 573.

⁶² **Regesta Germ-Gall-Polon, 1569/73*, p. 141.

⁶³ *SdeSI*, I, 307; *EppIgn*, VII, 708. Cf. Decree 98 of Congr. I. *MonLain*, V, 117 f.

⁶⁴ The recitation of litanies in common was at first regarded in Spain as one of Bustamente's additions to the spiritual life of the Society. If he had his way, Bustamente would also have introduced prayer in choir immediately (*Astráin, op. cit.*, III, 448 f.).

⁶⁵ **Call. Visit. 1560-1609 (1564-1616)*, p. 110.

⁶⁶ *SdeSI*, I, 560.

⁶⁷ Alvaro de Cienfuegos, *La heroyca vida, virtudes y milagros del grande S. Fr. d. Borgia* (Madrid, 1702), V, 16, 4.

Ignatius and his immediate circle of followers (Polanco, Nadal, Gonçalves, Canisius) and to revert to the monastic garb.

The rector of Dillingen once complained of the difficulty of preserving the good attitude of the younger members of the Order assigned to his college. Borgia drew his attention⁶⁸ to a means which by that time was being observed in almost all monastic communities, the practice, namely—over and above the more or less lengthy novitiate at the beginning of religious life—of the renovation of spirit during the annual vacation or at some other opportune time of the year. Originally, it consisted of various exercises of humility and charity;⁶⁹ but eventually, it developed into a repetition of the Exercises lasting several days.⁷⁰ It seems that under Mercurian the custom of having these “Exercises for renewal”—Nadal distinguishes them thus from the Exercises themselves,” made as part of the novice-probation”—spread from Aragon to the Order as a whole,⁷¹ until it became a law under Aquaviva (1608).

The so-called *exercitatio corporis* also belongs to the ascetical practices that formed part of the daily order drawn up by Borgia. This term was used to designate manual labor: the individual was called upon to use his physical strength in cleaning the house, kitchen and farm work, etc. The last half-hour or quarter-hour before meals was set aside for such labor.⁷²

At St. Francis' behest, exhortations to the community, lasting almost an hour, were held every other week in Rome and elsewhere.⁷³

IV

So much for the amount of time to be devoted to religious exercises during the generalate of Francis Borgia. Now let us see how in the same period the Ignatian tradition also underwent change as regards the method to be followed in the spiritual life.

The text of Borgia's regulations for prayer speaks of extended

⁶⁸ **Regesta Germ-Call-Polon*, 1567/69, p. 207.

⁶⁹ *MonNad*, IV, 447 f.

⁷⁰ *PolCompl*, II, 126.

⁷¹ Astráin, *op. cit.*, III, 179 f.

⁷² **Gall. Visit. 1560-1609 (1564-1616)*, p. 18 (one-quarter hour); Braunsberger, *op. cit.*, V, 489, 718 ff. (One-quarter to one-half hour).

⁷³ **Gall. Visit. 1560-1609 (1564-1616)*, p. 114.

“prayer”-periods and specifies three quarters of an hour of “prayer” in the morning and a half hour in the evening, the time to be divided between the examination of conscience and vocal or mental prayer, “in each case according to the needs of the individual and with the approval of the superior.” The term *meditacion* (meditation) is still avoided everywhere—deliberately, one suspects, in order to assure freedom of choice. At first it was not Borgia’s intention to draw any definite limits between vocal and mental prayer. In Germany Nadal had permitted the custom to arise of sounding the bell after a half hour to mark the end of mental prayer and the beginning of vocal prayer (in given cases, the breviary). St. Francis did not approve. It seemed to him “more consonant with the *Constitutians* and sound reason” not to lay down any general rule in this regard.⁷⁴ A response to Master Antonio in Turin, dated August 24, 1569, echoes these sentiments: “Concerning prayer, our Father has no qualms whatsoever in leaving it up to your piety and prudence to determine whether you pray vocally or mentally, on your knees or in some other way.”⁷⁵ He wrote on another occasion to the provincial of Aragon:

I hear that you always exhort your subjects to make acts of love of God in prayer and that you wish to lead all along this path. Now I certainly praise your Reverence’s zeal and holy desires; but keep in mind, Father, that not all are capable of this or can comprehend it! Some follow one method in prayer, others another (cf. I Cor 7:7); and since all kinds are good, we must guarantee freedom so as to be able to give up one and adopt another when the situation calls for it. For many and different are the inspirations of the Holy Spirit and many and different the dispositions and capabilities of men.⁷⁶

Implicit in this statement was a certain criticism of the movement in Aragon which, at times unwisely, propagandized the so-called “prayer of quiet.” During his journey through Spain in 1571, Borgia felt it necessary to give community exhortations in which he took issue with this movement.⁷⁷ Here we have the antecedents of those anti-mystical circles in the Society which spread more strongly in the ensuing years and whose members—howsoever

⁷⁴ *MonNad*, III, 487.

⁷⁵ **Regesta Ital.* 1567/69, p. 280.

⁷⁶ **Regesta Hisp-Port* 1570/73, p. 27.

⁷⁷ Astráin, op. cit., III, 184 f.

rightly they may have done everything else—did make one mistake: appealing to Ignatius in support of a rigidly restricted “intellectual method” of prayer.⁷⁸

To return to St. Francis, various clues lead us to conclude that the General was happy to see at least the additional half hour spent in mental prayer. A prescript issued in 1566 by Nadal while on a visitation in Vienna reads:

Insofar as they find it helpful, priests and scholastics should devote to meditation a half-hour over and above the time required for the divine office and the two-fold examination of conscience. If they do not find this helpful, they should read something in a recollected and devout way, not for the sake of intellectual understanding but in order to appreciate the content interiorly by pausing here and there, as the last part of the Exercises (the three methods of prayer) teaches us.⁷⁹

In Ingolstadt Nadal explicitly prescribed that priests could begin the breviary only after a half-hour of mental prayer,⁸⁰ and no objection to this was raised in Rome. Moreover, in 1573, Borgia's successor, Mercurian, in response to an inquiry from the Flemish Province noted that Francis in his time had made his will clear: at least half of the hour of prayer was to be devoted to mental prayer or, as the case might be, to meditation; the remaining time could, when necessary, be given to vocal prayer.⁸¹

⁷⁸ Mercurian characterized “affective prayer” (Cordeses) as well as the “prayer of quiet” (Balthasar Alvarez) as departures from the Exercises and the Institute (Astráin, *op. cit.*, III, 181 ff.). A prescript dated March 12, 1578 (?) forbade the members of the Society to read without special permission the works of Tauler, Suso, Ruysbroeck, Rosetum, H. Herp (*Ars serviendi Deo*), Raim, Lullus, Gertrude, Mechthilde *et alia huiusmodi* (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Brieger, 1895, pp. 98 ff.; incomplete text in *Ordinationes Praep. Gen.*, 1838, pp. 20). This prohibition did not prevent Possevino (*Apparatus sacer I*, Cologne, 1608, pp. 942 f.), Bellarmine (*De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, Rome 1613, pp. 229, 366), and Lessius (*De Summo Bono II*, p. 1, n. 7) from singing the praises of these mystics. See Braunsberger, *op. cit.*, I, 79 ff. for Canisius' enthusiasm for Tauler. The following may throw further light on Ignatius' point of view in this regard: *EppIgn*, X, 349 f.; *SdeSI*, I, 324 f.

⁷⁹ *MonNad*, IV, 290.

⁸⁰ *MonNad*, IV, 253. That this was in accord with the mind of the General is clear from his response to the procurator of the upper German province in 1571: “Prayer is to last one hour and this may be filled out by reciting the Office of the Blessed Virgin or the rosary; meditation may be substituted for these latter.

⁸¹ Bouvier, *op. cit.*

Preludes, points, and colloquies

In contexts such as these, executive agencies of the Society were already replacing the more general concept of "mental prayer" with "meditation." For example, Claude Matthieu, upon completing his visitation of Rodez in 1571,⁸² prescribed the following with the approval of the General: "The hour of prayer in the morning will normally be devoted to meditation. Therefore superiors and confessors should take careful note of what subject matter Ours choose for meditation. For they should be very familiar with certain subjects, especially with those in the Exercises which deal with the life of Christ." It was desirable that during vacation the rector have the scholastics introduced to meditative prayer. Presenting matter for meditation to one-and all, however, was to be avoided. If the novice master found it worthwhile to give such matter in particular to some individual, he could do so.⁸³ When the rector of Syracuse showed a certain independence in this regard, he was mildly called to task for his breach of etiquette.⁸⁴ But he was still allowed to satisfy his zeal twice a week. Nadal did not miss the opportunity to draw up a list of subjects suitable for meditation, prayer intentions, virtues proper to religious, etc.⁸⁵ Toward the end of his life, he recalled how Father Ignatius once remarked that it would be a worthy undertaking at some future date to encourage piety by making a collection of the most beautiful pictures depicting events in the Gospel, a collection that would unite purity of style, good taste, and spiritual depth. We must admit that the zealous Majorcan did not meet the challenge too badly. A fine accomplishment of his old age was the *Observations and Meditations on the Sunday Gospels of the Entire Year*, which was published after his death together with one hundred fifty-three magnificent copper engravings.⁸⁶

The meditations which were composed with the help of St. Francis himself once he had taken up residence in Rome fall into

⁸² **Call. Visit. 1560-1609 (1564-1616)*, p. 65.

⁸³ **Ordinationes et Responsa Praep. Gen. 1553-1580*, p. 154.

⁸⁴ **Regesta Ital. 1565/67*, p. 231.

⁸⁵ *MonNad*, IV, 575 ff.

⁸⁶ *Adnotationes et Meditationes in Dominicalia totius anni Evangelia*, Antwerp, 1595. Another work, very seldom mentioned today, belongs here: *Evangelicae historiae imagines*, 1593.

a different category. Altogether ascetically oriented and constructed in a strict, methodical way with "preludes, points, and colloquies," they were obviously intended to serve as models for the members of the Society.⁸⁷ Although they were printed much later, they are nevertheless the predecessors of the so-called meditation books which subsequently flourished inside and outside the Order. These meditations of the Saint are still extant in three precious manuscripts containing the original text,⁸⁸ as well as in two incomplete copies, one of which was read and corrected by Francis himself⁸⁹ while the other was used by Nadal and prescribed for public reading in the colleges.⁹⁰ But it is no longer possible to determine exactly to what extent the individual meditations were actually reproduced for the use of the religious. It is certain that they were in frequent demand and also that promises were made that they would be sent on as soon as they could be neatly copied.⁹¹ The two copies mentioned above may well owe their existence to some such promise.

We can well imagine that this sort of advertising on the part of the third General was of great importance for the adoption of the method of meditation and, for all practical purposes, took the

⁸⁷ Laynez seems to have given the original stimulus for this work at a time when Borgia was sentenced to inactivity because of unfortunate circumstances. This is to be gathered from a letter of Borgia's to Sister Joanna Baptista dated June 19, 1566 (**Epistolae familiae Borg. ad S. Fr. B.*).

⁸⁸ **Meditazion. S. Fr. B.* (printed in F. Cervos, *El Evangelio meditado: Meditaciones . . . por S. Franc. de Borja* (Madrid, 1912); *Adnotation. S. Fr. B.*)

⁸⁹ **Conciones et meditaciones S. Fr. B.* (printed in Cervos, *op. cit.*).

⁹⁰ *P. Natalis Meditat. et Dialogi* contains the pertinent copy of the meditations from *Conciones et meditaciones S. Fr. B.* The greater part was printed in Latin (*Op.*) in 1675 by a great grandson of the Saint and in Spanish in 1912 by F. Cervos (*Evangelio meditado*). But the meditations for the feasts of the saints and the *De comm. Sanctorum* are missing from the manuscript *Adnotation. S. Fr. B.*

⁹¹ **Regesta Ital. 1565/67*, pp. 206 f.; **Regesta Germ-Gall-Polon 1569/73*, p. 78; *MonNad*, III, 347, 364 ff. The journal of the saint shows the zeal with which he worked on these in his free time. On May 1, 1564, he begs for "grace for the Gospel meditations"; by July, 1567, he had almost completed them; in the congregation of procurators held the following year, he submitted them for examination to a number of fathers (*MonBorg*, V, 741, 766, 859, 889).

place of an express command. After all, the laws of the Order had always precluded such a regulation.⁹² The practice of using the hour of prayer for meditation is a matter of custom, as Suárez points out.⁹³ Historically, this custom owes its existence to two men who in many another respect complement each other and who were just as important for the practical orientation of the Society as the *Constitutions* of the founder: Borgia and Aquaviva.

Naturally, the events of the period are also important for understanding these developments. This was the time when Teresa of Jesus was instructing her spiritual daughters in meditative prayer—without, of course, stopping at this level—and when Charles Borromeo was constantly urging this same form of prayer on his priests.

A summary review of the developments in the prayer legislation of the Order under the third General indicates the following: (1) the distinction which Ignatius drew between religious in training and formed religious was put aside and the same norm was now introduced for all; (2) the half hour of prayer in the morning was extended to a full hour and through other additions the time for prayer in general was almost doubled; (3) in general at least, a half hour of mental prayer became the rule; furthermore, because of Borgia's predilection for "meditation," the way was prepared for the priority—and for a time even supremacy—given to this method of prayer.

V

So much for the actual situation. For the historian there remains the question whether and how far Borgia's innovations brought about the results intended.

A fair judgment appears possible to us here only if we keep in mind certain other facts about the Order which at that time con-

⁹² True, the concept *oratio* is changed to *meditatio* in the writings of Aquaviva in 1610; and the hour of "meditation" is presupposed as a rule binding on all. But in their decrees (including Decree 5 of the Fourth General Congregation, Decree 25 of the Seventh General Congregation, Decree 38 of the Eighth General Congregation) the general congregations did not commit themselves to this, as Bouvier (*op. cit.*) shows against Oswald.

⁹³ F. Suárez, S.J., *De religione Societatis Jesu*, VII, 2, 2.

siderably influenced its structuring. We refer not so much to the change in the relation between the coadjutors and the professed, but rather and above all to the liberal administration of the rules for acceptance and dismissal of candidates. This, of course, helped the Order to grow significantly in numbers, even doubling and tripling it. But it also brought about the negative effect of the law of numbers.

One thing is certain: the conditions which underlay Ignatius' rules for the Society's prayer life no longer obtained. To repeat, Ignatius' view of the spiritual life was extraordinarily high, perhaps too idealistically so for the run of mankind. The basic principles of the spiritual life which he mentions are meant for a chosen elite. A statement he made in his last years speaks volumes: "If there were any reason why he would like to live longer, it would be to see realized his intention that admission into the Society be made very difficult."⁹⁴ Yet his strictness in this regard was already legendary. The more the requirements for candidates were lowered under the third General (several superiors and provincial congregations lodged complaints about this, but because of the growing number of colleges being taken under the Society's wing Borgia could not do otherwise), and the less resolutely the training of the young religious was oriented from the very beginning in the direction indicated by Ignatius (St. Francis for one did not return to it), the greater was the number of those for whom Ignatius' idealism—if they knew it at all—necessarily seemed too high or unattainable. Still, the average Jesuit was a good religious; and perhaps for him Borgia's system was the natural one. Thus, we can look upon the ascetical character of Borgia's spirituality, its "monastic wrappings" included, as a providential quality^{94a} of the man himself. It helped him to achieve effectively what the evolution of the Society demanded: to set up a structural organization, so far as it seemed necessary, in place of the "spirit." It is surely no accident that, with the possible exception of the northern countries, Borgia's innovations came off with relative smoothness. By and large, they were more the expression of an existing spirituality than its cause.

⁹⁴ *SdeSI*, I, 444, 397.

^{94a} See note 34a above.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

We can, however, learn something from this period of the Society's history. So far as it was attempted or carried out, uniform regulation of the spiritual life—especially when it appealed to the so-called "Ignatian method" in its effort to hold back or choke off a spirit of mysticism—was not only opposed to the ideals of Ignatius but also necessarily led to lamentable inner crises and to the obstruction of valuable personal and apostolic forces. Perhaps there is food for thought here. The early Society was, to all appearances, more blessed than the later one with strong personalities and apostolic-minded saints.

But in all its pithiness the saying still holds: "The Spirit breathes where He will."

EXILE FROM BURMA

the last chapter

SIGMUND J. LASCHENSKI, S.J.

This is the last chapter of the story of the Society of Jesus in Burma, at least for some time to come. The beginning of our Burmese adventure has already been recounted in WOODSTOCK LETTERS. There a brief history of the Church in Burma was given. In that first article, I tried to sketch the various apostolates we undertook, especially the staffing of the country's first Regional Major Seminary for diocesan priests. In the last ten years, Burma has undergone a great internal struggle which has affected all areas of society. This article is an attempt to explain how the Jesuits have contributed to the Church in Burma, especially in the last five years. Our work in Burma was short, but we hope not without lasting effect. All of us who were there can only pray and encourage those who remained to carry on our work as we live in exile from Burma.*

THE STUDY OF THE BURMESE LANGUAGE continued until the end. We made time for this during the annual major vacation period of two months when several of the fathers would go out to the villages and towns in the Mandalay area or in the Delta and, living in the midst of the people, would imbibe the language as well as study it formally under a teacher. Some could find time to learn the language during the Christmas holidays by juggling their teaching schedules at the Seminary. Others doubled their teaching load for

* "Jesuit Assignment to Burma," WOODSTOCK LETTERS 90 (1961) 3-20.

a while to get a couple of months off occasionally during the school year. All had more and more daily experience in speaking the language about town as the use of English faded from the scene. Learning Burmese was a hit-and-miss affair all the way. The degree of proficiency attained by the fathers varied: all could get along in basic communication when necessary; several could preach and hear confessions; and a few were at the point of being able to give retreats in Burmese. As a group, though, not to mention as individuals, they were far from being expert, a fact which frequently enough hampered apostolic effectiveness, even within the Seminary. The Seminary faculty provided a considerable amount of consultation service to bishops, priests, brothers, sisters and laymen. Worthy of mention in this regard is Fr. Joseph F. Murphy's function as Secretary of the Central Commission for the planned First National Plenary Council in 1958, his membership on the Committee for Spiritual Life and Formation in the Conference of Religious Superiors, which was formed in 1962, and his services rendered when representing the Seminary's problems to the bishops at their annual episcopal meetings.

Fr. Rufus P. Roberts, too, was frequently consulted by both priests and bishops for help in the solution of marriage cases as *Officialis* of the Archdiocese of Rangoon. Beginning in 1961, he organized the legal sector of the Archbishop's office, published an updated *Folium Facultatum* for the Archdiocese, which was subsequently adopted by many of the other Burmese dioceses, and composed a new constitution for a native Burmese congregation, the Sisters of St. Francis Xavier.

Perhaps here it would be proper to mention Fr. Edward J. Farren's work with the Catholic Teachers' Guild of Rangoon, a group of some 400 people, both religious and laymen. Fr. Farren took over the organization recently started by Archbishop Bazin, saw it through its early years of growing pains, built it up into an autonomous body of mature men and women with an increasing sense of professional pride, established within the association a successful credit cooperative, and then watched the whole structure disintegrate before his eyes with the Burmese Government's nationalization of the schools and accompanying hostility towards all non-government-sponsored institutions. No doubt, consultation of

a more technical nature was offered on various occasions by other members of the Seminary faculty, too. But all were called on frequently by the laity, religious, and clergy for spiritual counseling. Usually this would come about through contacts arising from other apostolates.

Retreats

The request for retreats kept increasing to the point that much of the October mid-semester holidays, the Christmas holidays, and the long vacation would have had to be consumed in giving the Spiritual Exercises. Eventually the community protested, because some time was needed to catch one's breath after an extremely busy school year. More importantly, time was required for the study of Burmese. Fr. Murphy, our superior and the rector of the Seminary, made increasing efforts to involve others, such as the Columban fathers and the Salesians, in this apostolate to help lighten the load. The Archbishop of Rangoon, the Most Rev. Victor Bazin, M.E.P., lent assistance as a retreat master.

A glance below at our own retreat statistics throughout the eight years might be of interest:

	Retreats to					TOTAL
	PRIESTS	SEMINARIANS	BROTHERS	SISTERS	LAYMEN	
1958	2		1	5	2	10
1959	1	1	1	6	5	14
1960	2	1	1	8	2	14
1961	3	1	3	6	7	20
1962	1	1	1	7	2	12
1963	3	1	2	11	6	23
1964	3	2	2	8	1	16
1965	3	2	2	3	0	10
1966			1			1
	18	9	14	54	25	120

The above table does not include the annual retreat given to the scholastics in 1959, nor occasional tridua and days of recollection. We had to leave Burma in 1966 just at the time that the retreat season opened. Our retreat work took us all over the coun-

try and provided the opportunity for learning much about Burma and the Church in Burma. Two of the retreats, one to sisters in 1964, and the other to brothers in 1965, were given in Burmese. The rest were in English. From the beginning it was judged necessary for our fathers to be regular confessors in Rangoon to the Christian Brothers, the Good Shepherd Sisters, the Little Sisters of the Poor, the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary, the Medical Mission Sisters, the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition, the Sisters of the Seven Dolors, and later, the Sisters of St. Francis Xavier. We went to these institutions each week and included a monthly conference. Daily Mass was provided for one community of Christian Brothers near the Seminary and for two communities of the Good Shepherd Sisters. After a couple of years our services to the French-speaking convents of the Little Sisters of the Poor and one community of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary were handed back to the French Foreign Missionaries of Paris. There still remained, however, a weekly jaunt to eleven communities.

Work in education

From the beginning, also, we were requested by Archbishop Bazin to assist the two French priests who had been working with the Catholic students, some 200, attending the University of Rangoon. Fr. Roberts was the first one to engage seriously in this apostolate. In 1962, after a two-week apostolic training course for members of the Catholic Student Association, conducted by Fr. Roberts, Fr. Eugene P. McCreesh, and Fr. P. Courtot, M.E.P., the Director of the Association, a Young Christian Students' chapter was formed. From then on both, Fr. Roberts and Fr. McCreesh were busy with the students. Later the movement spread to the high schools, where both fathers worked hard to help high school faculty members set up and conduct YCS groups.

Fr. Murphy was regular confessor and lecturer to university students in Marian Hall, a hostel run by the Good Shepherd Sisters. I assisted a sodality of university women students, mostly Chinese, which is now playing a vital role in the life of a parish that has been deprived of its priests. In the last year Fr. Farren was beginning a small sodality for teachers at their request. Through the Catholic Teachers' Guild, Fr. Farren had considerable contact with both university and high school students.

In 1963, I was asked to initiate a Sisters' Formation Program for the religious of Rangoon. Literature from the United States was studied and work began in an unobtrusive way with monthly sessions. The program included an investigation of the customs and beliefs of the non-Christian peoples among whom the sisters worked and lectures on the history of the Ecumenical Councils up to and including Vatican II. The following year the sessions were increased to twice a month. In 1965 there developed out of this an intensive and much needed eight-day course, 8:30 A.M. to 6 P.M., in modern catechetics for both sisters and brothers. On April 1st, the day after the course ended, the Government of Burma nationalized (took away) all the high schools which the brothers and sisters had been conducting in the country for the past century. From then until the end of March, 1966, we provided a second course in catechetics for the religious who had missed the first one, and then an advanced course to train the same religious in conducting similar courses for lay catechists.

As can be imagined, this year of 1965-66 was one of anguish for the religious of Burma, who lost everything they had and were now forced to readjust themselves radically to a new mode of apostolic existence. It is to their credit that they were able, not only to persevere in peace amidst such trying circumstances, but to enter with enthusiasm into a full-time study and practice of the catechetical apostolate, which was urgently demanded now that all the Christian high schools, and later all the primary and middle schools as well, had become the state schools of a strong, secularist, socialist government.

A further development was the formation of a catechetical translation committee composed of brothers, sisters, a layman, and one of our fathers, which spent the last year translating Sadlier's *On Our Way Series*, a task that is still being carried on. This particular text was chosen in preference to others as being most suitable for adaptation to Burmese life. When the first book, Grade Two was finished, and close to a thousand copies were cyclostyled and distributed, it met with an enthusiastic response from people who until then had in Burmese only the *Baltimore Catechism*.

It was the intention of this committee to move into the much more difficult area of Bible translation in conjunction with Fr.

William D. Lynn and Protestant scholars, perhaps, when the catechetical work was completed. A Catholic Burmese edition of the Gospels and Acts and the entire Baptist Bible are available. Both are in need of thorough revision.

During the transition period which led to concentrated attention on the catechetical formation of the brothers and the sisters, the Sister Formation Program came to an end. Moreover, Fr. Lynn and Fr. Roberts were now assigned to give regular courses in liturgy and canon law to the same religious. Peculiarly enough, Archbishop Bazin, who up to this time had shown himself a bit cool towards the Sister Formation Program, now began to urge it, asking us to give all kinds of courses, together with himself and a few of the other priests, to just the sisters. But having clearly reached the limits of our capacities and energies, we had to refuse. The Sister Formation Program as such went on without us.

Liturgy and ecumenism

From 1964, during the early years of liturgical renewal, all the Jesuits had many occasions to cooperate with the Archbishop and the local clergy, both foreign and native, in implementing the decrees. Deserving of special notice, however, is Fr. Lynn's long series of articles in both the English and Burmese editions of *The Sower*, Burma's Catholic newspaper, explaining in detail the liturgy of the Mass and the principles behind the recent changes. Fr. McCreesh, too, made a significant contribution, after many hours spent with the seminarians and one of the Burmese priests in translating the Mass into the vernacular for congregational use and composing a Burmese sung Mass. In a similar way our Kachin seminarians from northern Burma composed, together with some of the Irish Columban fathers, a Mass in Kachin. Much remains to be done in implementing the liturgical reforms in a Church which exists mainly among a diversity of racial and tribal groups, some of whose dialects do not yet have a written form.

Fr. John J. Keenan was instrumental in initiating a retreat movement among adult, educated Catholic laymen. Fr. McCreesh assisted with the Rangoon Catholic Doctors' Association. Fr. Murphy headed the Apostleship of Prayer for Burma. Fr. Roberts taught occasional courses on marriage and medical ethics to university students and student nurses. In the earlier years when we had more

time, a positive effort was made to establish contact and form friendships with Buddhist monks and laymen, but with the pressing obligations of later times this effort, though never totally abandoned, was much diminished. Some of the Seminary staff regularly taught catechism to children and adults. All at one time or another visited the homes of as many of our seminarians as possible. All were called upon for parish assistance and occasional preaching. The instruction of catechumens was a common, if not frequent, form of the apostolate, except for Fr. Farren whose activity in this matter, particularly among the Chinese, was constant and remarkable.

Generally speaking, it seems that Protestant-Catholic relations in Burma before 1958 were cool. In some places Catholics were reacting vigorously to Protestant charges. During the Karen insurrection after Burmese independence in 1948, Baptists were pitted against Catholics in armed conflict in the mountains of northeast Burma. True, there were rare instances of personal friendship, such as that between Archbishop Bazin and the Anglican Bishop of Rangoon, and between Fr. M. Narbaitz, an outstanding French missionary in the Delta, and his Protestant neighbors. Perhaps there were other examples. But, on the whole, Protestants and Catholics tended to lead their lives of Christian witness as if the other did not exist. Little was shown in the way of communication, mutual trust, or Christian love.

The Burmese ecumenical movement was begun on December 2, 1960, by Dr. Paul Clasper, Vice-President of the Baptist Burma Divinity School, with an interdenominational meeting at his home on the Divinity School campus. Three Jesuits and eight leaders of the Baptist Church were present. Fr. Lynn presented a paper on the Catholic position on ecumenism, and U Kyaw Than in turn gave the Protestant view. A lively discussion ensued. The Archbishop approved this meeting with a certain amount of reluctance and a warning to keep the matter quiet. We did not interpret this, however, as forbidding us to inform the seminarians.

The following year a similar meeting was held in Dr. Clasper's home with an exciting discussion on faith and good works. This time a few Protestants of other confessions were present. The same year three of our fathers participated in a three-day institute on the

problem of the Christian encounter with Buddhism, an institute which took place in the Anglican Seminary and was sponsored by the Burma Christian Council, a loose federation of the major Protestant Churches of the country comprising Baptists, Anglicans, Methodists and Lutherans.

Cooperation

In 1962 three of us accepted Dr. Clasper's invitation to a dinner and discussion with Dr. John Bennett of Union Theological Seminary, New York. After this Dr. Clasper and his family returned to the United States. He now resides at Drew University in Madison, New Jersey where he is Professor of Ecumenics and World Religions. Before the close of the year, however, four Jesuits went to the home of Dr. William Winn, who was to take Paul Clasper's place in the ecumenical movement. The meeting at Dr. Winn's house was an informal question period by Baptist faculty members and students on Vatican II.

In 1963, we had the first joint picnic for our seminarians and the senior class of the Baptist Divinity School, young men and women who were about to go forth as ministers of the Word of God. We attended at their invitation. The picnic was a success, broke down many prejudices, stimulated mutual understanding, and laid the groundwork for friendships which continue to this day.

At the Pontifical Requiem Mass for Pope John at St. Mary's Cathedral in June of the same year, the Most Rev. Victor Shearburn, Anglican Bishop of Rangoon, and his aides knelt on prie-dieus in the sanctuary and a contingent of Baptist friends worshipped in the nave. Our students also received a letter of condolence on the Pope's death from the Baptist seminarists.

Two of us, together with the local parish priest, attended Baptist and Methodist Christmas celebrations at Twante, a distant river town. Three others went to the Baptist celebration in Rangoon for the 150th anniversary of the arrival of Adoniram Judson, the first American Baptist missionary to Burma.

In 1964 we took the initiative for the first time and invited the Baptist senior seminarians to Du Bern Beach nearby for their annual picnic, then to our Seminary for tea. At Fr. Murphy's invitation Bishop Shearburn and Canon Maung Phe, the rector of the Anglican Seminary, visited us for a talk on ecumenism and for

dinner. Fr. James Fisher, Secretary of the Catholic Church in Burma, Fr. Gabriel Thohey, who was soon to become the first indigenous Coadjutor Archbishop of Rangoon, and Fr. Lynn participated in the annual meeting of the Burma Christian Council. By this time our own students had thoroughly caught the ecumenical spirit and increasingly took the initiative in establishing contacts with their fellow non-Catholic Christians during the holidays.

When our separated brethren were invited to the episcopal consecration of Coadjutor Archbishop Gabriel Thohey in 1965, they came and stayed for the entire two-and-a-half-hour ceremony. They came again for the minor orders and subdiaconate of our seminarians. Our fathers attended two Faith and Order meetings of the Burma Christian Council. Fr. Lynn addressed the Karen Burma Baptist Convention on the occasion of their one hundredth anniversary, preached for one of the regular Sunday worship services at the Immanuel Baptist Church, and took a group of the theologians from our Seminary to a student ecumenical meeting at the Baptist Seminary. The Catholic Major Seminary staged a lawn party and Bible service for a group of some thirty parishioners from the Immanuel Baptist Church.

The last year of our residence in Burma, 1966, saw a joint ecumenical effort in the city of Rangoon during the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity in January. The charismatic character of it surprised all! Every other day during that week, Christians of different confessions thronged together for an ecumenical prayer and Bible service, first at one of the Baptist churches, then at the Methodist church, then in the Anglican cathedral, and on the last day in the Catholic cathedral, where the Anglican Bishop, a Chinese Methodist Bishop, ministers of all the major churches and our own Catholic priests gathered around Archbishop Bazin in the sanctuary to pray for unity. Similar experiences were had in Myaungmya and Moulmein, and it was reported in the *Religious News Service* for March 28, 1967, that this year the services spread to Taunggyi, Toungoo, Maymyo, and Mandalay.

The joint annual picnic with the Baptist seminarians went off well for the third time in 1966 and it occurred again this year after our departure. Fr. McCreesh gave the third Lenten sermon at the Immanuel Baptist Church on the text "Behold your mother"

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

(John 19:27), which had been provided by the pastor of that church. All our seminarians attended and provided the choir. Finally, Dr. William Hackett, Baptist minister, scholar, linguist, and agricultural expert, visited the Seminary to talk to our students on problems of administration and ministry within the Baptist Church. During the second semester of 1965 George Bo Pha, a young Baptist scholar, joined our Seminary faculty as music teacher.

The beginnings and growth of ecumenism in Burma have been elaborated in some detail, even at the risk of going too long, to impress on those who read this account the importance we attached to such efforts for the effectiveness, if not the very survival, of Christian witness in Burma. Although much remains to be done, the mutual understanding and friendship that have already resulted are of inestimable value. It was especially rewarding on the seminary level, where tomorrow's pastors had already formed deep friendships before meeting one another in the active apostolate. What this means for the Church in a predominantly Buddhist society, and more recently, in a socialist state that is hardly friendly to any religion, can be easily imagined.

The seminary

The Maryland Province Jesuits were sent to Burma in 1958 at the request of the bishops there to staff the Catholic Major Seminary, the first major seminary of the Union of Burma, a Regional Seminary for all the dioceses under the Sacred Congregation *de Propaganda Fidei*. The background of this mission and the first two years of its development have already been treated in the issue of WOODSTOCK LETTERS that was mentioned in the beginning of this article.

Our student body grew slowly from thirteen in first and second year philosophy in 1958 to forty-four men distributed over three years of philosophy and four years of theology in 1966. We expanded from a group of Burmans, Delta Karens and Tamils in our first year to a seminary of many races including Burmans, Tamils, Delta Karens, Hill Karens, Kachins, Chins, and Eurasians. But over the years our students grew in maturity as well as in number and races. Presupposing their advance in age and grace, three factors may be judged to have been important constituents of the

seminarians' growth in maturity: their apostolic formation, studies, and spiritual guidance.

Apostolic formation

1.) Ecumenism. This formative element of growth has just been explained in the pages immediately preceding, and the fact that it had a noticeable effect in the maturing of our students is merely called to the reader's attention.

2.) Catechetics. All had to engage in catechetics regularly beginning from the second semester of their first year until the end of their seventh year. During the first semester of first year philosophy Fr. Lynn gave a course in the basic content and methodology of modern catechetics. After that the students were assigned to one of the catechetical missions where they would usually have to work two years before being transferred to a new mission. The missions included the Leper Asylum and Home for Incurables, conducted by the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary; two catechetical centers in private homes in North Okkalapa, which was part of a vast, resettlement suburban area of Rangoon; St. Margaret's and St. Francis Tekkatho, two private schools run by Catholics for neighborhood children, both Christian and non-Christian; and the Seminary itself, which was a center of instruction for both our Catholic employees and the Catholic children of the immediate environs. Such were the scenes of sixteen classes involving some 200 people each week. Two of the faculty sat in on these classes regularly and presented the teacher with a critique on his teaching afterwards. Fr. Farren also contributed to the seminarians' training by making available visual-aid equipment and instructing them in its use. Moreover, a variety of literature in modern catechetics was furnished by the library, and the young men were encouraged to engage in catechetical activity as much as possible during the long vacation.

3.) The apostolic symposium. The long vacation is a period of two months from mid-March to mid-May during the hot season, and corresponds to the three-month summer vacation in the United States. For this vacation, each seminarian returned to his own diocese, where he was allowed a week to ten days at home, as a rule, and then sent by his bishop to one or more other parishes to live.

From the start we were intensely concerned about this period of time as a vital supplement to the apostolic formation of the men. When a seminarian returned to his diocese, he was under the authority of his bishop, and more immediately, was dependent on the pastor of his parish. Although the bishops were keenly interested in their seminarians, some were better at providing an apostolic holiday program than others, and the same held true for the pastors. Consequently, in many places much was left to the initiative of the individual student, which was either encouraged or suppressed and the results were often sporadic.

As a partial solution to the problem the seminarians conducted an apostolic symposium after they returned to the Seminary at the beginning of each academic year. Those who had shown more initiative or had more apostolic opportunities were selected to speak in the symposium and share their experiences while the rest were encouraged to make greater efforts in the future. The following is a sample report from one such symposium in July, 1963:

On June 9th, the day of the monthly recollection, the Seminary conducted its fourth annual Apostolic Symposium. At this Symposium fourteen seminarists representing the upper six years of the Seminary related their apostolic experiences . . . of the past vacation. It has been our observation that the seminarists not only learn much from such a presentation, but also receive valuable motivation. . . .

The following were the most common works:

Holy Week Commentaries	17 seminarians
Teaching catechism	16 seminarians
Preaching	23 seminarians
Visiting the sick	17 seminarians

In addition, three men spent much time showing religious slides to the villagers; three were engaged in translation work; two toured with their parish priests; and one worked hard in staging a religious play.

Finally, the third year theologians . . . took the medical training course in Kemmendine. This year it was decided to have the course run for four weeks instead of two, much to the satisfaction of the sisters conducting the course and the seminarians taking it.

Some interesting points brought out during the Symposium were these:

- a.) In bringing Christ to the people, an effective way is through their children.
- b.) It is necessary to be prepared in advance to train both servers and singers for Holy Week, and to preach. It seems that some were asked to preach, especially, on very short notice.

- c.) One should not be afraid to take the initiative, though always with due deference to the parish priest, and suggest to his parish priest that he be allowed to give Holy Week commentaries, preach, teach catechism, etc., if the parish priest fails to give the seminarian staying with him anything to do.
- d.) Apparently the people want to see their priests and seminarians men of prayer, are edified if they do see this, and are surprised and hurt if they do not.

The other solution, which we began to apply to the problem of the long vacation, was to design certain obligatory programs. Thus between the third and fourth year of theology the men had to live together for five out of the eight weeks in a center and prepare for the *Ad auds*. These parish centers were carefully chosen by the bishops so that there would be a priest present who was willing and able to act as consultant for the students.

Increasing Opportunities

Between second and third years the theologians had to return to Rangoon for first a two-week, and in later times, a four-week course in theoretical and practical medicine under the expert guidance of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary and of government physicians at the Leper Asylum and out-patient dispensary. Here the seminarians not only studied about leprosy and all the common ailments, but had to work in the dispensary for three hours each morning treating the patients themselves, and later go and dress the lepers' wounds.

In recent years when we began the practice of sending our students out to neighboring dioceses during the ten day mid-semester holidays, we found that most often the pastors were waiting for them with a full round of apostolic activities from teaching music to giving retreats. These October holidays were always eagerly anticipated by the seminarians, both because of the potentially interesting apostolate and because they were going to a diocese different from their own.

As a further intensification of the apostolic training program, all were sent out after our departure to nearby parishes during the Christmas holidays. Since Christmas of 1966, the older men began the practice of going to the parishes to work there every weekend.

- 4.) Sodality. After some discussion it was decided to begin a

Seminary sodality. It had to be voluntary and adapted to the goals and life of seminarians. Passing through various stages more or less successfully, it evolved into a sodality for theologians. The first year and a half was a time of probation. This was followed by temporary consecration to Christ through Mary, and if the candidate so desired, he made a lifetime consecration in his fourth year. Plans were being made for an alumni sodality as part of the alumni association. The key elements of the Seminary sodality were consecration of one's life under Mary (an idea which has strong appeal to the Burmese Catholic), orientation to the priesthood, and extra preparation for the priestly apostolate through study and action. The study became a sociological inquiry into the many components of the societies in which they would be functioning as priests. The planned action, which was never able to be carried out because of the sudden change in Seminary administration, was to conduct a sociological survey in the villages where the seminarians would be living during the long holidays. There was, however, considerable action of another sort on the part of the Seminary sodalists through participation in the meetings of parish and university apostolic groups about town.

The results of sodality studies were made available to all the seminarians, and the weekly sodality meetings, open to all, were attended by many non-sodalists. There was also a special sodality project for greater contact with and understanding of the sick and disfigured, in which, on a purely voluntary basis, the director and one of the sodalists would from time to time visit the Home for Incurables and help the staff by bathing the spastic children there.

5.) Apostleship of Prayer. The Apostleship of Prayer had been introduced into Burma by the French Foreign Missionaries of Paris long ago, but apart from the use of the Morning Offering which was available in both English and Burmese prayerbooks, by the time we arrived on the scene the association was nearly defunct. Although we attempted to revive it on a national scale, the response to our efforts on the part of the clergy was not exactly enthusiastic. However, as in many other fields, our hope was in the future priests and bishops, our own students. Towards the end of the course of theology each one had to put in a year as a promoter of the Apostleship of Prayer. This involved a monthly meeting and active

promotion of the Apostleship of Prayer among the people of our catechetical missions and those who came to the Seminary every Sunday for Mass. The response of the seminarians to the whole idea was encouraging, for they recognized two elements of the association as having particular value for the Church in Burma: the offering of one's day to Christ in the Morning Offering and attempting to carry out the offering and the organization of a parish spread out over the hills, the plains, or the Delta into bands of ten people under a promoter who would visit them each month.

6.) Homiletics. Perhaps the most important part of their apostolic formation was the seminarians' work in speech and homiletics throughout the seven years. During the years of philosophy, class was held every Sunday morning in the theory and practice of correct English speech. Sermons were delivered in the refectory also.

Homiletics classes were likewise conducted on Sunday mornings through the four years of theology. Concurrently each theologian had to take his turn in preaching every Sunday morning at the 8:15 Mass. This Mass was originally intended for our Catholic workmen and their families, but attendance spread rapidly to people living in the neighborhood who, because of the distance from their parish church, would not otherwise get to Mass at all. Before giving his Sunday sermon or homily in Burmese, the seminarian had to practice, tape-record, and listen to the sermon the night before, and have it criticized by the Jesuit in charge of speech. Such Seminary training was very much supplemented by the widespread practice, due to the shortage of priests, of seminarians preaching in the country parishes of Burma during the vacation periods.

7.) Liturgy. The liturgy, so vital to the life of our people, especially in lands where a liturgical celebration is often enough a rare event, was always the object of special concern. There were weekly classes in rites and liturgy for the philosophers, and a course in the liturgy for the theologians. Of still greater importance was their participation in the liturgy. With the Archbishop's permission, we kept somewhat ahead of the new liturgical changes and were already incorporating them into our services when the laws went into effect. Full participation in the Eucharist in both English and Burmese with deacons, lectors, commentators, choirs, and proces-

sions was constantly experimented with and re-assessed. The 8:15 Sunday Mass for the people proved to be an invaluable liturgical workshop for the theologians, with one of the fourth-year theologians appointed for a semester as quasi parish priest to coordinate the liturgical program and keep in touch with the people.

Studies

The last two subheadings lead to the area of formal studies. The study of philosophy and theology and related subjects received prime emphasis. This was felt to be imperative in a land where learning was very much lacking, and had even been discouraged among Catholics in the rural areas by an earlier generation of missionaries.

Despite the stress on studies and our continual wrestling with the problems of improving the quality of our courses in philosophy and theology; despite the fact that we petitioned Rome and received in 1964 a dispensation from the use of Latin as the medium of instruction, which had proved a formidable barrier to learning for young men whose background was completely devoid of any Latin and Greek culture; and despite the impression that the situation was steadily improving, we felt at the time of our departure from Burma that the Seminary was still considerably substandard in comparison with many other Asian seminaries. English had to be taught during the years of philosophy. Throughout the seven years of the course, constant effort had to be made to instill a desire to read more than what was strictly assigned. By the time they finished, most of our students had acquired reading habits and a desire to continue reading at least in literature which is pertinent to the Church. This was gratifying, but it is indicative of the academic level at which we were existing.

A further problem was the constant battle that had to be waged to maintain minimal entrance requirements for the Major Seminary. Seminarians of today were to be the leaders of the Church tomorrow. In the light of our experience with the intellectual needs of the Burmese seminarian, seven years of seminary training was, for the most part, just barely enough. Moreover, if the candidate was to profit from these seven years, he had to have passed at least the ninth standard and have two additional years of Latin and

English before coming to us. But this minimal requirement did not really satisfy us, and we lobbied hard with the bishops to send us only boys who had passed the tenth standard and matriculated, i.e., were eligible for college.

The majority of the bishops supported this position and tried, not always successfully, to see that these requirements were fulfilled. However, certain bishops and their consultors from the north-eastern part of the country, who like everyone else were terribly short of priests and wanted men fast, offered vigorous opposition. They believed that their priests would be working deep in the jungle among the most primitive types of people, and so, needed little education. At least, so they felt, our insistence on such high educational standards was utterly unrealistic. To which we replied that precisely because of the primitive conditions in which their priests would be laboring, it was all the more necessary for them to be well educated. Moreover, the children of even the primitive peoples were beginning to go to school, and some to college. How would ignorant priests be able to take their places among these educated fellow citizens as leaders of the community in the modern world?

Closely connected with studies was the library which, with the help of many benefactors, was gradually acquiring real excellence. By 1966 it contained over 12,000 selected volumes. In 1964 the Government issued an ambiguous decree on the registration of all private libraries. The Archbishop decided that this decree must apply to us also, even though as a strictly religious institution we were very different from ordinary private libraries. Five hectic weeks ensued during which, with the help of two hired typists and assistants, every book was registered in triplicate according to author, title, publisher, date of publication and country in which it was published. Shortly after, we received our registration number from the Government, and later the entire library was checked by an agent from "the Special Branch" of the police. For reasons that were not altogether clear the Government refused to grant a renewal of the registration the following year. But we carried on, books were allowed into the country duty-free, and we were able to maintain a fresh intellectual life. The library is intact to this day, and during the past year we have been able to send many more books to enhance its value.

It might be useful to sum up this section on studies with a list of the teaching loads of the faculty. Fr. Murphy, the rector, taught a three-year cycle course on the Gospels to the philosophers and various courses in Oriental and Church history. Frs. Farren and McCreesh shared the philosophy department and taught occasional courses on related topics. Fr. Keenan, in addition to being procurator and minister of both the Jesuit community and the Seminary, taught science and parish accounting. My chief work was that of spiritual counselor, librarian and teacher of speech, English, rites, and liturgy. Fr. Lynn was busy with all of systematic and historical theology, Scripture, liturgy, and occasional related subjects. Fr. Roberts had canon law, moral theology, and homiletics for the theologians.

Spiritual formation

All the elements of apostolic and intellectual formation also had a direct and essential impact on the spiritual development of the students. Nevertheless, more was both needed and provided. Although most of the seminarians who came to us had had from two to seven years in a minor seminary and were, on the whole, trained remarkably well by the French or Italian missionaries in charge, their introduction into a life of prayer and asceticism remained rudimentary. It was the task, therefore, of the spiritual counselor at the Major Seminary to provide instruction in theoretical and practical asceticism through weekly conferences, and to guide the students in the art of mental prayer. All the students had to stop in and see the spiritual counselor once every two months although they were also free to consult with any other member of the faculty. The work of spiritual formation was carefully supplemented by Fr. Rector, who himself gave weekly conferences of an ascetical nature, and conducted regular, personal interviews. Moreover, there was not one of the faculty who did not have considerable influence in the spiritual growth of the seminarians in one way or another.

In keeping with recent emphases on less regimentation in the seminary and allowing for greater scope in the exercise of responsible freedom, disciplinary regulations were relaxed and revised at least twice in the past few years, with, it ought to be noted, a fully positive response from the young men. It might be said that we had

established rapport with our students. They recognized that we were with them and for them in the best sense of those phrases. In a letter dated July 14, 1966 to Very Rev. Fr. Provincial, Fr. Edward J. Sponga, after we had departed, the seminarians wrote:

Every year, 31 July has been a very big day in our Seminary for more than one reason. . . . This year, although we will conclude our annual retreat and celebrate the feast of St. Ignatius on 31 July, God has deemed this day to be otherwise. 31 July will not be a big day for us; it simply cannot be a big day for us without our much beloved Jesuit Fathers. . . . We miss them very much. From their letters it is clear that they too miss us; but for good reasons, dear Fr. Provincial, we miss them more. They are all men of sterling character and solid virtues; but above all, they are Jesuits, and that makes the whole difference. Although their hearts were rent at the thought of having to leave us at this time, they can take consolation in the fact that the spirit which they have instilled in us will continue to guide and influence us, so that we may be, with God's grace, just the kind of priests that they strove to make us to be.

The Jesuit community

Going to Burma in 1958 we were eight, five priests and three scholastics: Frs. Joseph F. Murphy, Edward J. Farren, John J. Keenan, Eugene P. McCreesh and myself; and Messrs. Francis P. Fischer, Louis E. Niznik and Thomas E. Peacock.

At the end of 1959 Mr. Fischer returned to the United States for theology, and Messrs. Niznik and Peacock followed shortly after in May 1960. Their places were taken by Fr. Lynn, who arrived on May 7th, and Fr. Roberts, who came on May 17th. In July 1964 Fr. Keenan returned to the United States, leaving a staff of six. We had been hoping to get Frs. Fischer, Niznik, and Peacock back in 1965 upon the completion of their tertianship, but by then the Burmese political situation had become so unfriendly that this hope had to be abandoned.

Unable to see other Jesuits except for rare visitors passing through, we had to live with one another and work together for the Church in Burma day after day, year after year. Our early journeys were confined to within the country itself in order to get to know it. Then in July 1961, Fr. Murphy attended a meeting of seminary rectors in the Philippines. I represented the Maryland Province in Jamshedpur at the consecration of its first bishop, the Most Rev. L. T. Picachy, S.J. in September 1962. Shortly after this the Burmese Government slammed its doors shut and forbade all travel abroad

for anyone except on government business. Not long after Very Rev. Fr. John M. Daley's provincial visitation in November 1962, the Government refused to grant visitors' visas beyond twenty-four hours duration. The community was hammered and forged into shape on the anvil of necessity. Though we always got along with one another, in the later years we were becoming a close-knit group. Perhaps we reached our high point, at least in its outward manifestation, at our first concelebrated Mass with our students and many lay friends present in the Seminary chapel on the evening of December 3, 1965, the feast of St. Francis Xavier. We were formed in Christ by one another, by our seminarians, and by the beautiful Burmese people, lay and clerical, for whom we worked, whom we loved and who loved us.

Many other things could be written about the Seminary and the Jesuits in Burma: the planning, re-planning and despair of new seminary buildings on a new and enlarged seminary site; the final approval of all, after prolonged negotiations, of a contract between the Seminary and the bishops of Burma; the laymen on our staff over the years who taught the seminarians Burmese; the addition of Christian Brothers to the staff during our last year after the nationalization of their schools; the Seminary lecture forum; the delight that was ours on the occasion of the ordination of our first six priests in 1964, and then in the subsequent ordinations of 1965, when three more were ordained, and 1966, when five became priests; the intense interest in our alumni and the formation of an alumni society with its *Alumni News Bulletin*, and book, periodical, and consultation service; the whole problem of Jesuit vocations and the acceptance and training of candidates in a country which no one could leave or enter; the request of the Archbishop for a Jesuit editor of *The Sower*, the National Catholic paper; requests made in 1960-61 by a member of Parliament from Arakan in western Burma, before the rule of the present Government, for a group of Jesuits to staff a high school for leaders, etc. But time and space are running out.

The end

In 1962 the political and economic situation of Burma under Prime Minister U Nu was quickly deteriorating. Something had to happen, and it did. On March 20th the Burmese Army, with Gen-

eral Ne Win at its head, staged an almost bloodless coup d'état and took over the government. The Army had been in power a couple of years earlier for a brief period as a "care-taker" government, and had proved itself efficient and enlightened. High-ranking officers of moderate political views had been shipped off as ambassadors to foreign countries. The remaining group which formed the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma and rules Burma to this day were men of extreme nationalistic bias and strongly socialist-oriented in the practice of government.

First came a series of documents: *The Burmese Way to Socialism* in April 1962; *The Constitution of the Burma Socialist Program Party* in July of the same year; and *The System of Correlation of Man and His Environment* in January 1963, all stating the policies, aims and initial structures of the new Government.

Next in a series of gigantic annual steps the Government nationalized the banks, most of the businesses, services, shops, hospitals, high schools, and finally all the primary and middle schools. The larger denomination fifty and one-hundred Kyat notes were demonetized and eventually a brand new currency was issued. In the wake of such rapid nationalization the already weakened economy of the country grew steadily worse, the most basic commodities like rice and cooking oil were in short supply, and a vast, new black market flourished.

Government efforts to end five different insurrections going on in different parts of the country generally failed. Crushing an incipient revolt of Buddhist monks, the Government showed itself cool towards all religions. Less than friendly to the West, the Government cultivated the friendship of Russia and the satellite nations and maintained a constant interchange with the government of mainland China. The bishops of Burma were allowed to attend the first two sessions of Vatican II. Only the foreign bishops were allowed to attend the third session, and none were permitted to go for the fourth session. Although we were never in anyway harassed, and, indeed, up to the end received gracious treatment from government officials, the situation hardly looked promising. On the contrary, it was getting worse, and we knew it. We continued in hope and in prayer.

Suddenly the serenity was shattered.

Kanazogone

The Seminary had just closed for the vacation. Three of this year's 1966 graduating class had already been ordained. Two more ordinations were due in the Delta, so Fr. McCreesh and myself packed our bedrolls and headed for the jetty. We were jammed safely aboard the double-decker river launch when at 4:45 P.M. with much shouting and ringing of bells, the cables were loosed, and our boat cast off and headed out across the Rangoon River. Night fell before long, and curled up back to back with the half-dozen Burmese friends who had joined us from Okkalapa, we fell asleep on the lower deck.

The next morning the view was beautiful as we approached Kanazogone aboard the small motor boat to which we had been transferred in the early hours of the morning. The water sparkled, a bright blue, and across the water along the river bank lay Kanazogone, a long, sprawling, shaded village, dominated by palm trees and washed by one of the numerous tentacles of the Irrawaddy River, reaching out in constant motion towards the sea. Here on the morning of March 24, 1966, shortly after the ordination to the priesthood of Fr. George Phuneesan, a Christian Brother stepped from a launch, walked along the grassy footpath to the clergy house, and presented to Bishop George U Kyaw a letter from the Archbishop of Rangoon, a letter which informed us that the Government of Burma had on the previous day decreed our expulsion.

Kanazogone, ordination day, expulsion. Associations which have seared our memories.

The Government issued a list of 232 foreign missionaries, priests, brothers and sisters, together with the dates on which they must leave Burma, and communicated it to the Church authorities. Not all the priests were on this list. Some ninety of the older ones who were in Burma before independence and had permanent stay-permits were permitted to remain. All the Protestant missionaries, relatively few in number, were however obliged to leave.

After attending the second ordination, that of Fr. Paulinus Eischaung, at a village farther west in the Delta, we returned to the Seminary. Grim days at the Seminary. Days filled with emotion, days of despair and of hope. Of hope because the bishops had filed

a petition with the Government that the Seminary fathers might be granted an extension to remain at least a while longer and prepare men to take their places, and because the Catholic Laymen's Board put in a similar petition for all seventy-three priests who were to be expelled. We waited, and did nothing to arrange the formalities for our departure from the country. We hoped against hope. And our people prayed.

After Holy Week and the Burmese New Year festival, April was half over. No word had been received from the Government concerning the petitions which had been sent in. According to the decree Frs. Murphy, Farren, and McCreesh had to be out by April 30th and Frs. Lynn and Roberts by May 31st. I would leave with the first group. We waited one more week.

Meanwhile, some of the Burmese faculty who were to replace us began arriving at the Seminary, and in the short time available we introduced them to their work. More and more visitors dropped in to say goodbye, and there were many people whom we had to go out and visit. Saturday passed. Still no reply from the Government. Sunday, then Monday followed of the last week. On Tuesday we had to go to the Immigration Office, surrender our stay-permits and fill out the papers necessary for departure clearance. Many Burmese people were trying to leave the country, and often a year or more dragged by before they received permission to go. We, who wanted only to stay, were cleared in less than two hours.

The next-to-the-last day, the last day, and then it was the night of April 29th. As Fr. Murphy and I reached the airport shortly after midnight, we were met by many of our friends outside the door. It was difficult to get through to the Pan American counter. Inside the building at least 200 people were waiting to bid farewell to the two of us, a French father, and two Good Shepherd sisters. The atmosphere was hushed. We communicated with one another, all of us, in deep sadness. The last blessings given, we entered the external flight department where no one else could follow. The immigration officer greeted us politely and checked our passports.

"Eight years in Burma, Father. That's a long time," he said.

"Not long enough."

Pan Am's 707 jet liner from Bangkok, bound for Calcutta, arrived, and soon we had to take those last steps across the landing strip

to the plane. Our friends had all moved to the outside balcony where they stood and waved and waved, but without a sound, until one by one we disappeared through the doorway of the plane. The door closed. It was more than the mere door of a jet plane which closed that night.

Later in the morning the same scene would be repeated when Frs. Farren and McCreesh boarded a jet for Bangkok. And it would happen again a month later at the departure of Frs. Roberts and Lynn.

Sequel

The bishops of Burma had to contribute six of their parish priests to take our places at the Seminary. Three of them, the three who are teaching all of theology and half of the philosophy courses, are our own graduates from the first ordination class of 1964. Thus we were replaced. There was no one to replace the rest of the seventy-three priests who had to leave. No one to replace the brothers and sisters.

The Seminary has recently completed its first year without the Jesuits. We kept in frequent touch with them by mail, and know that it was a struggle. There were many problems and a few ideals had to be sacrificed. But they succeeded, and during the weeks from March 18th till April 2nd six more priests were ordained.

There are some 200,000 Catholics and 300,000 non-Catholic Christians out of a total population of about 24 million Burmese people, most of whom are Buddhists. Nevertheless, if the expulsion of the foreign missionaries is due only to a wave of extreme nationalism, there is hope for the Church in Burma. It can grow and mature on its own. Because of its underdevelopment, this will be difficult, but it is not impossible. The Government, however, has also acted consistently in the political, social, and economic spheres in a manner that is more than suggestive of a genuine Communist state, a fact which introduces an element of serious uncertainty.

The Jesuit venture in Burma was unique. We had what was, perhaps, an unparalleled opportunity for influencing the Church of an entire country through the formation of its future priests and bishops. It was literally too good to be true. Beyond this, it is extremely difficult for one who was involved in the tragedy to philosophize. We must live silently by faith, and in our faith find hope.

REMINISCENCES OF FATHER PATRICK DUDDY, S.J.

a nineteenth century Jesuit

EDITED BY R. EMMETT CURRAN, S.J.

Fr. Patrick Duddy was born in 1819 and died in 1891. Most of his life was spent in Philadelphia. A Jesuit for over fifty years, he was for a long time Procurator and Minister at St. Joseph's Church, Willings Alley. The following are excerpts of a manuscript given by Fr. Duddy in his last years to Dr. Lawrence Flick, then President of the Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. The manuscript remained in his family until very recently.

We think the reminiscences offer a unique observation of the Church and the Society during the turbulent years of mid-nineteenth century Philadelphia. The author lived through the Hogan schism and the Know-Nothing campaigns; he knew Bishop Hughes, Bishop Neumann, Fr. McElroy and others who are familiar in American Catholic history. These are the candid, random remarks of a priest who moved easily among the men and events of his era.

The Hogan schism

[In 1820 Bishop Henry Conwell suspended an Irish priest, William Hogan, who had been living rather indecorously as a favorite of the wealthy Catholic society besides openly ridiculing the Bishop in the press and pulpit. This touched off a long controversy between Conwell supported by the general hierarchy and Hogan supported by the trustees of St. Mary's Church, at that time the Bishop's cathedral and resi-

dence. The trustees closed the church to the diocese and a schism then began that involved the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and the Vatican before ending in 1831 with the capitulation of the trustees. By that time Hogan, tired of the struggle, had withdrawn to the sidelines and Conwell himself, well over seventy, had been forced into retirement by the vicissitudes of the case. Fr. Duddy offers an instance not found elsewhere. The Bishop had at this point taken refuge at St. Joseph's and the trustees had already attempted to burn it down.]

Mr. Paisley kept a young ladies boarding house on North East corner of 4th and Willings Alley. The young ladies used to watch the bishop in his room. The young ladies swore that the bishop had intercourse with women. At the first meeting of the bishop there were but 6 or 8 persons present. Everybody was with Hogan until the truth came out. My father was one of the 6 or 8.

Father Morgan had some letters from a Miss Nevins in which she stated that she had accused the bishop wrongfully of being the father of her child at the instigation of Hogan. She afterwards went before a magistrate and made affidavit that the child was Hogan's and that she had been induced by Hogan to put the child on the Bishop.

Bishop Conwell presented a very fine appearance. He looked like a noble Irish gentleman. Cardinal Ximenes gave him a picture of himself and the Bishop had the Cardinal's head taken off and his own put on. [This hardly seems likely since the Cardinal had died three hundred years before. Conwell most likely received the picture from the same source that he had received Ximenes' ring—Joseph Bonaparte, the former king of Naples, who held a pew at St. Joseph's during these years.] The bishop was not an able man and a mediocre preacher. . . .

St. Joseph's

[Fr. Duddy was baptized in old St. Joseph's, the first public Catholic Church in the American colonies, which in 1954 became a national shrine.] My earliest recollections of the church . . . are that [it] came out even with the house, and then it was enlarged about the time Bishop [John] Hughes was ordained priest. [Actually the church was enlarged in 1821, five years before Hughes' ordination.] . . . In front of the house there was a graveyard and the graves and bodies are probably there yet . . . Under the church there was a graveyard too. When father [sic] Jordan had the basement improved a whole boxful of bones were [sic] picked up. . . . Father Farmer and some other priests had been buried there. . . .

The last seculars there were Fathers Whalen and Donaghue. . . . Father Whalen was a very eccentric man. He had a big opinion of him-

self. He always started with I and ended with I. He was very egotistic. . . .

Father Donaghue started the Sunday School at St. Joseph's. He was an excellent man. He had been educated by the Sulpicians in France. He was a great scholar but no orator. He was about 5 feet 8 inches in height, had dark hair, a sandy complexion and was a very sociable man. . . .

In June 1833 the Jesuits came. Rev. Father Kenny [Peter] who had been a visitor to this Province . . . , and Father Stephen Dubuisson came at that time and then Fr. Kenny left and Father [James] Ryder came and took his place, and he was taken away on the 1st of January . . . , namely in 1834 and Father Richard Hardy took his place and after him Father Edward McCarthy. Father [Felix] Barbelin came September 1837.

Father Dubuisson was a straight compact man, long and erect. He had a slight impediment in his speech. He was a very good preacher. He had been private secretary to the first Napoleon. He was required to go to the theatres with Napoleon, and he always took Thomas à Kempis with him and whilst the others were enjoying themselves, he read Thomas à Kempis. Napoleon called him his papist secretary. He was then a layman.

He was of sallow complexion, and had black hair. Whilst he was pastor here a man by name of Shilling died on Lombard street, who had made a will which ignored his nephew, and which was therefore contested. As Father Dubuisson had attended the sick man he was subpoenaed as a witness to prove unsoundness of mind in the diseased [sic]. The Lawyer wanted to poke his fun at Father Dubuisson and asked him: "Are you a Jesuit?"

"I am."

"Well, are you one of those full Jesuits?"

Father Dubuisson replied, "I don't know what you mean by a full Jesuit but I have not had my breakfast today yet." He was a very exact man.

. . . One day when I was thirteen I saw Father Dubuisson at his prayers and whilst doing so I saw him raised about 2 feet from the floor. I had been sent to Father Dubuisson to get a Bible for Fr. Kenny and when I knocked at the door and got no answer I knocked again. . . I peeped in and saw that. I then knocked louder and was asked to come in when Father Dubuisson arose and was quite bewildered but said nothing.

Father Ryder attracted people by his good preaching. Prior to that none but poor people and San Domingo Negroes came. . . . [He] was

a man about 5 feet 6 or 7 inches in height. He was born in the city of Dublin and came here in 1833. . . . He remained until the following January and was then taken away to Georgetown College because they expected a rebellion there and he was believed to be the only one that could manage it. He was the best preacher in the city but no singer. He was a man of full habits and very particular about his clothes. He was always neat and clean but not dudey [sic]. He had black hair and florid complexion. He had a certain accent (Dublin . . .). People used to converse with him for the pleasure of hearing the accent. He couldn't bear a sneak or a person doing a mean dirty thing. Any acknowledging a fault always gained his favor provided it was not done out of bragadocio [sic]. He was a fine disciplinarian. He managed more by love than by fear. He could scold and give [a] tongue lashing when he wanted to.

The windows in the old church were very low. One Sunday he was saying the mass and as he said "Your prayers are requested for the repose of the soul of Mrs. Henn who departed life last evening," a rooster jumped up on the window sill and flapped its wings and crowed.

Father Edward McCarthy was a beautiful singer, pretty good preacher, and . . . an able man. He was a pleasant man but rather quiet and retired. Was about 5 feet 6 inches high, was inclined to be corpulent and had bowed legs. He was walking along the street one day on a sick call whilst the hog catchers were after a pig. The hog ran between his legs in its blind chase and his legs being short, the hog carried him off. . . .

Father McElroy built the new church here. He was a man 6 feet high. He had a heavy frame but not a great deal of flesh. . . . He had a sharp eye and black hair and florid complexion. . . He always knew how to take care of no. [number] one. He was stooped, shouldered [sic]. . . . He preached well for about 20 minutes and then he would commence to repeat until one got tired. He was a man of great will. He was always opposed to all Sodalities and Sunday Schools and anything of that kind. He was also opposed to basements under churches.

Bishop Hughes was ordained at St. Joseph's and said his first mass there. [He] . . . later was made pastor of St. John's which he built. When he built St. John's, the people thought he was crazy because they did not believe that the city would ever extend so far west. Before leaving the city for New York to be consecrated bishop, he came to St. Joseph's and said Mass, saying that he said his first mass there and that he wanted to say his last there. . . . He was a good preacher and was a first class scholar. . . .

Bishop Neumann was a meek humble man. On one occasion I

was present at a gathering of priests when one of the priests, a pastor, abused the Bishop very much and the latter simply bowed his head and took it meekly.

Roughing it

[The City of Brotherly Love in the 1830's was definitely no forerunner to the age of ecumenism. Verbal battles raged in the local papers between the defenders of Catholicism and Protestantism. At times the battles were of a more primitive nature, such as the afternoon of July 12, 1831 when a band of angry Irish, to the cry "Every shillelagh is worth twenty swords!" attacked a parade of sword-brandishing Orangemen. Fr. Duddy recalls a less dangerous but equally effective mode of belligerence.]

No rich persons would come to mass at St. Joseph's . . . because of the slops that were thrown out the corner of 4th [and] the Alley from Paisley School for young ladies. On the other side there was a stable. Sometimes when people came up 4th Street to church, "thunder mugs" [chamber pots?] were emptied out on them. This was done only to well-dressed people. . . . I got some myself. This was done because the people were going to St. Joseph's Church. When Father Ryder came this was stopped, namely in 1833.

[And this is where the reminiscences stop.]

XAVIER SPECIALIST

THERE IS PROBABLY NO LIVING STUDENT of Church History who has worked so long, so consistently and so thoroughly in this field of scholarship as the Rev. Georg Schurhammer, S.J., of the *Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, in Rome. His bibliography, beginning in 1907 with his first publication, "Wunder und Ungläubige," in *Stimmen von Bergen*, and reaching down to his latest (1964), the Japanese translation of "The Disputations of P. Cosme de Torres, S.J., with the Buddhists in Yamaguchi in the year 1551," numbers three hundred and forty-three items, including books, articles, monographs and reviews.¹ Thematically the range of his literary output is very wide; all aspects of early Jesuit history, both European and Oriental, are included, without, however, the tone of this vast corpus becoming particular, provincial, and esoteric. The broad scope of this scholar's interests, his method, versatility, and the finesse of his whole approach reveal the liberally educated mind at its best. As a tribute to Fr. Schurhammer on the occasion of his eightieth birthday in 1962, the *Institutum Historicum* has published five volumes of his work. The contribution, considering that it does not represent the totality of his scholarly accomplishments, is staggering.²

Georg Schurhammer was born in 1882 in Unterglötteral, in southwest Germany.³ The theological studies, which he had begun in 1901 at the University of Freiburg in the Breisgau, he interrupted to enter the Society of Jesus at Tisis in Vorarlberg. After his novitiate, and philosophical studies, which he made at the Jesuit College *Ńt-Valkenberg* in Holland, he departed for India where he taught at St. Mary's College in Bombay, and where he hoped to spend his life as a missionary. His career was suddenly and unexpectedly interrupted by an acute nervous breakdown which was to prove an important factor in determining the subsequent course of his life. In 1910, when the body of St.

¹ The bibliography of Fr. Schurhammer's works, complete up to 1964, is published by L. Szilas, S.J., *Orientalia* (Rome, 1963), pp. xiv-liii.

² Georg Schurhammer, S.J., *Gesammelte Studien, Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.J.*, 20 (Rome, 1962); 21 (Rome, 1963); 22 (Rome, 1964); 23 (Rome 1965).

³ For the bibliographical notice here I am indebted to the work of H. Rahner, S.J., and L. Polgár, S.J., "Bibliographie des P. Georg Schurhammer, S.J.," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 26 (1957) 422-52.

Francis Xavier was exposed at Goa, the young Georg Schurhammer made a pilgrimage to that celebrated shrine; and there, while kneeling before the precious relic, promised that, if through the intercession of the Saint he should recover his mental health, he would one day write his life in gratitude. The prayer was heard; in 1912 he returned to Europe, completed his theological studies, and was ordained at Valkenberg in 1914.

The World War prevented Fr. Schurhammer from returning to India to take up the missionary work that he loved so much. He became at this time affiliated with the editorial staff of the *Katholische Missionen*, which was located first at Valkenberg (1917), then at Bonn (1919). During the post-war years (1920–32) Fr. Schurhammer turned out a whole series of historical studies which proved that he was a research scholar of the first order. His extensive writings have appeared in German, English, Portuguese, Spanish, Italian and other modern languages, and are known throughout the world. Between 1920 and 1940 his output was prodigious. In 1922, for example, he published twenty-three important articles and monographs, e.g.: "Das Stadtbild Kyotos zur Zeit des hl. Franz Xaver (1551)," and "Xaveriusforschung im 16. Jahrhundert"; in 1926, "Fernão Mendez Pinto und seine 'Peregrinação,'" and, in 1928, "Die kirchliche Sprachproblem in der japanischen Jesuitenmission des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. Ein Stück Ritenfrage in Japan." This is only a very small sample of a wide range of titles that could be cited; and it is especially to be noted that a large portion of the research underlying these works is definitive.

In 1932 Georg Schurhammer was called to Rome to become a member of the newly founded *Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu*; he has remained there ever since. Now in his eighty-fifth year, he continues to devote himself to scientific research on problems of early Jesuit history. His long career is a perfect example of the selfless scholar whose life is generously oriented to the service of the community. It is hard to exaggerate the contribution which Fr. Schurhammer has made to the *Geistesgeschichte* of both the Church and the Society.

Casting aside myth and legend

When Fr. Schurhammer promised in 1910 to write the life of St. Francis Xavier, he had in mind a work which would be completed in two or three years; but as the project began to grow and take on its true proportions, it seemed that it would be the work of a whole lifetime; that is precisely what it has become. After more than fifty years the proposed "Life of Saint Francis Xavier" is still far from completion, largely because of the rigorous, sound methodology on which it rests. In

undertaking this vast project, the first problem which had to be faced was the accumulation of the necessary source material of the life of Xavier, not merely Jesuit and European, but also secular and Oriental sources. This research involved visiting all the great depositaries of documents throughout Europe, selecting pertinent material, studying and evaluating it, finally arranging it all for publication. Nothing like this had ever before been undertaken for tracing the beginnings of the Church's missionary activity from Europe to the Orient. It was a necessary propaedeutic for writing a scientific biography of Francis Xavier which would be a model for all future hagiographical writing. Casting aside myth and legend, the finished work will reveal the Saint in all his true human greatness.

In the years 1923-24 Fr. Schurhammer began this vast undertaking with a visit to Portugal and its archives. Here he was delighted to find thousands of original, unpublished documents dating from the period of Francis Xavier's lifetime and touching on both European and Oriental Portugal. The study of this copious material took ten years; but it was a period rich in subsidiary study and publication. On February 5, 1932 appeared the great work, "The Contemporary Sources for the History of Portuguese Asia and Neighboring Countries at the Time of St. Francis Xavier (1538-1552)."⁴ Because this edition has been exhausted for a long time (most of it was destroyed during the war), and because there have been important contributions to this specialized field in the past thirty years, this new edition (1962) has been prepared and issued. Note has been taken of these scholarly advances, and of new source material that has been discovered since 1932. More than six thousand documents are listed here. Fr. Schurhammer provides an enlightening introduction in which he situates the contents of the book historically, evaluates the different kinds of source material and lists the archives where these literary treasures are currently preserved. The geographical range of the survey is remarkable, including Europe, East Africa, Abyssinia, Arabia, Persia, India, the Malayan archipelago, the Philippines, China and Japan. The work, provided with index, literature, photographs, cross references, is methodologically perfect. It may be supplemented; it will never be surpassed.

The whole life of St. Francis Xavier, as Fr. Schurhammer envisions it, is contained under eight principle headings: 1) the life and times of the Saint in Europe, which include the basic and definitive history of

⁴G. Schurhammer, S.J., *Die Zeitgenössischen Quellen zur Geschichte Portugiesisch-Asiens und seiner Nachbarländer zur Zeit des hl. Franz Xaver (1538-1552)*, *Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.J.*, 20 (Rome, 1962).

the foundation of the Society of Jesus;⁵ 2) the career of Xavier in the Orient;⁶ 3) a critical edition of the Saint's letters and other writings;⁷ 4) a description and evaluation of his miracles; 5) the cult of the Saint; 6) a complete bibliography of all that has been written on him; and 7-8) the iconography of Francis Xavier. In the many years that Fr. Schurhammer has been preparing this monumental work he has had occasion to visit every part of the world in which St. Francis Xavier has lived and worked, and he has had the opportunity to master all the source material that underlies the life career of the Saint. The result of this intensive study has been a series of articles and monographs on the most recondite aspects of Xavier's history both at home and abroad.

Orientalia and Xaveriana

In two volumes the best of Schurhammer's Xaverian research over the years has been collected and edited. The first volume, *Orientalia*,⁸ is more directly concerned with the day and age of the Saint, his ambit and milieu, his contemporaries and his immediate successors. Here we see the universality of Fr. Schurhammer's scholarship as he ranges over many continents and countries with their distinct languages and customs: Portuguese India, Ormuz, North and South India, Indonesia, Japan, China, and Africa. Some of the titles suggest the character of the volume, e.g.: "The Treasures of the Jesuit Archives in Macao and Peking," (1929); "The Conversion of the Paraver (1535-1537)," (1935); "The First Japanese Embassy to Europe (1582-1590)," (1921); "The Jesuit Missionaries of the 16th and 17th Centuries and their Influence on Japanese Painting," (1933); "The Temple of the Cross," (1928), and "The Malabar Church and Rome before the Coming of the Portuguese," (1933).

The second volume, *Xaveriana*,⁹ is devoted to various studies of the personal history of Francis Xavier and his active apostolate in the Orient. It is prefaced by *Chronologia Xaveriana*, a very useful, systematic chronology of the life of Xavier. Two articles deal with his spirituality:

⁵ G. Schurhammer, S.J., *Franz Xaver. Sein Leben und seine Zeit*, 1: *Europa 1506-1541* (Freiburg, 1955).

⁶ G. Schurhammer, S.J., *Franz Xaver. Sein Leben und seine Zeit*, 2: *Asien (1541-1552)*; 1: *Indien und Indonesien (1541-1547)*, (Freiburg, 1963).

⁷ G. Schurhammer, S.J., and J. Wicki, S.J., *Epistolae S. Francisci Xaverii aliaque eius scripta*, 2 Vols., *Monumenta Historica S. J.*, 67 (Rome, 1944-45).

⁸ G. Schurhammer, S.J., *Orientalia*, *Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S. J.*, 21 (Rome, 1963).

⁹ G. Schurhammer, S.J., *Xaveriana*, *Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S. J.*, 22 (Rome, 1964).

"Francis Xavier," (1963), and "Mary and St. Francis Xavier," (1952). A very stimulating chapter (XII) studies critically the manifold forms of the Xavier-legend, e.g.: the extraordinary success of his missionary activity, the many Xaverian miracles and wonders, the exaggerated numbers of converts, the millions (actually about 30,000) of baptisms administered by the Saint, and the like. The objectivity with which these delicate questions are handled is commendable. For Fr. Schurhammer it is a matter of discovering the sources and allowing them to speak for themselves. Truth is invariably more attractive than fancy.

Of special interest here from the point of view of historical method is the important article, "The Crab-miracle of Xavier—a Buddhist Legend?" which appeared in 1962.¹⁰ Perhaps of all the episodes in the life of St. Francis Xavier the crab miracle is the most popular, certainly the most picturesque. The story is well known. While aboard ship, tossed by the stormy waters of the Moluccas, Xavier cast his crucifix into the tempestuous sea, with the fervent prayer that God might calm its rough swell. Later, while standing on the shore at Tamilau, a crab, bearing the lost crucifix, emerged from the waters of the sea, and returned it to Xavier. Since Lucena's *Life of Francis Xavier*, which appeared in Rome in 1613, the miraculous incident has become a characteristic feature in the history of the missionary Saint. It appeared later, in 1623, in Pope Gregory XV's bull of canonization, and it is to be found in almost every subsequent life. The motif is also well known to Xaverian iconography.

In 1905 the Bollandist Hippolyte Delehaye in his *Légendes hagiographiques* posed the question of the authenticity of 'this miracle.' "The story," he wrote, "of the crucifix of Saint Francis Xavier—submerged into the sea and rescued by a crab, is borrowed from Japanese mythology." It was derived from a Buddhist legend, recast in Christian terms. Others agreed with the judgment of this internationally known student of hagiography.¹¹ Not so Fr. Schurhammer. Characteristically he resolved to re-examine the whole problem on the basis of the extant sources, the only true, reliable link with the historical past.

The result of this intensive study was to show that the crab-incident was in fact an historical event. Of importance to Fr. Schurhammer in reaching this conclusion was the testimony presented on November 3, 1608 to Francisco de Otaço, S.J., Rector of the College in Cebu in the Philippines, by Fausto Rodrigues, who knew Francis Xavier personally.

¹⁰ "Das Krebswunder Xavers—Eine Buddhistische Legende?" *Xaveriana*, pp. 537-62, originally published in *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 46 (1962) 109-21; 208-16; 253-63.

¹¹ This idea had been expressed much earlier by A. B. Mitford, *Tales of Old Japan* (London, 1871), pp. 40-53.

In the course of this examination (which was preparatory to the canonization process) we find among other things a description of the crab-incident by one who claimed to have witnessed it. This testimony in the context of other factors appeared so convincing to Fr. Schurhammer, that he was willing to accept 'the event,' without, however, declaring it to be 'a miracle.' Wondrous as it appears, it might still have a natural explanation. The Buddhist legend of 'the holy crab' was formed under Christian influence.

Varia

The two volumes entitled *Varia*¹² contain all kinds of disparate materials, including seventy-two pictures of various Xaverian *loci*; the central bond of unity is Francis Xavier. The first of the two volumes forms a continuation of *Orientalia* and *Xaveriana*. In this series of studies we see Fr. Schurhammer as the scholar of meticulous detail whose preoccupation it is to put Xaverian studies in good order, to leave nothing unsaid, to gather up the fragments. The wide variety of his range is seen at once in the principal headings, which include specifically Oriental and Xaverian studies, the relics and canonization of St. Francis Xavier, his cult through the ages, various special questions on the American Missions, even some items on local history of his own beloved Schwabian Glotteral. A series of articles on the portrait representation of Xavier, on the attempt to discover the *vera effigies* of the Saint, shows that Fr. Schurhammer has a certain competence in art history. The second volume is largely devoted to important book reviews which he has written over the years.

One of the truly important contributions which Fr. Georg Schurhammer has made to Jesuit history is to maintain it on a universal plane, to see it in terms of world history, as Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee have seen it. His scholarly work has proved valuable in understanding the origins of the Society, the expansion of the Church in the days of the Counter Reformation into the vast regions of the Orient, and the important role which the Society played in this enterprise. In the person of St. Francis Xavier, Fr. Schurhammer has revealed to us one of the true wonders of Church History—an adventurer and an explorer, but first of all an apostle of Jesus Christ and his Gospel.

ROBERT E. McNALLY, S.J.

¹² G. Schurhammer, S.J., *Varia* 1: *Anhänge*; 2: *Besprechungen und Index, Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.J.*, 23 (Rome, 1965).

CATECHETICS: A LOOK AT THE NEW TRENDS

(*Listing prepared and commented upon by Fr. Daniel J. Fitzpatrick, S.J. and Fr. Kenneth J. Hezel, S.J., both of whom are tertians.*)

IT IS THIRTY YEARS NOW since the publication of Josef Jungmann's *The Good News and Our Proclamation of the Faith*, which so revolutionized the modern catechetical movement. During these years the movement has had a rather sporadic and uneven growth throughout the world. Jungmann's insight, that the most important aspect of catechesis is its message, that is, the *kerygma*, has taken deep roots—so deep that the trend over the years has been merely to reaffirm that *kerygma* is the core of the Christian preaching. Hence much of the literature of the recent decade has centered around a restatement of older insights and an attempt to devise new methods of implementing them.

Perhaps this trend was a necessary step forward. The catechetical movement knew that it must advance, and yet it did not know exactly where it was going. A real search was in progress. Those involved in catechetics were brave enough to continue the search despite the many blind alleys along the way. The patience and courage which this search has demanded is now at last beginning to bear fruit. The search is by no means over; it can never be. Yet there are signs that the catechetical movement has come of age and will take a new direction in the years to come.

The cause for this optimism is the appearance of several books in the last few years, which, if nothing else, have caused catechists to take another hard look at their task in today's complex world. What Jungmann did in 1936 must be done again in 1967.

Basic questions

The new signs of life are best seen in the fact that catechetics is now, more than ever, asking the right questions. Perhaps these are best summed up in the general questions posed by the title of one of the

more significant books to appear in the last two years, Fr. Alfonso Nebreda's *Kerygma in Crisis?* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1965). Nebreda answers this self-imposed question by stating that *kerygma* is indeed in crisis and that the dedicated Christian teacher and preacher must face up to this fact. In the first three chapters of this rather short book, Nebreda sets up the problem as he sees it by showing quite clearly that to catechize the world of today requires something more than mere presentation of the Gospel message in terms of evangelization. In the next three chapters, he offers his attempt at a solution in terms of the now widely-heralded concept of "pre-evangelization." "It must be made clear that the *terminus ad quem*—man existentially taken in his concrete cultural, socio-psychological condition—is as much a part of the theology of preaching as the *terminus a quo*—the word of God in its creative dynamism."

In today's "non-Christian" world, the Christian message can only be heard if the hearer has first been prepared to accept this message. This, of course, is first of all a missionary principle, but Nebreda has taken it and shown its validity in the so-called Christian countries as well. There is such a phenomenon as the "baptized non-Christian," even if this notion must be limited and varied more than Nebreda would lead us to believe. The author has not used many words in an attempt to impress his readers, but he has spoken significantly and well. He has asked a basic question which calls out for an answer.

Nebreda's emphasis on the existential aspects of the catechetical situation has been echoed almost simultaneously with the translation into English of Fr. Marcel van Caster's book, *The Structure of Catechetics* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965). Despite the fact that this is a rather poorly written book—it seems to be a translation of class notes rather than a manuscript prepared for publication—it contains many insights valuable for today's catechetical problems. This is an attempt at an "existential catechesis," in which the author points out that the catechist must not only be faithful to the word of God but also to the actual situation in which the students find themselves. Not only are the kerygmatic aspects of catechesis treated, but the anthropological aspects are also considered as well; and a way is sought to face the problem of communicating the word of God to man, of spanning the gap between God's word and man's existential situation. The emphasis on an "existential catechesis" rather than on a solely kerygmatic catechesis is important, especially since it comes from Fr. van Caster, who is a professor at the Lumen Vitae Center in Brussels.

Catechist and theologian

Also significant is the fact that *The Structure of Catechetics* makes numerous references to many of our foremost twentieth century theologians. Such names appear as Bouyer, C. H. Dodd, J. N. D. Kelly, Daniélou, and Guardini—a sign that the catechetical renewal wants to take seriously what these modern theologians are saying.

The dialogue that must take place between theology and catechetics is of prime importance. Each discipline has much to say to the other, and this has been brought out most forcefully by Bro. Gabriel Moran, F.S.C., in his latest book, *Catechetics of Revelation* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966). Bro. Moran, already a well-known theological figure from his previous two books, *Scripture and Tradition* and *Theology of Revelation*, has done a great service to the catechetical movement. After wide and deep reading in the field, Moran has pointed to some serious and basic questions which must be faced if the catechetical movement is not to stumble and fall.

The first three chapters, which comprise Part I of the book, contain the kernel of Moran's message. Three areas are explored: "The Catechetical Problem," "Recent Developments," and "The Present Situation." From the outset Moran points out that the catechetical problem truly centers on the problem of revelation. For it is here that catechetics and theology meet; the way in which catechesis is to treat revelation will depend very much on how theology defines it. For Moran, "Christian revelation is a personal-communion of knowledge, an interrelationship of God and the individual within a believing community." Thus, in Jesus Christ revelation "reaches a high point never to be diminished. With the resurrection of Christ and the sending of the Spirit, revelation begins in fullness." Revelation "ceases with Christ, but Christ never ceases," and thus revelation is truly "God now revealing himself to man in Jesus Christ." Moran points out that it is catechesis which first had these insights, yet there has been a lack of theological inquiry to support them. Moran rightly suggests that theology could be of importance here, especially a theology of revelation which "brings out the present, personal, social character of God revealed in Christ." Such a theology of revelation excludes nothing that is good and human. God speaks to different men in different ways, and this is all part of the on-going process of revelation. Here, above all, Moran makes a valuable contribution to catechetics, for such a notion of revelation has widespread significance both for catechetical theory and practice.

Moran then proceeds to outline the purpose and scope of his work. He does not propose a detailed catechetical method derived from his

theological study. Rather the purpose of his book is "to examine some of the commonly held principles of recent catechetical study from the viewpoint of a theology of revelation." This is an important area for catechetics and one which falls within the four steps suggested by David Hunter, in *Christian Education as Engagement* (Greenwich: Seabury, 1963) as necessary for the improvement of religious education: (1) understand the situation giving rise to the need; (2) identify the real dynamisms of the situation; (3) develop a strategy for coming to grips with these dynamic forces; and (4) plan tactics and procedure. Hunter contends that we constantly jump from the first to the fourth of these steps, whereas the main work lies in between. Moran sees his own work as lying somewhere between the second and third stage.

After defining the problem and delineating the scope of his work, Moran launches into his task in Chapter Two with a consideration of the developments since Jungmann. Moran feels that Jungmann rightly centered the problem on the question of revelation, and yet at the same time overlooked some important items pertaining to the theology of revelation and its relation to catechesis. He also feels that there is a good deal implied in Jungmann's work which subsequent catechetical authors failed to make explicit.

When Moran discusses the present situation of catechesis in his third chapter, he is at his best. The thinking here is clear, probing, and at times disturbing. Many of the principles enunciated in the catechetical literature Moran labels as "vague and negative generalities." In fact, he goes so far as to say that the "catechetical movement has from its inception hovered on the brink of trivialization; it continues to hang there." And Moran is not afraid to spell this out in detail:

... there is practically no one associated with religious education today who would say that he advocates rationalism instead of living faith, that he prefers legalism to personal commitment, that he wants meaningless catechism answers rather than a relevant Christian message. The only trouble with this statement of aims is that unless one goes more deeply into the matter, the second half of each of these pairs is simply the negation of the first. Despite appearances to the contrary, these formulas express much more clearly what we are opposed to than what we are in favor of (pp. 31-32).

And again:

A deep probing of these issues behind the new phrases is not always evident in catechetical writing. This, I would claim, is the great crisis of catechetics today; not the dying catechism and manual, but the still rising hope that the education of hundreds of millions of people in an incredibly complex world can be carried out with a bit of Scripture and liturgy and much sincerity and good will. This simply is not enough. There is need for patient inquiry, deep understanding, and detailed knowledge (pp. 34-35).

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

One of the most important contributions Moran makes is his consideration of the student's freedom. This, he feels, is a central issue in modern religious education and one which has not been taken seriously enough. Much of modern catechetical literature confidently assumes "that we have improved 'the content of our message'; we know what is good for students and we can get them to respond to what we want them to do." According to Moran the catechist has failed to realize that the student can say "no" as well as "yes" when the Christian message is presented to him. Moran returns to this theme in a later chapter of his book when he considers "Revelation and Individual Freedom."

The rest of the book, Part II, deals in more detail with many of the problem areas presented in the first three chapters. Although Moran asks many serious questions, specific answers are not always given; this is outside the scope of his present work. Nevertheless, many guidelines are suggested to point out the direction in which the answers lie.

Catechesis of Revelation is an important book. Bro. Moran has taken great pains to do the required research, has had the insight to propose many good suggestions, and has had the courage to point out areas where he has found modern catechesis deficient. We are grateful to him for his work.

The Nijmegen School

Coincident with the publication of Bro. Moran's book there appeared in English a translation of a Dutch attempt to reformulate the catechetical problem. *Fundamentals and Programs of a New Catechesis* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1966) is the product of the Higher Institute of Catechetics of Nijmegen, which presents a new thought-provoking and challenging program of catechesis. The program, tentative in nature, is at present undergoing experimentation in Holland. Few religious educators, including the authors of the two major high school religion textbooks used in our schools today (V. Novak, S.J. and M. Link, S.J.), are satisfied that the present programs or books are the total answer to our problems. Nor is an all-embracing solution honestly hoped for. *Fundamentals and Programs of a New Catechesis* deserves our attention because of the genuinely new and fresh outlook it provides.

The book, honest to its title, describes in Part One a theory of catechesis and some practical implications based mainly on a new concept of revelation and man's earthly existence. Part Two, "Programs," spells out, in as structured a manner as principles allow, the aims, method, psychology, and content for primary and secondary school pupils in Holland. It would be less than fair to judge these outlined programs

without first seeking to understand the basic principles underlying the courses described.

To speak of a "new" concept of revelation and man's earthly existence is not really cricket. This new understanding does not originate with the Nijmegen school (nor do they make this claim), but is based upon the latest trends in Catholic theology and catechesis itself. And this may be one of the book's main values, for it gathers together, adds to, and attempts to go beyond much that has already been written on these topics.

The offer of salvation

It is within the context of the pastoral work of the Church that revelation, faith, and catechesis or "education in living the faith" are spoken of. The Church's task is none other than the continuation of Christ's work on earth, namely, to confront men with God's offer of salvation, "communion of love with God Himself," and thereby to awaken and nourish man's faith. Throughout the entire history of salvation, this offer of God to enlighten man's existence and bring men to himself, has been revealed in historic word-events. This confrontation of man by God through signs—in the Old Testament at the Reed Sea, in the New Testament in Jesus Christ, and now in the Church through its liturgy, Scripture, and human events—this is God's revelation. Seeing each situation of man's life as God's invitation to *this* man to communion with Him rests upon the Incarnational premise that all creation has been redeemed and is in contact with Christ. "Christ's salvation, His Ascent to the Father, makes our whole life and everything it contains a possible ascent to the Father, a possible participation in His Ascent." This understanding plays an important role in the Nijmegen approach to catechesis.

Just as revelation and the possibility of salvation embrace all of human existence, so too man's acceptance through faith must embrace that whole existence. Faith is a vision, a new view of life; it is a commitment, a turning from self toward God; it is life, a new attitude and way of living. Yet faith, while always total, can grow as man's freedom and understanding grow. But it does so only in terms of human growth, and only as a man increases his ability to make a human response. An essential factor, then, in Nijmegen catechesis is the integration of the various aspects of man's growth: intellectual, social, psychological, physical, religious, environmental, etc., according to the individual's stage of development. So the task of the catechist is clearly to bring the child from an unquestioning faith to a personal response, to enable him to see his entire existence as God's saving action, and

to recognize each major situation in life as a further offer of divine salvation that becomes fruitful only through his free human acceptance.

While this is not an entirely new conception of faith and revelation, its application to an entire catechetical program is new. The kerygmatic method in most texts today begins with revelation and tries to apply it to the student's life. Nijmegen begins with the life of *this* student, in *this* class, at *this* stage of growth, and seeks to throw light on *this* life as it is lived today and directed to the future. This light is the mystery of Christ as it exists for us today—in Scripture, liturgy, and in the life of men, especially that of the religion teacher. Beginning inductively with the stage of personal growth and problems experienced by *this* class, the teacher helps the students discover the totality of their lives "as a gift of God and as an invitation and project to translate that Christian outlook into personal commitment wholly inspired by faith." The essential difference between kerygmatic and inductive catechesis is the starting point. Simply stated, the kerygmatic approach takes one aspect of revelation and seeks to show how it fits into this student's life. The inductive takes this student's life here and now, and seeks that aspect of revelation which will enrich his life.

If we agree that the aim of catechesis is to awaken and nourish a faith-response in students by showing how God meets them with salvation in everything He does, then the pedagogy will also change. Even less than before will the grasping of the specific content of matter be the main objective. And so marks will play a minor role; in the schools of Holland no grades are given at all. A syllabus can be suggested for each year on the basis of general needs, interests, and psychology of the students at a particular age level, but each teacher must allow himself sufficient freedom to adapt the matter further to his particular group. Homework comes not from assignment, but from interest. Memory of facts gives way to remembrance of experiences which deepen the faith. High school class-hours are reduced to two per week. Naturally, dialogue and self-activity are the main tools. In the programs sketched for years one through twelve, there is a gradual de-emphasis on assigned subject matter for each grade; by the 11th and 12th grade, the pupils themselves choose the matter for the discussions.

Such an approach raises many difficult problems: Is this too idealistic? Does the average teacher have the time and the ability? How avoid duplication? How 'cover all the matter'? Is the intellectual aspect of faith being watered down? How does one grade achievement? Will it work? Each of these questions is discussed within the context of either

the principles or the programs outlined in the second part of the book. The Nijmegen school does not claim to supply all the answers; in fact the book is an invitation for cooperative effort toward achieving solutions. But it does attempt to meet the main problem still present in many classrooms: the divorce of religious learning from the students' lives. Evidence for this abounds at meetings of religion teachers, in the Fichter Report, in the position paper at Los Angeles last summer on "Formation Through the Religion Program," and in the reactions of students themselves (cf. *Letters in America*, Nov. 26, 1965). At least two new religion textbook series have already adopted some of these basic principles, and they have been successfully used by teachers to complement the Novak and Link texts. They are *The Roots of Faith* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966) from the Pittsburgh Diocese, and a CCD text and manual, *To Live Is Christ* (Chicago: Regnery, 1966).

A Protestant missionary recently reported the following conversation he had with a Chaco Indian of Colombia:

"Have missionaries who work here ever made mistakes?"

"Yes, they have made mistakes."

"Can you tell me about any of the mistakes they have made?"

"It is hard for an Indian to say such a word . . ."

"True, it is hard to name mistakes; maybe you can name just one mistake they have made."

(After a period of silence)—"It is often that they scratch where it doesn't itch."

There is no doubt that teaching religion is the most challenging task in our high schools today. The Nijmegen book is a positive contribution in helping us to meet this challenge effectively, if no other reason than that its sole aim is to scratch where it itches.



WOODSTOCK

L E T T E R S

FALL 1967

VOLUME 96 NUMBER 4

INTRODUCTION

As our cover indicates, this issue is devoted to obedience, especially as realized in a Jesuit context. We refer our readers to two previous articles which are historically significant concerning the problem of obedience: "A Basic Ignatian Concept: Some Reflections on Obedience," Karl Rahner, S.J., *WL* 86 (1957) 291-310, and the letters "On the Virtues of Humility and Obedience," John B. Janssens, S.J., *WL* 93 (1964) 231-52.

Our first two articles are printed to honor the late **John Courtney Murray, S.J.**, a professor of theology at Woodstock College, editor of *Theological Studies*, and director of the John LaFarge Institute. Fr. Murray was largely responsible for writing the *Decree on Religious Liberty* promulgated by the Second Vatican Council.

Joseph J. Sikora, S.J., whose death this summer we also mourn, analyzes the philosophical implications of obedience. His books include *The Scientific Knowledge of Physical Nature, Inquiry into Being*, and *The Christian Intellect and the Mystery of Being*. **Heinrich Ostermann, S.J.**, discusses the problem of authority and obedience. This article is important not only for its scope, but because it reflects the considerable experience and personal insights of the Provincial of the Lower German Province.

Jesuit obedience as seen in terms of a mature personal response to God's call for service is discussed by **Thomas J. McGuire, S.J.**, a first year theologian studying in Frankfurt, Germany. **Alexander F. McDonald, S.J.**, is the tertian instructor at Manresa Hall, Port Townsend, Washington.

William W. Meissner, S.J., author of *Group Dynamics in the Religious Life* and "Psychological Notes on the *Spiritual Exercises*" (reprints of this article are available from our office), explores the psychological ramifications of authority. Fr. Meissner recently received his M.D. degree from Harvard University.

Included in this issue is a report on freedom-authority-obedience issued by the New York Province in June, 1966, which incorporates the suggestions and ideas submitted by every house in the Province.

CONTENTS

FALL, 1967

INTRODUCTION

- 415 A TRIBUTE TO JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, S.J. • *Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.*
- 421 THE DANGER OF THE VOWS • *John Courtney Murray, S.J.*
- 428 A TALK ON OBEDIENCE • *Peter Arrupe, S.J.*
- 435 RELIGIOUS OBEDIENCE IN THE MODERN WORLD • *Joseph J. Sikora, S.J.*
- 459 SHARED DECISION-MAKING IN THE CHURCH AND IN RELIGIOUS ORDERS • *Heinrich Ostermann, S.J.*
- 471 OBEDIENCE OF JUDGMENT AND INTELLECTUAL HONESTY • *Alexander F. McDonald, S.J.*
- 475 GOD'S CALL FOR SERVICE • *Thomas J. McGuire, S.J.*
- 483 NOTES ON AUTHORITY • *William W. Meissner, S.J.*

REPORT

- 511 FREEDOM-AUTHORITY-OBEDIENCE • *Richard A. Blake, S.J., ed.*

READERS' FORUM

- 530 PRIEST AND POETRY • *William T. Noon, S.J.*

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

WOODSTOCK LETTERS solicits manuscripts from all Jesuits on all topics of particular interest to fellow Jesuits: Ignatian spirituality, the activities of our various apostolates, problems facing the modern Society, and the history of the Society, particularly in the United States and its missions. In general it is our policy to publish major obituary articles on men whose work would be of interest to the whole assistance.

Letters of comment and criticism will be welcomed for the Readers' Forum.

Manuscripts, preferably the original copy, should be double-spaced with ample margins. Whenever possible, contributors of articles on Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit history should follow the stylistic norms of the Institute of Jesuit Sources. These are most conveniently found in Supplementary Notes B and C and in the list of abbreviations in Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. W. J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 609-16.

STAFF

Published by the faculty and students of Woodstock College. Editor: Edward J. Mally, S.J. / Managing Editor: Patrick H. Samway, S.J. / Associate Editors: Robert C. Collins, S.J., James P. Jurich, S.J., Raymond A. Schroth, S.J., R. Emmett Curran, S.J., Kenneth J. DeLuca, S.J., Michael C. Reilly, S.J., Richard A. Blake, S.J., Edward T. Dowling, S.J., Peter D. Fordi, S.J., Richard R. Galligan, S.J., Leonard R. Riforgiato, S.J. / Book Editor: Gerard C. Reedy, S.J. / Business Manager: Paul L. Horgan, S.J.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, S.J.

On August 16, 1967, Fr. John Courtney Murray died in New York City. As a priest, scholar, and educator, Fr. Murray brought his intellectual acumen and Christian graciousness to many problems of the modern world. The editors of WOODSTOCK LETTERS would like to pay tribute to Fr. Murray by printing two articles. The first is the sermon delivered at Fr. Murray's funeral Mass by his friend and colleague, Fr. Walter J. Burghardt, on August 21, at the Church of St. Ignatius Loyola, New York City. The second is a famous conference which Fr. Murray originally delivered to the Woodstock College community on February 21, 1947, concerning the danger of the religious vows. David J. Casey has reconstructed the text of this conference from two of Fr. Murray's personal copies, one with his own handwritten emendations, together with a number of slightly varying mimeographed copies.

When the editors of WOODSTOCK LETTERS recently approached Fr. Murray about printing this conference, he said that he would not like to have it printed until he had an opportunity to update it in the spirit of Vatican II. With this reservation in mind, the editors have decided to print this conference not only for the depth of its content, but also for its historical value.

A EULOGY

WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J.

"God loves nothing so much as the man who lives with wisdom"
(Wis. 7:28)

HOW DOES ONE RECAPTURE sixty-three years? How do you bring to life a man who taught with distinction in the Ivy League and on the banks of the Patapsco; who served country and Church in Washington and Rome; who graced the platform of so many American campuses and was honored with degrees by nineteen; who researched theology and law, philosophy and war; who was consulted "from the top" on the humanities and national defense, on Christian unity and the new atheism, on democratic institutions and social justice; whose name is synonymous with Catholic intellectualism and the freedom of man; whose mind could soar to outer space without leaving our shabby earth; whose life was a living symbol of faith, of hope, of love?

How does one recapture John Courtney Murray? No one really recaptures him for another. Each man or woman whose life he touched, each one of you, has his or her own Murray-for-remembrance. As for me, leafing through the last third of those sixty-three years, I remember a mind, a manner, a man.

I

I remember a mind. Few men have wedded such broad knowledge with such deep insight. Few scholars can rival Father Murray's possession of a total tradition and his ability to tune it in on the contemporary experience. For, whether immersed in Trinitarian theology or the rights of man, he reflected the concerns of one of

his heroes, the first remarkable Christian thinker, the third-century Origen. He realized with a rare perceptiveness that for a man to grow into an intelligent Christianity, intelligence itself must grow in him. And so his own intellectual life reproduced the four stages he found in Origen.

First, recognition of the rights of reason, awareness of the thrilling fact that the Word did not become flesh to destroy what was human but to perfect it. Second, the acquisition of knowledge, a sweepingly vast knowledge, the sheer materials for his contemplation, for his ultimate vision of the real. Third, the indispensable task that is Christian criticism: to confront the old with the new, to link the highest flights of reason to God's self-disclosure, to communicate the insight of Clement of Alexandria that Father Murray loved so dearly: "There is but one river of truth, but many streams fall into it on this side and on that." And fourth, an intelligent love: love of truth wherever it is to be found, and a burning yearning to include all the scattered fragments of discovered truth under the one God and His Christ.

The results, as you know, were quite astonishing. Not in an ivory tower, but in the blood and bone of human living. Unborn millions will never know how much their freedom is tied to this man whose pen was a powerful protest, a dramatic march, against injustice and inequality, whose research sparked and terminated in the ringing affirmation of an ecumenical council: "The right to religious freedom has its foundation" not in the Church, not in society or state, not even in objective truth, but "in the very dignity of the human person." Unborn millions will never know how much the civilized dialogue they take for granted between Christian and Christian, between Christian and Jew, between Christian and unbeliever, was made possible by this man whose life was a civilized conversation. Untold Catholics will never sense that they live so gracefully in this dear land because John Murray showed so persuasively that the American proposition is quite congenial to the Catholic reality.

II

With the mind went the manner. What John Murray said or did, he said or did with "style." I mean, the how was perfectly propor-

tioned to the what. There was a Murray style. It stemmed, I think, from a singular feeling for the sacredness of words, the sacredness of things, the sacredness of persons. How fresh syllables sounded when *his* rich voice proclaimed them—even when he changed the Church-State issue into the “ecclesiastico-political problematic.” How fascinating a problem proved as *he* probed surgeon-like for its heart—from the Law and the Prophets he plumbed so profoundly to the latest experience of contemporary man. How dear human beings became while *he* fathomed the four bases on which a people must be built: truth, justice, love, and freedom.

Each of you has his or her private memory of the Murray manner. How your heart leaped when he smiled at you; how your thoughts took wing when he lectured to you; how good the “little people” felt when *he* spoke to *you*. How natural it all sounded when *he* ordered a “Beefeater Martini desperately dry.” How uplifted you felt when he left you with “Courage, Walter! It’s far more important than intelligence.” How the atmosphere changed when he entered a room: it was warm, electric, somehow bigger. How he spoke first and softly to *you*—not because you were colored, but because you were his friend, or because you were a stranger—or because you were human. For, as his Jewish secretary put it, all you had to be was a human being and he respected you, even loved you.

Each of you has his or her memory of the Murray manner. How aloof he seemed, when he was really only shy—terribly shy. How sensitive to your hurt, how careful not to wound—with his paradoxical belief, “A gentleman is never rude save intentionally.” How courteous he was, especially if you were young, just beginning, fumbling for the answer or even for the question. How gentle he was, as only the strong tested by fire can be gentle. How firm and outgoing his handclasp—his whole self given for this moment to you only. How open he was, to men and ideas, as only “the man who lives with wisdom” can be open. How stubborn and unbending, once the demands of truth or justice or love or freedom were transparent.

How rhythmic he was, on the public platform and the private links. How serene, in delicate dialogue and mid the threat of a world’s destruction. How priestly in every gesture, a mediator be-

tween God and man—not only at the altar (so warm and majestic) but in the day-to-day encounter with the learned and the illiterate, with the powerful and the impotent, with those for whom God is a living reality and those for whom God is dead. How delighted he could be with the paradoxes of life—as when the Unitarians honored this professional Trinitarian. How the laughter lit his eyes when he recalled that during the Rome discussions on religious freedom “Michael Cardinal Browne proved more unsinkable than his famous Irish cousin Molly.” And how confident he looked as he predicted that the post-conciliar experience of the Church would parallel the experience of the bishops in council: we will begin with a good deal of uncertainty and confusion, must therefore pass through a period of crisis and tension, but can expect to end with a certain measure of light and of joy.

III

The captivating thing is, the manner was the man. As the mind was the man. Here was no pose, no sheerly academic exercise. Here was a man. In his professional, academic, intellectual life, he lived the famous paragraph of Aquinas: “There are two ways of desiring knowledge. One way is to desire it as a perfection of oneself; and that is the way philosophers desire it. The other way of desiring knowledge is to desire it not simply as a perfection of oneself, but because through this knowledge the one we love becomes present to us; and this is the way saints desire it.” Through Father Murray’s knowledge, the persons he loved, a triune God and a host of men, became present to him.

The mind and the manner were the man. A man of warm affections and deep loves. In love with God, in love with man, in love with life. It is this that explains his joy in human living: at his desk or at an altar, on the lecture platform or in the home of a friend. It is this, I think, that explains his agony in the period of suspicion—agony not because he had been rebuked, not because the underground was active again, but because he knew then what most Catholics know only now, that he was right; because he knew that human beings would go on suffering needlessly, unjustly, as long as the Church did not say flatly and unequivocally what she in fact says now: religious freedom is a human right.

John Courtney Murray was the embodiment of the Christian humanist, in whom an aristocracy of the mind was wedded to a democracy of love. Whoever we are—Christian or non-Christian, believer or atheist—this tall man has made it quite difficult for any of us who loved him to ever again be small, to ever again make the world and human persons revolve around our selfish selves. We have been privileged indeed: we have known and loved *the* Christian man, “the man who lives with wisdom.”

Dear friends of Father Murray: On his questionnaire for Woodstock’s forthcoming evaluation by the Middle States Association and the American Association of Theological Schools, Father Murray listed the two lines of research in which he was currently engaged: (1) the problem of contemporary atheism; (2) a Trinitarian conception of the state of grace. In his mind the two areas were not segregated. For the twin poles of his life were man and God—the heady synthesis of his beloved Aquinas: God in His secret life, man as he comes forth from God, and man as he returns to God through Christ.

Through Christ, this man of God, this man of men, has returned to God. It should be an intriguing return, especially if, as I suspect, there is a Jesuit named Weigel waiting in the wings. For sheer knowledge and love, the dialogue, or triologue, may well be unique.

THE DANGER OF THE VOWS

*an encounter with
earth, woman, and spirit*

JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY, S.J.

MANY CONFERENCES ARE GIVEN about the obligations of the religious life, the beauties of it, the graces one receives in it. Perhaps one aspect is a bit neglected—the risks of the religious life, the dangers inherent in it because it is religious. Let me speak of them.

Actually you run one supremely perilous risk—that of losing your manhood—impoverishment, diminution, deformation (if true, a serious threat to our Holy Orders). If you doubt, look about. How many take the risk and lose . . . so many men of diminished manhood, of incomplete virility . . . not necessarily more than in the world. To be a man in any walk of life is not easy; few achieve full virility, full womanhood either . . . but for reasons that do not entirely operate among us. The world puts obstacles in the way of manhood; religion does, too. And there are those who succumb to the obstacles.

Recognize them by certain marks: men who are at least in some greater or lesser degree irresponsible, whose manhood has something lacking, who have been damaged because of the way they have reacted to the vow of poverty . . . men who are dispersed, energyless, because unorganized and immature intellectually and emotionally . . . their manhood has been changed by the vow of chastity . . . men who to a degree are purposeless, their lives not consciously and strongly patterned, not inwardly directed toward a determined goal with all the organized power of the whole self.

Lack of responsibility, lack of integrity, lack of purpose—all somehow relate to the three vows. All are indicative of diminished manhood.

Man becomes a man by the encounter with three elemental forces, and by the mastery of them—the encounter with the earth, with woman, and with his own spirit.

First encounter

The first encounter is with the earth, the material creation. The prize is food, man's sustenance, his very bodily life. The encounter is a bitter conflict with a rude antagonist. "Cursed is the earth in thy work . . . with labor and toil shalt thou eat thereof all the days of thy life . . . in the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread."

Earth is man's proud primal antagonist, and its conquest is his initial necessary purpose. It is the earth that man must work in order to create for himself the very conditions of manhood, of human existence. And the earth is cursed in his work. It is insubordinate to his purposes; it resists him; only reluctantly does it yield bread to him. It is insecure beneath his feet; its fruits elude his grasp. It is a composite of vital forces wherein there is a promise of life for him, but which are difficult to harness and are able to sweep away all that he laboriously plants and grows or builds—and in the ruin to wreck also man himself, to destroy his material life, to defeat his efforts, or so to permeate him with its own insecurity that he gives up and flees to other dependencies, depends on those more successful in their wrestling with earth than he has been. If he fails in this struggle, he dies as a man; either he starves or flees to dependency, and in this flight loses his dignity. He has shirked his initial responsibility, fallen short of the initial creative purposes that must be his—the purpose of creating for himself those material conditions of life that are the indispensable support of his human dignity. Thus he falls short of his own dignity, which is that of being master, by his own work, of material creation.

Admittedly, the elemental character of this human struggle is dimmed in our industrial civilization, wherein so few work on the earth itself and are in contact with its elemental vitality and destructiveness. But though the arena has changed, the struggle itself is essentially unchanged. Men must still work, if they are to be men, and by their work win for themselves material security, their initial dignity, the condition of manhood. This is the primal law.

And when one escapes from obedience to it, one imperils one's manhood. Man is not man until by his own hard work he has bent stubborn earth to his own purposes.

Second encounter

Man's second encounter is with woman. Woman is Eve, *Zoe*, life, the life-giving principle, without whom man cannot live, without whom it is not "good" for man to be, for without her he cannot be man. (St. Paul's law: "*Vir per mulierem.*") She is the second earth, out of which man must live, and through whom, as Milton saw, "all things live for man."

She offers two things to man; one is possibility of procreation, hence of manhood, of realizing himself as, under God, the creator, the active principle of generation. Without her, his own manly life-giving powers are condemned to frustration and sterility. It is she who must draw out from him the seed of life resident in him; and in her must it be deposited, because only in her can it grow and take on human form, and only from her can it come forth, the image of the father, the image of God. Through woman, man becomes father, and therefore man to the maximum, because more fully like to God, who is Father, whose eternal act is generation of a Son. It is woman who puts within the reach of man the act of man, and therefore the integrity of his manhood.

More importantly, it is woman who offers man the possibility of headship, of entering into his native inheritance of rule—of realizing himself as head, *Logos*, the principle of order, which by ordering life rules it. Woman is life, but not *Logos*, not the principle of order. In St. Paul's metaphor, woman has no head of her own: "*caput mulieris vir.*" She is not her own ruler; man is to govern her. All this because she is simply Eve—life. And life is not its own law; it must have the law given it by reason, by *Logos*, and by administering this law, man becomes man. This is the primal fact that Adam mistook. He mistook the role of Eve, and therefore the meaning of life, and so did not know himself. His failure and his sin was in not being a man—not only betraying God, but violating his own nature. And it is this sin with which God reproaches him in Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Adam had pleaded that it was the woman who gave him the fruit of the tree; somehow through her he had

glimpsed a vision of life, a higher life than he believed himself to have. And because she offered it, and because what she offered looked like life, he took it. And God said:

‘Was she thy God, that her thou didst obey
 Before his voice, or was she made thy guide,
 Superior, or but equal, that to her
 Thou didst resign thy manhood, and the place
 Wherein God set thee above her made of thee,
 And for thee, whose perfection far excelled
 Hers in all real dignity: Adorned
 She was indeed, and lovely to attract
 Thy love, and not thy subjection, and her gifts
 Were such as under government well seemed,
 Unseemly to bear rule, which was thy part
 And person, hadst thou known thyself aright.’

(X, 145-56)

Man does not know himself aright until he knows he is the head of woman, set above her, having her under his government. This is his part and person; and if he resigns it, he resigns his manhood. In other terms, it is in his encounter with woman, with life, that man knows himself, achieves himself as *Logos*, who is to rule life and not be ruled by it. Through his encounter with woman there is offered him the possibility of achieving the triumph of reason over life (or the marriage of reason with life). Out of this encounter comes life that is human—untamed life in the bones of man is disciplined unto integrity, which is chastity, which is in turn the freeing of all the forces of life by their subordination to reason. Again it is woman who puts within the reach of man the act of man—the act of self-rule, through rule of her. It is she who lets him become man.

Third encounter

The third great encounter in which man becomes a man is the encounter with his own spirit. Meeting his own spirit, he meets a power within him that can give purpose to his life—the power to choose a destiny, and to summon all his energies for its pursuit. Meeting his own spirit, he meets the responsibility for the choice of purpose, and for the success or failure in the achievement of his chosen purpose in this world and in the next.

"What, think you, shall this child be?" is the question put by the relatives of John the Baptist. It is put about every child coming into the world. And no one can answer it save the child himself, when he grows old enough to put it to himself: What shall I be? And what shall I do that I may be myself—that I may exploit all the energy and virtue there is in me—that I may thus achieve my own uniqueness, my integral manhood? The questions are answered by a whole series of choices—of acceptances and refusals, of aggressions and submissions. I shall do this, not that; I shall take this path, not that. Here I choose to stand and fight; there I choose to give way. This gift I will use, that one I shall not. This will be my first task, that my second, that other I shall not attempt. This man will be my friend, that one my enemy. This I will destroy, that I shall build. Thus, in a word, I choose to live, in this path, for this purpose. This is my choice, made independently, freely, in the loneliness of my own soul; and I shall abide by all its consequences, good or ill.

In this wrestling with his own spirit, and with all the alternatives presented to it by circumstances and his own desires, a man becomes a man. He enters into possession of his powers, and of himself—becomes self-directed, self-controlled, able to think his own thoughts, feel his own feelings, meet his own friends with love, and his enemies without fear. By choosing his purposes, he becomes purposeful, and to that extent a man, strong and gentle, clear in mind, able to mobilize his energies; such a man, in his own degree, as our Lord was when he emerged from his lonely desert struggle, in which he had encountered the alternatives that life would have to offer him, and made his choice. Through his life runs that thread of purpose, which is the mark of virility: I am come for this, I am not come for that. . . .

These, then, are the three encounters wherein a man becomes a man—with the earth, with which man struggles for security, the conditions of life; with woman, with whom man struggles for the ascendancy of reason and law over *Zoe* and *Eros*; with his own soul, with which man struggles for the ultimate victory, over himself—the disciplining of himself to inward, strong purposefulness.

Our problem

You see now our problem. On entering religion, we avoid this triple encounter, we step aside from the struggle with these ele-

mental forces. By the vow of poverty, we are redeemed from the struggle with earth; security is given to us without a struggle; we do not know want nor the fear of want. We are no longer responsible for creating the conditions of our life; they are created for us. We free ourselves from the heritage of work. The collectivity assumes a responsibility for each of us; we vow to depend on it, and we do. And that is a terribly risky thing to do—seemingly it amounts to a violation of the law of nature. No man may depend on another for livelihood—a child may, because he is a child; but a man should assume responsibility for himself. And if he does not, he risks remaining an irresponsible child. He risks the destruction of living an inert, parasitic life—living off the collectivity. He has taken out of his life one of the elemental forces, motives that drive a man to the achievement of his manhood. And unless it is replaced by a comparable drive, he will inevitably be less a man—diminished, impoverished.

By the vow of chastity, we decline the encounter with woman. We make the radical refusal to enter the world of Eve—that strange, elemental world of life, wherein is offered to man the possibility of being the principle of man, the head of woman, and therefore himself (*caput mulieris . . . vir per mulierem*). Again there seems to be a violation of a law of nature. And the risk is manifold (adolescent senility; sex is dead). The Fathers pointed to pride as the danger one runs in choosing virginity—a certain hardness of spirit, a withdrawal of reason into a world of unreality because it is isolated from the facts and forces of life, and therefore unable to be integral. Man risks becoming a disembodied head, that fancies itself a whole thing when it is not; when it denies its dependence on the body and all that the body stands for; and therefore risks denying its dependence on God who made it dependent on the body. The pure spirit can readily be the proud spirit—whose hardness makes it poor material for priestly consecration.

This is the danger of false integrity. There is the opposite danger of a failure to reach any integrity—of a relapse into softness and dispersion of an immature emotionality, that has never grown up, been strongly polarized, and therefore wanders into sentimentality, wasting itself, and draining off the psychic energies. In a word, there is again the danger of childishness. Your typical bachelor is pro-

verbially crotchety, emotionally unstable, petulant, and self-enclosed—small and childish in the emotional life. Your religious risks being the same. The chaste spirit risks being also the childish spirit.

Finally, by the vow of obedience one declines the most bruising encounter of all—that of a man with himself, with his own spirit and its power of choice, with his own powers and the problem of their full exercise, towards the achievement of a determined purpose.

Here again one throws oneself on the collectivity, and on the will of another. One ceases to be self-directed. One's choices are made; and there is the comfortable feeling that one does not have to assume the responsibility for them—that falls on the superior. One need go through no particular agonies of decision; one need only follow the crowd, and obey the principle, "*munere suo fungi medio-criter.*" There need be no greatly earnest searching of heart, to discover if there are powers not yet exploited. And hence there can be an end both to aspiration and conflict. In a word, one can live through one's public life, and spare oneself the lonely agony of the desert struggle. In eliminating alternatives and the stern necessity for choice, obedience eliminates also the necessity for self-assertion and the assertion of one's own purposes. And thus it subtracts from one of the elemental disciplines that make for manhood. Your obedient man can become relatively inert, purposeless, and to that extent less a man.

These are the dangers; this is our problem. We have no time here for a solution, but such a solution as we need is founded on a paradox. By taking vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, we risk irresponsibility, childish immaturity, and purposelessness. We avoid the risks by keeping them integrally. Any chipping off in their observance is a blow, light or heavy, on one's manhood. Truly poor equals responsible; integrally chaste equals mature; absolutely obedient equals enterprising and purposeful.

A TALK ON OBEDIENCE: OCTOBER 11, 1966

PETER ARRUPE, S.J.

IN THE MATTER BEFORE US I see a typical instance of the renewal of religious life itself in one of its most important aspects. For this reason I thought it proper to make a few remarks on the subject. The crisis of obedience which so greatly concerns us takes its rise from new circumstances which effectively influence today's way of life. If we are seeking how to resolve this crisis, we will surely not find an answer by simply clinging to ancient norms or by opposing the new state of affairs. We must rather incorporate the new elements of today's Society into our characteristic obedience in such a way that when the new elements have been elevated by supernatural principles, we will have an obedience that is both traditional, in the sense that it is guided by our fundamental and distinctive principles, and adapted, in the sense that it is outfitted with new elements.

In a word, a crisis that has arisen from new factors ought to be resolved not by obsolete but by new approaches. Modern conditions summon us, as it were, to a new discovery of the human and evangelical value that St. Ignatius so thoroughly grasped. This is not a question of some sort of adaption that we are forced against our wills to undergo, or of a watering down or "devaluation" of obedience. Quite the contrary, as a result of providential circumstances, we are now invited to purge the notion and practice of obedience of some foreign elements which once, perhaps, made obedience easier. Obedience has, in fact, now been made more difficult. For that very reason it can and ought to become more authentically Christian and Ignatian.

For it ought to be enriched with the new elements that the continuous progress of the world makes available to us. In the world there are many natural factors which furnish a new opportunity for raising the level of our obedience by supernatural standards and adapting it to apostolic activity. Modern conditions which, at first

glance, seem to weaken our obedience can actually make it stronger and more apostolic, driving us on, as it were, to attain the Ignatian ideal by their use.

True adaptation presupposes progress. If, in this regard, little or nothing is done or is done reluctantly, or, on the contrary, there is an excessive or hapless surrender to modern trends, certainly obedience will suffer irreparable harm. From those apparent conflicts which we now perceive more vividly, we are forced to this deeper understanding and new "transformation" of obedience. There is the conflict between apostolic dynamism and the aspect of passivity or receptivity; between the guidance of the Holy Spirit and a rule exercised by man; between dialogue looking toward discussion of what is to be done and the strictly personal character of decision-making or of the laying down of a directive. There is, moreover, the conflict between the responsibility which each religious and apostle is aware of in his own conscience and the responsibility of the superior as such; between freedom of judgment and the exercise of a critical sense in the prior examination of a question by consultants and others, and full adherence to a decision, once it has been taken, not only by agreement of wills with regard to the goal to be achieved, but also, insofar as truth permits, by inclination of judgment through that sort of intellectual sympathy by which, as St. Ignatius says, a religious man thinks that "what is commanded is rightly commanded" (*Constitutions*, 550).

Indeed, this modern situation in which the Society finds itself furnishes it with an opportunity to arrive at a fuller, more effective statement of the insights and principles of St. Ignatius. I shall briefly recall these principles under six headings and then add a few words on the "re-education" necessary for a renewal of obedience. After that, I shall touch on the Ignatian virtues which come into play especially in the exercise of obedience, and on the "cast of mind" supposed in these virtues.

On Ignatian principles

1. The principle of ecclesiastical and religious authority still stands in its entirety. Its supernatural nature ought, however, to be vividly inculcated. For the old grounds on which respect for authority in part rested are vanishing. A superior today simply cannot dwell in his own lofty place apart from the brethren, perhaps

thus covering up his own limitations and deficiencies. He ought rather to engage in ongoing and friendly conversations with the rest of the community as a brother among brothers. The personal limitations of superiors here come to light more readily and decisions are made with greater difficulty. At the same time, on the human plane, religious are exposed to the risk of becoming too dependent psychologically on the greater or lesser endowment of "leadership" in the person of the superior. Moreover, that authority which used to be acknowledged so much in the person of the superior seen as more or less the sole guardian and interpreter of the divine will, today seems, as it were, to be hidden in the middle of the collectivity. One might perhaps say that it is being transformed into collective government.

If we look at the situation correctly, however, we see that there is no basis for speaking of collective government as such. What happened is only that a way is introduced whereby the community together with the superior, by a common effort, seeks after the divine will. The Holy Spirit makes that will manifest through the superior, through the members of the community, and even through outside circumstances and factors. There is no question of spreading authority through the collectivity, but of a real and positive help which the collectivity furnishes to the superior through its dynamic and spiritual cooperation in order that he may carry out his task of directing the community toward the greater service of God. But authority remains intact.

2. The second principle consists of personal "representation" through personal conversation or collaboration in which a religious may make known to the superior his personal "movements of the spirit and thoughts," difficulties, and objections. Today this is called dialogue and this collaboration is extended to include communications or discussions with a variety of councils, larger committees, or the whole community. Ours, however, if they should really wish to engage in spiritual discernment through these procedures, will be called on also to foster collective indifference, freedom from egotistic considerations, inner independence, and reverence, too, for the freedom of others, which is far more difficult but indicates great progress in representation of the Ignatian style.

Among other advantages of such dialogue will be an increased

sense of coresponsibility for the common good, and, after a decision has been made, a deeper consensus in carrying it out. For the superior himself, there will be a fuller knowledge of men and affairs. Thus the dynamism and effectiveness of obedience will be vastly expanded.

3. Once a decision has finally been taken and, if the situation calls for it, after representations and proper recourses have been made, there should be an eager and prompt acceptance. This is what is sometimes called "blind obedience," insofar as we now turn our attention from morose pondering over reasons "against," and turn our attention to the positive reasons inherent in the matter, or, transcending this order of things, we look only to the motive of faith and charity. It is much more difficult to suspend one's judgment about matters that have been under consideration a long time, particularly if for a long period reasons contrary to the mind of the superior have been set forth in dialogue, than it is to accept the decision instinctively in a sort of mechanical and blind fashion.

4. The fourth principle is one of "delegation" or rather, in a broader sense, and as the *Constitutions* often suggest, of "communication" by which the major superior entrusts the execution and arrangement of many things to a superior under him or to an official or someone else "whom he trusts as though he were his other self." This application of the principle now known as "subsidiarity" is more urgently needed today because of the complexity of things to be done and the speed with which matters must be expedited. But for us this is not so much a question of improved "techniques." By communication in this sense is meant a spirit of trust and of charity that is "communicative of itself"; and the collaborators in whom a superior reposes this trust are summoned to deeper fidelity, taking on as far as they can the mind and intention of the superior and freely giving him an account of things.

5. The next principle looks to "personality." Isn't it true that today we expect a man to throw himself wholly into his work? Isn't it true that the contemporary world looks for what are called "strong" personalities? In the Society we must form leaders . . . men endowed with personality. But by obedience a man does wholly involve himself and pour himself out in a collective undertaking. And when it is a question of our obedience, which is thoroughly per-

meated by theological charity, one's personality reaches complete fulfillment through such a giving of self. At the same time, however, because of the modern regard for personality, a superior is expected to show great reverence, acting as he does in the role of one who serves the communion existing between a son of God and the first-born brother, between sons and the heavenly Father.

But the members of a community, for their part, are also expected to collaborate in the formation of their own personalities and, on the other hand, to make a holocaust (as Christ did) of themselves in charity, a situation in which true personality is brought to perfection.

6. The final principle centers around the manifestation or account of conscience, whose goal can be said to be truly apostolic, so long as the apostolic life is not limited to a mere rendering of apostolic activities, but is understood as the whole life of the apostle. Young people today express themselves quite freely; they often need to be encouraged in the face of some secret anxiety. Security of this sort cannot be found merely in the psychological order; by communication in a spirit of trust, they ought to be helped to arrive at total personal integration and maturity in Christ himself. Sincere and open spiritual communication of this sort between a superior and a subject, something which is much more needed today than before, contributes greatly to that close relationship between the two of them that is described in many places in our *Constitutions* and that stands as a characteristic mark of our Society.

It is immediately evident that one can find in this account of conscience a basis for mutual confidence that is truly spiritual. For it brings about in a superior an inner experience that provokes him to expend himself completely for the spiritual advancement of his subjects to the point that he considers this his first and chief duty. As for the subjects, it stirs up in them that trust and fidelity with regard to the superior that makes obedience more ready and more generous. Today, our younger men want a superior to be dedicated to the spiritual and apostolic welfare of the community. They find it hard and difficult to put up with an administrator-type superior.

Re-education

In order that the Ignatian principles in this new and renewed style may carry over into our life of obedience and our exercise of

authority, is there not a need for some "re-education" of both superiors and all of us? There is a certain new art of governing and art of obeying that must be learned.

As for superiors, this means that with fuller understanding of their mission they may learn today's manner of governing, namely, through the use of dialogue and subsidiarity. They ought to know also how gradually to train Ours to an obedience that is manly and adult. In particular, when it is a question of laying down a more serious decision, they ought to know how to prepare a subject for it. Once they have made a decision or given a directive, however, they ought to hold to it and press it firmly, and do this out of a sense of fidelity to their office and charity toward their men.

Re-education is necessary for all, both for the older men, whom we must help to understand the new ways of expressing perennial values, and the younger men, that they may overcome prejudices and frequently distorted images which often enough they bring with them from the world from which they come.

For otherwise we must look forward to great and irreparable damage. In place of authority a personal collectivism or capitularism will insert itself. Dialogue will lose its constructive power and turn into endless and decision-less conversation. Delegation of authority will be turned into a scattering of energy and directive power, and this would be the root of internal division and common confusion. A recognition of the value of personality would be mere human respect and not respect for the man, and a denial of the offering of the whole man in the holocaust of obedience. The account of conscience would be nothing other than a mere conversation about one's own activity and often even an airing of the sayings and deeds of others. If it may be permitted to use a looser expression: account of conscience would be reduced to a chat about one's engagements and a criticism of other's activities.

Needed virtues

Among the Ignatian virtues which a renewal of obedience demands, faith takes first place. For it is needed more than ever and ought to permeate every relationship of obedience and government. For St. Ignatius, faith in Christ and in the Church, the spouse of Christ, is especially expressed and incarnated in obedience. At the same time, however, in our age faith is becoming more difficult, as I mentioned above.

Another virtue, and one which is in a way the "motor" of all obedience, is the law of internal love. Day by day obedience ought to have less of the appearance of "enforcement"; more and more it is essential to eliminate confusion between obligation and coercion. In addition, a superior's concern ought to be exercised less than in the past through external watchfulness. For this reason it is all the more necessary that everyone have a spontaneous desire and need, as it were, to be led, not by his own will and determination, but by that indication of the divine will which is offered us through obedience. On this account a necessary condition (*conditio sine qua non*) for obedience and the religious life in our time is trust, i.e., mutual trust. We can sometimes put up with weakness even of a grave sort, but we can never put up with bad will or hypocrisy.

Along with faith and charity in the exercise of obedience must always go availability for that service which is the most universal, for our offering is not only for our work, but also of the very disposition of our energies and inner will.

It is easy to see the sort of "cast of mind" or spiritual type that is taken for granted in those virtues which are at work in our obedience. The *Exercises* of St. Ignatius do not often treat expressly of obedience, particularly religious obedience. But the *Exercises* are totally involved in seeking out and fulfilling the divine will in every action; from the beginning to end they drive home that offering by which the Lord may dispose of us; in the following of Christ, in conformity to Christ, they transform indifference into a deeper humility or prior preference for whatever more completely empties us of selfishness. It is no wonder, then, that little by little, St. Ignatius and his companions were led gently by the love of Christ, by devotion to the divine will, and by reverence for the Church to an obedience that was at once apostolic and religious.

For us, it should be a consolation and an incentive to realize that from a renewed experience of the *Exercises* and from fidelity to St. Ignatius, we can measure up to the challenges put to us by human progress and the evolution or development of the Christian conscience. Let us be imbued with the spirit of evangelical faith and charity proper to the cast of mind of the *Exercises* and thus perfect Ignatian obedience will spontaneously emerge, more than ever, today.

RELIGIOUS OBEDIENCE IN THE MODERN WORLD

*free growth and
development*

JOSEPH J. SIKORA, S.J.

THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW AND FULLER CONSCIOUSNESS in the Western world of the dignity, autonomy, and rights of the human person has been quite amply described in detail in many places. Especially in the postwar period has this consciousness seeped down to every level of society, and indeed not only in the West but in the rest of the world as well. Perhaps the very experience of the rise of the totalitarian states and the long struggle against them were a kind of object-lesson for all to see of the real value of the person and of human freedom. Certainly the deliberations and decisions of Vatican II have confirmed among Christians these insights that are by now themselves part of the common possession of mankind.

This new consciousness has led to some profound changes in the manner in which more reflective members of human society view their position in relation to the authority that must be found in every society. For some, perhaps, it is a matter of finding a new hierarchy of values, of seeing that authority after all is the derivative concept, that the freedom and expansiveness of the human person are prior and that authority exists precisely for the sake of this freedom and expansiveness. For others, who already understood, at least obscurely, that law and authority exist as moderators of the prior expansiveness of being (and even the eternal law presupposes the divine being), there is need not so much of a new hierarchy of values as of a new constellation of values.

While a hierarchy of values simply rates the values in order of importance, a constellation of values does this but also does much more. Such a constellation of values is a grouping of values that tend to be so associated in terms of complementarity, tension, reinforcement, etc., that the consideration of one or some of these values tends to evoke consideration also of the others as somehow correlative, conjoined, or in some manner opposed. Such a constellation of values arises in a given cultural context, from many factors. A constellation is partially determined by "the nature of the case"; clearly authority is associated with the common good. But other determinants might be: past history, more remote or more immediate; the prevailing philosophical trends of the day; the needs of the moment, as in a situation of war, economic stress, peace, or prosperity; needs-in-view upon the horizon; and so on. In the light of such factors as these, a notion and value such as free trade or respect for the rule of law or the unrestricted job-mobility of the person might be seen in widely varying lights, in widely varying value-contexts at different times. These varying value-contexts would not be simply a matter of differing orders or hierarchies of preference, but of various value-factors that would have to be considered, that would spontaneously or upon reflection rise into consideration together as intimately related.

A separate constellation

There was a time even in American, and still more in European, society when such values as authority, order, the common good, and obedience tended to form such a constellation by themselves. It was not that the freedom and expansiveness of the human person were simply unrecognized; indeed these may in fact have had fuller play in a less highly organized society than that of today. But when there was question of the rule of law, the above-mentioned constellation of values would appear without any prominent consideration being given to this freedom and expansiveness. The theoretical recognition, since the American and French revolutions, of the dignity and rights of man was not at all incompatible with such a practical constellation of values as this. Indeed, this latter was very likely a useful balancing factor in the preservation of social order in such a free society. We are in fact disturbed at the recently manifested tendencies toward civil disobedience and the various forms

of protest demonstrations of the past few years.

In the medieval and immediately post-medieval periods, however, such values as authority, order, the common good, and obedience, formed the same constellation and without anything like the same recognition of the unique dignity, freedom, and expansiveness of the human person. In the religious context of the times, this same constellation included virtues like submission, humility, resignation. There was, of course, something of the perennial tension between the individual and society; but this could easily be regarded more as a lamentable consequence of original sin, without much attention being paid to another whole set of values implicit in this tension. With this tension, there had to be also a *de facto* balance; but this balance was always to be tilted, in the practical intelligence, in the light of the value constellation we describe. For men of these times regarded the order of religious life and civilization as something divine, something in its way more divine than fallen man, simultaneously imposed on him by God and constituting a kind of throne on which God might sit to rule the affairs of men. What was asked of man was above all conformity and submission for the common good of all. And this common good of all was itself looked for not in an expansion of the terrestrial possibilities of the human person but rather in peaceful growth in union with God precisely through such humility, resignation, and submission. There were of course those who would simply disregard this whole constellation of values and seize goods and power for themselves, in an assertion of proud independence. But they would also await the judgment of God.

It is not necessary here to pass any kind of value judgment upon such a conception of human life in society. It seems quite true to say that for men of those times such a view would not do violence to their aspirations so much as provide some hope for their fulfillment. If the cultural context, and the constellations of values, have changed, this would not necessarily mean that middle twentieth-century man is more right. Indeed, a mere reversal of the constellation of values that has occupied our attention: authority, order, the common good, obedience, submission, humility, resignation—to the anti-constellation: freedom, spontaneity, personal fulfillment, independence, authenticity, dignity, initiative—might not necessarily be for the better. If such a simple reversal has been characteristic of

many modern men and nations, the results in exploitation, war, and the threat of complete annihilation do not seem to be altogether favorable.

Not complete reversal

And yet, if there is no question of complete reversal but rather of a complementarity—so that the same constellation of values now includes both the former set and the latter set, with a fundamental appreciation of the ultimate priority of freedom and the expansiveness of the human person—there does seem to be a definitive progress in our appreciation of “the nature of the case.” We Christians have as one of our continuing tasks the synthesis of these value-constellations for ourselves and for the world.

Metaphysical grounds

There is in fact more than adequate metaphysical ground for such a synthesis. The existentialist and personalist philosophy of the twentieth century has stimulated many Thomists to a fuller formulation of the metaphysics of the person. In such a metaphysics of the person, both the dignity and freedom of the person and his relation to society, and therefore to authority, can be seen in such a light as to give rise to just such a broader value constellation as we are looking for.

The metaphysical analysis of the person cannot be presented in great technical detail here, but it is possible to give a summary outline of it. One must begin by asking what there is about a person that marks him off as not only unique and autonomous but even endowed with a special dignity, a special call for respect. We note that persons are characterized by their unique conscious inwardness; they not only have an inside of being in addition to an outside, but they are conscious of this fact, conscious even of the very heart of this inside. This inmost heart of their inside of being is their subjectivity.

Now every independently existing being (existing independently of other creatures, though never of God) must have such subjectivity. No such being is a pure exteriority to others. Beyond the domain of communicable and objectifiable formal perfection in every being there is also the unique and incommunicable exercise of existence and activity; and there is also the unique and incom-

municable root of such exercise that is subjectivity in the formal sense, that which constitutes the subject as subject. The inwardness of every being, then, is constituted by this subjectivity, ultimately by the exercise of the substantial existence of the being.

But this metaphysical inwardness is not of itself a self-conscious inwardness. For self-consciousness it is further necessary to exist in such a manner that there be no dispersal of parts outside of parts in extension. Self-consciousness after all requires perfect reflexivity in that which is self-conscious. How else could it have that complete self-presence of the whole to the whole that is the very being of self-consciousness?

Brute matter, and even living and sentient matter, consequently must lack genuine self-consciousness. It is of course true that sentient matter can have genuine knowledge of other things and even a kind of self-knowledge. But this self-knowledge of sentient matter cannot be the perfect reflexivity and auto-transparency that are constitutive of true self-consciousness. The being of sentient matter is throughout a dispersed being, extended in diverse parts, even an infinite multiplicity of parts, that can never perfectly coincide with each other. The actual reality of genuine self-consciousness in man is one of the most certain indications that his being has something in it simply transcending all that is in brute and even sentient matter. This "something" is, of course, what we call the spirituality of the human soul.

We need not tarry here to follow out the implications of such self-consciousness for the spirituality of the soul; what are of interest to us are rather the implications of this self-consciousness for man's characteristic mode of operation and for his relationship to others of his kind and even to God.

Self-possession

As a consequence of self-consciousness, man can be said to be in possession of his own being. And this self-possession shows itself in the very real power of man to deliberate and even to say "No" to the various impulses toward activity that arise in virtue of the existential dynamism of human being as of all being. Such a moderation of the dynamism of being through the possibility of nihilation (a metaphysical "No" that is in no way a positive act at all) is the very reality of human freedom of choice. This freedom of choice is here

seen to be grounded in the prior freedom of human spontaneity that is only the self-conscious self-possession of a subject-being endowed with a multi-directional dynamism toward activity.

The human person must dominate his multi-directional dynamism toward activity and greater fullness of being by freedom of choice. Through the responsible use of this freedom he must seek for and choose the course of action and the pattern of life that will enable him to develop and to expand to the full stature destined for him in the designs of God.

This full stature is primarily measurable as a degree of love for and communion with God, but it also has another dimension. Human self-consciousness is not only of one whose heart is made for God but also of one that is turned and opened outward to community with fellow men. Consequently, we see ourselves in a movement toward our final state with God not just as in a "flight of the alone to the Alone" but as part of the movement of and assimilation of a human community as a whole to God. If communion with God is our goal, it is also that state in which communion with our fellow men will finally be reached in its highest degree. But even apart from this final eschatological communion and community of men together in God, we are already at present conscious of an inescapable involvement with others that is truly a consequence of our human being itself. Our life of grace and love cannot be focused on God alone to the exclusion of our neighbor. That would be to live a lie. The Christian life of grace is an entry into the life of God and a sharing of his purposes and his love. But God's love is not for me alone but for all men and for all creation: that all persons and all things reach their fullness of being in accordance with the divine design that moves all men and everything else in its way toward and into the mysterious communion of consciousness that is our destiny. By our life of grace we are enabled to take as our own perspective on all things that of the divine generosity.

Clearly, the very first aspect of this generosity of love is recognition and respect for the uniqueness, personal dignity, and freedom of other persons. To refuse this is to refuse to acknowledge the other as a person at all, to treat him as in some manner a thing that is wholly at one's service. This of course means a grave injustice to the other; but it also means a grave loss for oneself, a closing off of the

possibility of truly interpersonal communion with another self like oneself, and therefore a closing off of opportunities for mutual enrichment in communion and communication.

Parts in relation

But if the social nature of man calls for entry into such interpersonal relations and for mutual recognition of and respect for the uniqueness, dignity, and freedom of other persons, this same social nature of man calls also for a social order in which these same persons that are wholes unto themselves are also parts in relation to a larger whole. And if each human person has his own immediate personal relation to God that cannot be touched by any other creature, still each of us is also called to God precisely as a member of the community of mankind and the people of God. There is need for a religious social order, and for the Church, in which and through which the immediate personal relation of each one of us to God is incarnated as of itself meaning more than just a solitary encounter of the alone with the Alone.

The freedom and expansiveness of the human person is thus at every level a freedom and expansiveness within a society. But such society always requires some form or order, and consequently some mode of authority to safeguard the common good of the society as such, which is a sum total of goods for the persons constituting the society taken together. Man's way to all the goods of human life is a social way. Had God not seen fit to establish a religious community with special divine guidance, surely man himself would inevitably form some kind of community to achieve to a greater degree the religious goods he seeks. Some kind of authoritative principle, and consequently some institutional aspect—at least minimal—is to be found everywhere in the religious life of man in so far as it becomes socially manifested.

Even in the pluralistic situation in which many religions are recognized as in some manner "equal before the law" and the right of private judgment made in some manner absolute, there is found something of this social ordering of religious life. Here civil freedom in religious matters is itself an authoritative institution that regulates religious life in the nation as a whole, even though not within the particular religious groupings in the nation.

Servant of freedom and expansiveness

But the place of authority in social life must be seen to be ultimately that of a servant of freedom and of the expansiveness of the human person. The reason for authority rests on this prior being of the person; authority seeks to provide that order of life in which the free expansiveness of the person is allowed fullest play in the social context in which it must of its nature exist. This is not to say that the social life of man is secondary; the social dimension of man is given in the same self-consciousness in which the most intimate and private dimension of man is also given. But the order that must be imposed by authority on the free and social expansiveness and interpersonal encounter of men is secondary, derived from the demand for order that arises out of the being of any interacting multiplicity of free persons. The need for authority is thus a function of and arises out of the existence of freedom, not vice versa.

The internal law of our freedom itself, as a finite freedom that is everywhere conditioned by the whole nature of the one that is free, is thus prior to any exterior law imposed by external authority. And yet the internal law of freedom surely calls for the existence of such external law and external authority, insofar as this freedom is always freedom in a social context. The internal law also calls for respect for this external law and external authority, precisely insofar as they are really exigencies of the finite and conditioned mode of a freedom that only exercises itself in a social context. Only in the case of clear conflict, and only to the extent of such conflict, between the internal and external laws would obedience be withdrawn from the latter.

If one were to object that all this is well and good as regards merely human law and authority, but that we must speak in quite another manner of the relations between human freedom and divine law, we must insist that ultimately this is not true. Though man is of course subject to the law of God, this subjection is first of all in virtue of his nature and of the internal law of freedom that follows from this nature. No further precept of divine law, given in some exterior or interior fashion, could contradict this internal law of freedom, unless God were to contradict his own external law according to which all things are made.

Now the first law of the free being of the finite person is that of

expansion and development in freedom, to the greatest extent possible. All further laws, that determine the direction and course of the expansion and development in the social context of human existence, are in some manner further explicitations of the fundamental law of growth and development. This is true as much in the order of supernatural life as it is of natural life. (But of course, those explicitations that are provided by God himself or by his human vicars might not always *appear* to be explicitations rather than obstacles to the law of growth and development. Yet we are in God's hands and must follow his light.)

The most fundamental values then *are* on the side of personal freedom, independence, fulfillment, spontaneity, authenticity, dignity, initiative. But if authority, obedience, and so on are derived values existing in function of the law of free growth and development, because of the social context of human existence, they are nevertheless true values that must always be respected by man and incarnated into his life.

The fact of the Fall

Moreover, this whole consideration of the "nature of the case" as regards freedom and authority must also be supplemented by further consideration—perhaps dominant in the medieval mind (but nonetheless true for all that)—of the actual fact of the Fall of man. Because man is in fact fallen, because his intelligence is obscured and his will weak, exterior law and exterior authority do have a further value besides that of regulating the social context of human existence. In the actual state of man, the exterior law and authority also have an educative function both for the intellect and the will, through pointing out the right way more clearly and even through the threat of some kind of coercion or other. Even this educative function, however, is finally in the service of freedom and its internal law. For this function of external law and authority only exists in order that freedom and its internal law may be better understood and respected according to their true nature by man.

But when all this has been said, it remains that we must keep a balanced view, giving what is due both to freedom and all those values associated with it as most fundamental to the human person and to authority and those values intimately associated with authority and the recognition of authority. If the former set of values

is firmly grounded on the deepest ontological constitution of the human person, the latter set is also grounded on the constitution of this person in a social context and on the actual fallen state in which this person finds himself. But clearly the balance here is hard to maintain, especially at a time in which we see a strong reaction, and even an over-reaction, against a cultural perspective that gave quite insufficient recognition to what are finally the more fundamental values in the whole constellation of values centered on freedom and authority.

This cultural perspective was not unique to the Church—far from it—but its effect was felt strongly in the Church and in the formulation, over two millénia, of the understanding of obedience to authority in the Church. "It seems quite urgently necessary that some kind of reformulation of this understanding, on the basis of a fuller understanding, be undertaken. I would be quite happy if what follows helped a little toward such a more satisfactory reformulation. But my consideration is restricted chiefly to an analysis of the ideal of religious obedience, the obedience of those consecrated to God in the religious life, with only a few additional reflections at the end concerning the general question of obedience in the Church.

There are doubtless those who feel that religious obedience is not a viable ideal in the modern world. A metaphysical—at least implicitly metaphysical—view of the human person such as we have outlined might well lead them to conclude that each of us is so autonomous, his freedom of such value, his authenticity so important, etc., that it is now really inconceivable that one man should so thoroughly subject his will to that of another as religious obedience demands. This would not be to deny the value of the obedience to law and to authority that is demanded in ordinary social life; such obedience is demanded by our condition as social beings, and also by our fallenness, as we have seen. But if the primary values in this order are those of personal freedom and the expansiveness of the human person, then it would not seem reasonable to make any unnecessary—in this view—sacrifice of personal freedom and responsibility, initiative, and perhaps even of authenticity.

Values still desirable

And yet the primary values sought through religious obedience remain just as desirable in the light of the foregoing metaphysical analysis of the human person. Indeed, they appear even more meaningful in the light of such a deeper understanding of the dignity and freedom of the person. Few have ever sought to justify obedience in the light of a supposed worthlessness of the human person and his freedom. It has always been just the great value of freedom that has made the "sacrifice" of it through obedience the true holocaust that it has always been considered to be.

However great the value of freedom and of the expansiveness of the human person, it remains as true as ever today that in our fallen state we are apt to misuse our freedom and to disregard the fundamental laws that should direct human development toward the full stature of man under, and even in union with, God. However great a good it is for us in spontaneity and with free initiative to choose our way of action so as to serve God according to our lights, the Church still approves and recommends religious institutes, entered with spontaneity and free initiative, as excellent ways to live a life of service of God and man. Indeed Vatican II only reaffirms the eminence of the life of the counsels, and especially in such religious institutes. And this approval by the Church means that God can still be encountered and heard in the authority and regulations of religious life. Moreover, for the group apostolates of religious communities, some kind of authoritative direction and consequent obedience remain just as necessary as before. The political, ascetical, and mystical reasons for religious obedience remain intact, if they do not become even stronger in the light of our fuller understanding of the personal dignity and freedom of man. This includes even a well-worked out and balanced conception of "obedience of the understanding," provided that this is never employed to compromise intellectual integrity and lead thus to a more or less profound inauthenticity in action. There can therefore be no question of simply dropping the ideal of religious obedience as something more proper to another age and unsuited to modern man.

But it is a fact that the younger members of religious institutes in our Western democratic society have a much greater conscious-

ness of the value of freedom, the dignity and rights of the person, responsibility, initiative and spontaneity, authenticity, personal fulfillment. These values have never been *rightfully* disregarded in religious life; but it has been frequently possible for them to remain more or less in the background of consciousness of many members of religious institutes, and even to be almost eclipsed in some actual practice. And yet surely none of these values is removed by religious profession, by the vow of obedience. Indeed, the purpose of obedience is that each person under it may be more surely and efficaciously directed toward a greater fulfillment and incarnation of such values as these. And the purpose of authority in the religious community is again that it should direct the persons of the community toward such a fuller growth and expansion of their personalities, in which alone they are able to show Christ to the world to the greatest degree, and through which alone they are able to become most efficacious in their apostolic, and even contemplative, activity.

Grace and personality

Grace ordinarily does not work its best results in stunted personalities, in creeping or degraded personalities that do not realize their true worth. The great saints, the geniuses of sanctity and most intense lovers of God—people like Aquinas, Bernard, Theresa, Catherine of Siena, come immediately to mind—were also most *free*, most authentic, most responsible, most spontaneous and creative, and so came to the highest fulfillment of their personalities in the line of supernatural, and perhaps even, frequently enough, natural good. It is this kind of person that must be the goal of both authority and obedience in religious life. Education for freedom of the spirit in God, and not just preparation for smooth functioning (and all but embalming) in some niche or mold, is the highest purpose of religious life. It is quite possible that IBM or General Motors could do a much better job of the latter, and perhaps without so much danger to the human personality—for they could never get so close to its roots as can the directors of religious life.

Happily, the present renewal in the Church is taking cognizance of this aspect of religious life, and many good results are already being seen. Because of this, many of the suggestions to follow regarding the exercise of authority and obedience in the religious life today are by no means new. What is offered here is not so much

a number of novel concrete suggestions as a reasoned basis for them. Such a reasoned basis might serve to calm the fears of some that the ideal of religious obedience is being watered down or done away with, and also to encourage those who already "feel" the necessity for such a rethinking of religious obedience but have misgivings because of the absence of a fully reasoned basis for their "feeling." Such fears and misgivings are very much present today, even when authoritative sanction is given in one or other religious community for some such understanding of the ideal of obedience as is offered here. And while it is no longer possible to be a prophet of renewal, it would still be most worthwhile to offer whatever might make renewal easier to carry through and with better results.

So there is not to be a retreat from the ideal of religious obedience, but a thorough rethinking of it in the light of the new circumstances of Western, democratic society. The principal circumstance here is that of the transit from the former limited and slanted constellation of values around authority and obedience to the broader and more balanced constellation of values around freedom and authority, such as we have described earlier. It is no longer possible for men of our time and culture to retain the narrower perspective. When we think of the exercise of authority and of the duty of obedience, we also think spontaneously of broader human values that all this is meant to serve. We think of the prior freedom and expansiveness of the person, of his responsibility and initiative, and of his duty to be authentic.

Not automatons

The mere fact of a command being given does not end such considerations; it is frequently only the occasion for them to arise, in order that the command itself may be better understood and evaluated. And this does not mean that men with this attitude are more self-willed, proud, and stubborn. Rather, it means that they are perhaps more mature and more aware of the implications of what they do, both as regards themselves and as regards those whom they work to help. It really means that they are potentially far better subjects of obedience, since they will be able to enlighten the authority in many cases about aspects of the situation that he has not considered and since their final execution of a decision will

be the result of much more thought and ordinarily of much fuller personal appropriation. Automatons might appear to some as more obedient; but in an age of cybernetics and robots one does not need such subjects.

But what is even more important than their being potentially better able to cooperate in the formulation of the command (in a material, though not in a formal manner—the command itself is always given formally by the authority) as well as in its execution, is this: their ability to profit more from the exercise of obedience in its ascetical and mystical aspects. The greater the consciousness of the value of freedom and of its related values, the greater the worth of the submission to God in faith that obedience involves. The more that one discerns such values, the more clearly he must also realize that he really does hear through the final decision of the competent authority the voice of our Lord. And the more he understands such things, the less likely he is to slip into the passive drifting that can so easily corrupt the practice of obedience, the more likely he is to understand and realize in his own life the real purpose of religious obedience—the fullest possible degree of the freedom of the sons of God who live in the Spirit. But surely all this is no dilution of the ideal of obedience; rather, it is an opportunity for a new degree of perfection in the exercise of obedience.

We can consider briefly here a few aspects of this new perfection that is possible in the exercise of obedience. First, let us consider the significance of the now clearer and more compelling consciousness of personal authenticity and integration as values that must be preserved in any exercise of obedience. Authenticity is simply being oneself in what one does, so that there is no shadow of play-acting or hypocrisy in one's life (what is commonly referred to, for want of a real word, as "phoniness"). Integration is simply the extension of authenticity to the whole of one's life, so that every free activity does finally fit into a fundamental pattern that is fully consistent. Authenticity and integration are not just "good to have if you can manage it"; they are fundamental properties of the truth of the person, of what each of us ought to be as particular refractions of the personality of Christ, as individual persons each with his own call from God that must be heard and followed with his own response.

A time for reflection

But to act without seeing the value of what we do is already to fall into nonauthenticity and hypocrisy. This does not mean that commands that are not at once meaningful to us are simply to be disregarded. But it does mean that this is a time for reflection, and perhaps even for discussion—to the extent that the nature of the command allows. (Obviously, I am not referring to sudden commands to immediate action that must of its very nature partake of the impulsive. However much we might prefer to avoid such situations, they are a part of every human life. But the necessarily impulsive reaction is the more sure according as the person who elicits it is more fully an authentic and integrated person.)

Clearly, where there is no sin perceptible, there is some kind of value in the commanded action. But there is still the problem of seeing this value for oneself and making it to be truly a value to oneself, and perhaps also of perfecting and increasing this value by careful consideration and by further proposals to the one who commands. This value must finally be personalized so that the action itself will be truly an epiphany of the being of the agent and not just a sterile and automatic performance like that of a puppet. Such a personalization of value might or might not be easy in a given case, as in the general direction that one is to give to his life work.

But correlative with this need for personalization on the part of the obedient subject is the serious responsibility of the one in authority so to know his subjects that he can set them to tasks and give them direction that does really fit their personalities to the greatest extent possible. This is one of the principal aspects of the exercise of authority in a religious community. It must never be simply a matter of getting jobs done by it-matters-not-whom.

Clearly, there is a hierarchy of tasks; and therefore, there are degrees of seriousness in this matter of personalization. Daily household tasks do not make the same demands in this regard on subject and superior as do major decisions that can affect the course of one's whole life. But neither subject nor superior can ever lose sight of this basic need for personalization as the presupposition of authenticity and integration; and both subject and superior must constantly strive for it, each in his own way.

On the most general plane, this need for authenticity and integration has always been implicit in the question of the suitability of candidates for the priesthood and/or some religious community. We have always understood that there are degrees of compatibility between individuals and such groups and ways of life. And there is ordinarily a point at which a personality becomes, not bad, but rather unsuited for either the priesthood or some particular religious way of life, or even for any form of the religious way of life. We conclude that he would be unhappy there, and that he would have undue difficulty in leading an authentic Christian life there according to his own personality and the demands of living in such a state or group.

Continual effort

Something of the same consideration must be carried down to the more detailed aspects of religious life, so that the superior does not make it virtually impossible for a given member to personalize his obedience, or even unnecessarily difficult to do so. But of course, this in no way dispenses the subject of obedience from the continual, day-to-day effort at ever deeper personalization that leads to ever more complete authenticity and integration, first in the general directions that obedience gives to his life, and second even in the little matters that arise in day-to-day living.

But the ideal of personalization, authenticity, and integration is not achieved in some kind of continual introspective concern to see for oneself in a reflective manner at every point how everything one does is truly an epiphany of one's being and not just a sterile and automatic performance like that of a puppet. Such a continual effort of introspection would certainly distinguish one from a puppet, but it would also drive one mad or at least make one a little eccentric! What is finally required is that one really take on, as "second-nature"—which is to say "virtue"—a genuinely religious personality according to the nature of the institute. If this were simply impossible, one would really not belong in this institute.

Such a second-nature means that one's reactions in the ordinary course of day-to-day religious life will be truly authentic and personalized in a spontaneous manner; for now the pattern of such life fits the being of the one who lives it, by a kind of connaturality. The effort to fit into the pattern of life in this manner is precisely

the required process of personalization of value. It is in fact called for in anyone who has ever entered a new social group. There are of course moments in which this kind of personalization is not enough, when one is asked to follow his own particular direction in life—but one which he himself has not chosen for himself and perhaps would not choose, or when one is called upon for some out-of-the-ordinary task. For such cases, there is always need of a special effort of personalization; and in such cases the superior must exercise great care not to ask for too much from the given person, and indeed to consider carefully the best means to insure the fullest possible personalization and consequently the maximum degree of authenticity and integration. For this is only to help this person to be himself in accordance with the designs of God, in his own unique likeness to Christ.

To some it may seem almost paradoxical to speak of preserving the values of initiative and independence in the context of obedience. But in fact they bring a further perfection to the exercise of obedience. There once was a time when a more passive attitude in the face of more detailed direction from authority was felt to be a good. Such a situation seemed to imply that there was more humility and more obedience than there would be with only general direction or a more active attitude. Perhaps this was very frequently the case for many religious. But it does not seem to be the ordinary ideal now.

A reasonable sacrifice

For if the sacrifice in obedience is to be truly a reasonable one, then we must take into account and accept both the advantages and limitations of both subjects of obedience and superiors. In the ordinary case, both are adult, both are endowed with intelligence, freedom, and desire for the common good of the community, of the Church, and of the world. And if each knows his worth, this is not pride but simple objectivity (which is humility). If it remains true that subjects do not have all the facts, it is also true that they may well have some of them and that the one in authority may not have them all himself. It is further true that such persons have minds of their own, with perhaps some very good ideas and plans of their own to promote. Such considerations make dialogue, communication, and discussion a practical necessity if obedience is to be really

efficacious in promoting the greater good both in the work done and in the one who does it.

Moreover, the subject may be perfectly capable, and perhaps even more capable, of carrying out an assigned program of action himself, without need of any detailed program of directions drawn up by the one in authority. This is only an application of the general principle of subsidiarity. The superior should not take upon himself the task of unnecessary direction, of giving really unnecessary (and perhaps also less competent) commands.

Obedience that has room for both initiative and subsidiarity is not a less perfect obedience but a more perfect one. It will call attention to the fact that a vow of obedience is in no way an abdication of responsibility to think about and evaluate even legitimate commands, and to reflect for oneself upon the real needs of the present situation and possible ways to meet them. It will make the personalization that has been spoken of above much easier to achieve in a fuller way. It also requires a good deal of humble abandonment to submit for formal approval by authority the ideas and plans that have been nourished and cherished in one's own heart. The same is needed to retain real willingness to stand corrected for proposals and for action *after* we have stuck our necks out by an exercise of initiative in making proposals or by our exercise of independence in the scope of action allowed us by the principle of subsidiarity, when such correction should prove necessary. And such an obedience will also make for better results in work, and for a continuing growth and development of the personality in the face of the various challenges that it must confront in the course of life. With such a notion of obedience, there would be far less temptation for some religious to avoid the necessity for personal decisions and personal responsibility, in a kind of passive waiting on the word of the superior—a waiting which could even take the especially perverse form of doing nothing especially worthwhile until one hears some kind of authoritative command.

Such an approach to obedience as that we describe must also show the greatest regard for the primary role of the individual agent in the individual situation. He continues to be personally responsible for the way in which he acts in this situation, notwithstanding the directive of authority. He continues to be called to the greater

good in such a situation. It is true that this would not justify the subject in his simple departure from what has been commanded, on the ground of some supposed—though not verified—inspiration of the Holy Spirit. But it does mean that one must be attentive to the movement of the Spirit and the light of native intelligence not only in the superior but also in the subject, and that final judgment and command should when possible arise out of a consideration of the light that both have to offer. One may say that the guidance of the Spirit here is not to be found in its fulness except in both taken together (though of course the formal prerogative of command is reserved to the one in authority).

Broader concepts

This means a considerably broader concept of the capacity and duty of representation than that which we sometimes find. It is not that the subject objects only when he apprehends a command to be clearly sinful, or that he makes his contribution to fuller understanding of the situation only after the command has been given. Rather, he must actually cooperate with the superior in arriving at the final determination. It is true that the superior ultimately has the formal role; he must finally determine what is to be done. But this can only be done properly if the genuine material role of the subject be respected.

While there are matters that obviously require no consultation, there are also matters that can only be adequately considered by taking into account the information, views, and needs of the subject. And this is true not only in the case of individual persons but also of the community as a whole. There are times when the entire community ought to be consulted, either individually or as a group. It is of course true that the superior must care not only for the individual good but also for the common good; but it is not at all true that he alone is able to know and to care for this common good. But if this is an insistence on a real right of the subject to be heard, it is also a call to the responsibility of subjects and communities to reflect on such matters as arise and to make known to the superior, to the extent that seems useful and profitable, the results of their reflection. Obviously there is here great need of discretion and balance in both superior and subject, not to speak of mutual respect and tact.

Closely related to respect for the primary place of the individual agent who must act in the individual situation is the need for authority to refrain from imposing obligations and making commands in some domains. This is not only true as regards purely internal matters of conscience, where such commands would have simply no force at all, and as regards external acts like the casting of a civil or ecclesiastical ballot, that of their very nature flow directly from an internal judgment of conscience and again would not be in any way subject to such a command, but also as regards wide areas of human activity that are too intimate and personal to be properly regulated by such means. To many today these areas seem much wider than before. For example, the precise time of some spiritual exercises perhaps ought to be much more a matter of individual discretion (though this does not preclude assigning a certain period as in general more favorable or more preferred, and consequently calling for more than the ordinary conditions of silence in the house). Or perhaps the hours of rising and retiring are just too much an individual concern to call for anything except some general advice rather than a precise note on a daily order. But be it noted that there is no question here of concessions so much as a situation in which too precise and detailed a regulation might become a simply unreasonable imposition, one that fails to take into account the unavoidable fact of human differences. But it should not be necessary to go further here into the wide range of possibilities, from the unreasonable imposition to the merely silly custom that is nevertheless insisted upon.

Conscientious objection

Also related to this primary personal responsibility of the one who must act in the individual situation, even though he be commanded, is the matter of conscientious objection. In the ordinary case, the occasion for such a conflict between the conscience of a subject and the command of the superior should not be allowed to arise. If the regard of both subject and superior for the values of authenticity, integration, personalization, and responsibility is also enlightened by continual dialogue, it should be possible for the most part to avoid this conflict. So far as possible the superior should simply refrain from giving a command that would create such a conflict for a given individual. Clearly, such an occasion could

be circumvented in many instances by reassignment of the one in question, or by finding another man to do a particular job. But the concrete likelihood of conscientious objection in a given instance should also be an occasion for the superior to weigh seriously the reasons that one might have for such conscientious objection, which sometimes might even aid in enlightening his own conscience.

But if the conflict cannot be avoided, and all appeals to higher authority by the subject are exhausted and fruitless, then there is need for the authority itself to call in others to consider the conflict and to suggest possible courses of action to both subject and superior. (The recent legislation of the 31st General Congregation makes provision for such action in the Society, even to the extent of calling in someone from outside the Society itself.) Perhaps this will finally resolve the problem. But if it does not, then it seems that the time has come for such a subject, with as much good will as possible on all sides, to be freed from his vows so that he may follow the light of his conscience in a more untroubled manner.

But the most important aspect of religious obedience in the light of our new constellation of values is its significance as a *means* and not an end. It is of its nature a means to the growth and development of the person and of true personal freedom of spirit in the love and service of God. It must lead to greater love, but it would not do this if it were to result in seriously stunting this personal growth and in creating neurotic dependency rather than a fuller freedom of the spirit in the service of God. Mere mechanical performance in a rut might sometimes look like humble, devoted service and ascetical success. But it could just as well result from numbness and even a certain indifference that can arise in slaves of a system. This would not be a life of love, or at least not a life of very vital and intense love.

But such comments as these do not throw the burden of the effort mainly on superiors. It is true that they must take care that they use their authority and the instrument of obedience to help religious grow more surely and more fully into men and women completely in love with God and devoted to his service, and to avoid so far as they can the perversion of this powerful ascetical, and even mystical, instrument. But the primary burden is still on the subject of obedience, who must continually strive to see the

place and use of obedience in his life. It is not an escape from responsibility and from the necessity of personal growth and development to full freedom of spirit. It is, however, still a very great value, in the context of the whole value constellation of which we have spoken so much, that is still at present what it has been in the past, an efficacious means of personal growth in Christian life and Christian freedom of spirit.

And if obedience was so powerful a means in the past, notwithstanding an inadequate explicitation of its larger context, it can be even more effective at present and in the future, in the light of the further explicitation of this context that has become possible in the twentieth century. From this perspective, religious obedience is much more than a viable ideal in the modern world. It can be now even more fully what it has always been—a way to the highest perfection of human personality even in the natural order but especially in the supernatural life of love and service of both God and man.

Is it possible for such a conception of religious obedience as we have been describing really to become widespread in the Church? In fact we can already see it in many younger religious, who do not yet possess authority in their communities, and in more than a few of those who do have authority. I believe that, generally speaking, the Decree on Obedience of the 31st General Congregation pretty well says many of the same things.

This does not mean that the older view was "wrong." Rather, it means that the development of human culture also permits further development and perfection of the forms and means of spiritual life. Surely this should not be unexpected or unwelcome. Such a move toward a fuller freedom of the spirit under obedience is called for by the signs of the times. But it is also in deepest accord with the fundamental dynamism of the life of grace, that grace whose first effect and last goal is a fuller freedom of the spirit for an expansive personal growth in the life of knowing, loving, and serving God.

Problem of adjustment

But there is a very real problem of adjustment to this development. There are many older men, and many outside the strong influence of Western social thought, who simply do not yet appre-

ciate the idea of man that is behind it, for whom the new and fuller constellation of values around authority and obedience has not yet taken shape. Such a cultural difference calls for, and will continue for some time to call for, a great deal of patience and tolerance on both sides and a considerable and prolonged effort toward mutual understanding. And those of us who feel that "the future is on our side" in this matter must not fail to recognize that the great saints of the Church were produced by God in that earlier cultural context; we have yet to see the saints that we hope God will produce in the new one. We must still only *hope* to become religious as good as so many that have gone before us, though in our own somewhat different way.

The consideration of religious obedience that we have just completed has implications far beyond religious life itself. Surely the constellation of values around authority and obedience that has been noted here should have some impact on the exercise of authority in any sphere of human activity. But it seems especially appropriate to add here a few reflections concerning the significance of a "new spirit" in the Church. Still, in doing so, I would not wish to be identified with some postconciliar extremists who seem to think that freedom means license for indiscriminate criticism, or even for doing whatever one pleases in a total disregard of authority and law in the Church.

There had been, in the preconciliar Church, something of an emphasis on obedience as mere, almost passive, conformity to authoritative decrees. One did see at times a use of authority that treated Christians as spiritual children who must inevitably stay that way, instead of educating them for spiritual adulthood and recognizing that in fact there are some who already are rather mature Christians whose views call for respect even from those in authority. Communication and dialogue were at a minimum between the Christian people and the authority of pope, bishops, and administrative hierarchies. Possible organs of public opinion in the Church were kept, for the most part, under rather tight control. Subsidiarity was regarded by many in authority not as an ideal, but rather as a somewhat necessary evil that should be overcome as much as possible. Spontaneous initiative tended to be distrusted rather than applauded by a fair number of those in authority. The

assumption seemed to be made by many that Christians would not in fact grow very much in personal Christian life, and should not grow in interior freedom of spirit and capacity for independent critical judgment even in affairs of the Church.

Rising tension

But such a mentality was becoming increasingly difficult to maintain quite some time before Vatican II. With the growing postwar consciousness of the values on which we have dwelt so much in this paper, a rising tension between the aspirations of men more conscious than ever before of their personal dignity, freedom, and call to interior freedom of spirit, and the de facto regime of political government in the Church that reflected the values of an earlier cultural order, could not be avoided. In the providence of God, Pope John XXIII was the man who "opened the windows" in the Church.

Vatican II surely produced a general program of renewal that is directed away from the older regime toward a new one that should have more vividly before its eyes the context and purpose of authority and obedience that we have described—the free growth and development of human persons toward spiritual adulthood with its possibilities for mature love and full responsibility in the highest attainable degrees of freedom of spirit. Perhaps it is unnecessary to dwell again on the details of what Vatican II has done. The spirit of Vatican II is very much in evidence, both in many concrete results already achieved, and in an even more evident vocal aspiration for more to come. In such an agitated time there are of course also those spirits that have not understood, and some call for the return to the old regime while others call for the virtual abolition of genuine authority in the Church. It is very hard to say which group is more to be feared. Perhaps we should not fear either one very much, but rather be patient with them, pray for them, parry them, correct them when clearly necessary, but "never take nonsense *too* seriously." They will settle down and adjust to the new order of things, with both its authority and its freedom. Or they will simply leave the Church, preferring their light to the light of the Church. I do not see that we can deny them their freedom to make such a choice.

SHARED DECISION-MAKING IN THE CHURCH AND IN RELIGIOUS ORDERS

*the Church and
religious orders are communities*

HEINRICH OSTERMANN, S.J.

THE QUESTION OF SHARED DECISION-MAKING concerns not only the economic and social areas of life, but also embraces the entire Church, including religious orders. Has the swelling criticism of the Church and the religious orders come down to this: that many voices could not openly express their opinion, that the authorities always felt themselves *a priori* to be in full possession of truth and infallibility, and that many valuable resources lay untapped?

Without doubt, the Second Vatican Council has brought about a change in the image of the Church. The Church no longer exists *prima facie* as a pope-Church, or as hierarchical Church, but rather as the people of God united in Christ their head, in which all, from the pope to the last layman, contribute their part, in their own way, to the building up of the whole. Certainly the pope still appears as the visible head of the Church. But he appears less as an isolated ruler over against the mass of Christians, and more as head of the Church, in whom the whole Church expresses itself and makes itself heard. He is, as it were, the spokesman of the entire Church and gives expression to the stirring of the Spirit in the Church. The pope is not to be thought of except in vital union with the body of bishops to whom he is collegially bound. He will consult with the bishops of the world on magisterial decisions, just as he did in the case of the pronouncement on the Assumption of Mary. In the future, he will

Translated by Richard P. Kane, S.J., from *Orientierung* 18 (September 30, 1966) 194-98. Editorial deletions are those of *Orientierung*. We have translated and reprinted it here as it appeared there. The key word in the title and throughout the article, *Mitbestimmung*, (literally, "co-determination") is also rendered as "shared decision-making," which seems closer to the point of the article. Fr. Ostermann is currently Provincial of the Lower German Province.

leave the working out of the pastoral office in large part to the bishops. The college of bishops is no longer a dream, but a reality.

Just as the pope is no longer to be thought of except in relation to the bishops, the bishop, by the same token, is not to be thought of as isolated either. He is no longer confined to his bishopric, but bears responsibility for the whole Church. He feels duty-bound to establish ties with his fellow bishops and to institute bishops' conferences. Even in his own diocese, a bishop turns much more to his priests and laymen for advice. The Church is now unthinkable without the responsible cooperation of the laity. The Council established theologically that the Holy Spirit works in the whole Church and not just in the hierarchy. One becomes especially conscious of this in the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, No. 12, which states: "The body of the faithful as a whole, anointed as they are by the Holy One (cf. Jn. 2:20, 27), cannot err in matters of belief . . . when, 'from the bishops down to the last member of the laity,' it shows universal agreement in matters of faith and morals."

The Church exists as a community, in which the salvific will of God for man becomes highly evident, and which as a whole must feel itself responsible for the salvation of all mankind. There is something like a common will, a general mission of the whole Church, which includes all members, each in his own way. The Holy Spirit can use everyone in the Church for the working out of the mysterious plans of God. All can be bearers of sacred messages and charisms. All can be called to the unfolding of the good news and to the work of saving others, and all must keep themselves open to a call from God. This common responsibility does not mean anarchy in the Church. The Church is a well-ordered whole, with different offices and services. It would be going too far to describe the relation between authority and obedience in the life of the Church as Alois Müller did in his book, *Befehl und Gehorsam im Leben der Kirche*.

One thing seems to be decisive: first and foremost, the Church as a whole in all its members has to reveal the truth of Christ, to make him known, and to mediate his life. The proper formulation and preservation of truth are secondary. Out of concern over this second question we had forgotten the first. Instead of open questions about genuine truth, about the guarantees of infallibility, about the

right of the Church to provide true discipline and to command, the majority of the faithful were in fact prohibited from directing themselves to the spread of the Church and the work of salvation. Out of anxiety that something false might be preached, we restricted the right of preaching to clerics and to the ecclesiastical magisterium. Out of anxiety that the sacraments might not be administered properly, we considered the administration of sacraments to be the exclusive prerogative of the priest. Out of fear that theology might fall into the wrong hands, it was confined to the brains of a few consecrated souls, as if the oils of consecration would confer the ability to think. . . . Practically speaking, the responsibility for the mediation of salvation, which according to the will of Christ devolved on the whole Church, was restricted to a small circle, mainly the ordinary and extraordinary magisterium. The others were freed of active responsibility. They were not even informed, or else they were informed in the way we teach children. No one took them seriously. They had to hear what was suitable for their ears, and they had to obey because they did not seem capable of anything else. And all this despite the fact that the Church, from pope to last layman, is fully responsible for the mission of Christ to the whole world!

Shared decision-making in the Society of Jesus

Are shared decision-making and obedience contradictory? If one juxtaposes the two words "co-determination" and "Society of Jesus," they seem at first to connote an opposition. For behind "Society of Jesus" stands obedience, which is supposed to be *the* virtue of Jesuits. Yet obedience and co-determination seem to exclude each other. The Jesuit is thought of as "the staff in the hand of the old man" or as "a corpse," which one can shove around at will. In this picture, obedience means that the superior stands over against the mass of subjects, so that one man with absolute authority, excluding of course sinful commands, rules over his subjects. In this understanding of obedience, the general execution of the Society's will starts with the superiors, who in the manner of a secret political cabinet, seek to legislate to the mass of subjects the mysterious bid-dings of God for our time in the form of concrete commands, without informing either themselves or their subjects. This style of governing a religious order belonged to the Church of the past,

which was conceived of as strongly centralized, and in which the middle ranks of bishops and priests had little, and the laity nothing at all, to do with the planning, and had little or nothing to say about it.

But because the Church has experienced a change in style of government, and above all, in its understanding of itself, and because the Church as a whole has become conscious of its responsibility for the salvation of the world, structures within the Church, such as religious orders, cannot withdraw from this development, because they themselves are part of this Church.

What task does obedience really have in a religious order?

Outsiders often have the impression that religious have entered their orders to obey, to give up their own will, to renounce their freedom. That is a gross error. "Such an intention would be perverse. For freedom as a capacity for self-determination and responsibility makes a man to be what he is, a person. If a man really wanted to renounce his freedom, then he would be denying his humanity. Obedience as the extinction of freedom is inhuman and nonsensical. It only makes sense when it frees a man for a life lived at a higher level of freedom and when it enables him to become more capable of self-determination and responsibility than he would have been without obedience. Behind the idea of obedience is not the idea of the sacrifice of freedom, but rather the better, more purposeful pledging of freedom to the final goals which God has given us. Why does a man go into a religious order? Not to give up freedom, because freedom holds too many dangers, but mostly to make freedom more purposeful. Of course, a man must thereby accept a certain measure of restriction inasmuch as he lets a community and its representatives assign the field of his own free effort. A man enters a religious order to do more for the kingdom of God.

St. Ignatius and his contemporaries did not bind themselves together to obey, but rather to serve the Church together in a special way. They had a common desire to serve the Church and together they worked out possible outlets for their commitment. Later they chose from their group a superior, because a community cannot last without a firm organization. This superior is not, however, an individual authority cut loose from the religious community, but rather an expression of the community will. For this reason the superior does not lead a life next to or over the community but in

its midst, so that he can be a real expression of the community. Apart from the unity of a religious order, or from the will of the community, obedience seems as arbitrary as papal directives and magisterial pronouncements which are given without reference to the common beliefs and common life of the Church. How did Ignatius himself view the Order? Not as a monarchy with absolutist leadership, but as analogous to the Church itself, and, to be sure, in terms of the relationship of Christ, the head of the Church, to his body because the head and body make up an organic whole.

The relationship of superiors to members is, first of all, a spiritual one, analogous to the union of love between Christ the head and his members. Obedience, therefore, is not conceived of as a legal relation between a superior, who has power and exercises it, and his subjects who have to obey.

If we compare this notion of obedience with the reality, then it is one-sided and distorted in the sense that it is interpreted too legally. Then the will of the superior has the force of an expression of one man's power and the obedience of the subject is no more than a response to this expression of power.

True obedience, therefore, would come down to this: a religious order perceives itself as a community which has in its superior a head, in whom the common life and salvific will of the whole expresses and proclaims itself. Only when we understand obedience in this way does the will of the community find its expression in obedience. Then, the whole community has a voice and only then is it possible to avoid differences.

The religious foundation of obedience

Only from this viewpoint does a religious foundation for obedience seem really possible. A religious order is a part of the Church analogous to the union of Christ the head and his members. The order is approved by the Church. That is, the Church has declared that the purposes of the order do not conflict with those of the Church but rather they overlap, so that the religious order looks to the genuine interests of the Church and participates vitally in her salvific mission. If the salvific will of God is in any way known and manifest in the Church, it is also manifest in religious orders.

Thus, in the common will of the religious order as it proclaims itself in striving for the sanctification of all its members and in the

will to the apostolate of the Church, the salvific will of the Church becomes visible. Obedience, as the expression of the collective will of the religious order lies along the same line as the salvific will of the Church. If we see in the Church a visible sign of the salvific will of God, then we also see it in the religious order, which binds itself to the Church and to its concrete salvific will. Because of this, the members of the order should be recognized in their superiors, who make known the concrete salvific will of the Church and of this ecclesiastical community, as revealers of the divine will and representatives of Christ.

Basically, religious obedience is open to the same problem as ecclesiastical obedience, with all the possibilities of error. But do we always have to look at the negative side and not at the positive possibilities for the salvific will of God to reveal itself concretely and historically in the visible community of the Church and in one of its parts? The more obedience corresponds to the contemporary needs of the whole Church and unites with it, and the more it expresses the common will of the community and above all, the resources which vitally represent such a community, then the more the conviction persists that it is the expression of the objective salvific will of God in his Church. Also, in this view of religious obedience, it may not be reduced simply to a legal relation of superiors to subjects; instead it must seek to correspond as far as possible to the universal will of the religious order in the Church.

The double execution of obedience

In recent times there have been discussions about the difference between functional and religious obedience. Functional obedience means an obedience which, for reasons of purely natural expediency, is necessary to the maintenance of a community. Obedience must be practically expedient and sensible. Further, a minimum of regulation should prevail in a community, just enough so that it does not disintegrate and so that communication among members occurs easily and without friction. The assumption here is that an opposition to religious obedience is already existent. Then obedience would begin only at the point where it makes irrational demands, where it becomes a cross for the individual, and where blind following of orders is expected. This view gives the impression that

normal, sensible, purposeful obedience has nothing to do with religious obedience.

But if we conceive of obedience from the point of view of the superior and subject as the collective accomplishment of the whole religious order, or as the expression of the community will oriented toward the salvific will of the Church, then it is a common as well as religious obedience, since it serves, in its common execution, religious goals. Should one regard obedience as detrimental to the religious life when its acts have a maximum of rationality for the superior or subject who perform them?

Obedience in a religious order is always religious by virtue of the goals of the order and the vow of obedience. In this context, the distinction between functional and religious obedience is less important than the difference between obedience of regulation and obedience of guidance. The collective will of the religious order always has at its root a double function. It aims sometimes at the collective performance of the order, which it accomplishes as community, and at other times at the personal development and guidance of the individual members. From the first perspective, it might be called obedience to regulation, and from the second, obedience to guidance. Of course, the two mutually involve one another. Apostolic work is accomplished by men on the basis of their personal spiritual and intellectual achievement, and, of course, in the context of community. I can, therefore, influence individuals by collective conduct and regulation. There is no better way of guiding an individual than to put him into a work in which he can develop himself, and for which he is consistently demanded by the community.

It is not far from the truth to say that Jesuits have left the guidance of individuals to the spiritual fathers, (assuming that there are spiritual fathers who can provide guidance). It seems to me that when the organizational structure of a religious community is not working well, then the best individual spiritual guidance helps little. But structure means more than an external daily order. We know how little a religious order can be maintained through external conformity. We prescribed more and more set times for prayer in the external order to maintain the inner spirit until we fortunately got to the point of almost four hours daily, and with that, everything became impossible.

Structure means vital dynamic structure, under which, in a vital working community, the individuals are working toward significant goals. Such a vital, dynamic rule must, however, be carried out by the whole of the religious order. Authority and obedience in reference to this sort of governing have to express the community will. Behind all of this lurks the question: will we come out of our mistrustful individualism and, in this sense, become capable of community?

How does the common will of the religious order express itself?

It is easy to say that authority and obedience are or should be an expression of the common will of the order and not the subjective expression of a particular superior. How does the community will express and concretize itself?

One can point here to a series of moments which form the community will. Objective norms for the formation of the community will are:

1) the constitutions of the religious order, which give a program of life and work both for personal spiritual development and for apostolic work.

2) the needs of the Church. The concrete situation of the Church after Vatican II prescribes specific programs for apostolic orders: for example, directives on ecumenism, the investigation of atheism, missionary work, and so forth.

3) the concrete will of the pope, who can assign special, specific tasks to a religious order.

4) the historical orientation of a religious order. Certain traditional works cannot simply be scuttled.

More subjective expressions of community will, perhaps, would be:

1) those that come from the general, the provincial, or from the body of superiors. No provincial can repudiate his past. Each one enters office with certain pet projects which he injects into the formation of the community will.

2) the many charisms of individual members, who have fashioned, by dint of personal initiative under the influence of the Spirit, new works for the good of the Church.

All these moments define the community will of a religious order.

I have noted only the positive moments. One would also have to add the obstructive and disturbing ones. Everything coming from an egoistic individualism is destructive. All the ominous croaking of incompetents and procrastinators, and all the flak from individualist outsiders cripples the community spirit. The big question is: how do we firmly maintain the community will? How do we filter it so that a real will for the future results from it, a will which leads in the future to concrete decisions, that is, to concrete directives and works of obedience?

Information as the essential means of co-determination

If authority and obedience are to be a real expression of community will, then the superior must know what the members of the body think and desire, and the members must be ready to inform superiors. Given the complexity of the Society today, it is just not possible for the superior to oversee everything himself. In fact the superior has to decide things which he personally does not know about. He also cannot possibly acquire the specialized knowledge needed in every area. He has to rely on the informed views of his fellow religious.

Since every decision presupposes a judgment about the matter to be decided, and since this judgment cannot be made by the superior on the basis of his own knowledge, those members of the order who finally influence the judgment of the superior really do the deciding. The superior can keep himself aloof from the affair so that he decides nothing at all. But he cannot quite do that either. Admission to the novitiate, to vows, and to orders, etc., depends always on *informationes*. Those doing the informing prepare the decision, indeed they finally determine it. The superior is bound by their information. Thus a religious order does know in its personal politics a high degree of shared decision-making. Certainly the superior himself can select his own informants, and so exert his influence. But this has limits.

After reading the biographies of well-known figures in Jesuit history, one gets the impression that the earlier Jesuits informed one another about their work and plans much more than has been the case in recent times. The reports of the great pioneers were read by all, while today, even in the same house, one Jesuit hardly knows

anything at all about the work of another, and the efforts of different houses are little known by others. So complaints arise about "bureaucracy" and "games of hide-and-seek" in the Order. There is a whole host of traditional means of information which only have to be improved to handle this. Personal expression of opinion, visits to houses, contact with the superiors and the directors of larger works, periodic newsletters from individual provinces—all of these offer ways of communicating and consequently can become ways of shared decision-making.

Of particular importance for the formation of judgment and the building up of the order is the institution of the "council" or senate. In the Jesuit order, as in others, the superior in particular cases is bound to follow the decision of his consultors. Yet in most cases he is free. Thus, there arises the temptation to treat this institution only as the juridical duty to consult. The question then is: when must I require consultation? But the question really should be: how can I claim the best possible consultation and draw together the widest possible range of opinion for planning, for creating consensus, and for the preparation of decisions?

Delegation of responsibility

If obedience is really to be an expression of community will, then it is good that not just one man, but as many men as possible, give expression to this will. Since the community will in a religious order which has various apostolates must find not a single, but a multiple expression, it is good that there be many who have responsibility, and who are cohesive and loyal to each other. Authority should be practiced on the principle of subsidiarity. The higher superior should not interfere in the authority of lower superiors without a good reason. For special assignments one should gladly delegate people.

Again, this does not mean that all possible new superiorships have to be created, super-provincials, sub-provincials, coordinators, and so on. . . . That is a peculiar disease of the post-conciliar era. One notices this in the dioceses where special coordinators are installed. They often try to multiply new red-tape measures without sufficient grounds and without experience. It is enough if those who are performing a work have the necessary authority and freedom for it.

Who should determine the common will of a religious community? Those who have authority, their informants, consultors, and delegates of a religious order who have been selected out of a great number of members. What are the principles of selection? Certainly the different orders have defined these many a time. What qualities should the superior have? A number of categories are listed: not too dumb; not too harsh; not too vain, etc. Let us pass over these general categories. I would like to put the question from the point of view of the Church's present situation. What men do we want to see today at the head of the Church and the ecclesiastical communities?

Until Pius XII the Church was run largely according to eternal norms. For this reason leaders who would protect and rule reliably were willingly chosen. The office of superior was widely thought of as an administrative post. He had nothing to do but rule. This resulted in a distinction between those who ruled the religious orders and those who carried out the mission for which the order was founded.

In the first dynamic phase of a religious order, the superiors are likewise those who represent the order in its work for others. The office of superior is exercised with the left hand, so to speak. That is perhaps wrongly put. We cannot separate the spiritual life and the apostolate, since they are one. Likewise, we cannot separate the administration of an order from the actual work of the order. Otherwise the superiors have no understanding of the actual projects of the order. In my opinion, those who represent the order today through their work, no matter what it is, also lead the order.

Is this true leadership to be established? That does not seem to be difficult. One needs only to go through the province with eyes open and ask himself who works and gets results, has influence, starts new projects, has a fruitful imagination, and knows whose plans to realize. These people must be brought into the inner leadership of the order in any capacity whatever and, of course, into positions which are to their liking. Surely, certain qualities enter in. They have to love the order, and they may not be malcontented outsiders. If they are to be superiors, they have to have a certain knowledge of human nature and must possess a liking for responsibility. Only if this group, which often feels itself to be on the perimeter

of the order but which really represents the order, comes into the inner leadership, have we any hope that the order as a whole will win back its former energy, optimism, and healthy community spirit.

The question of authority

It seems to me that Jesuit obedience, rightly understood, is not inhuman. It takes great pains to do justice to the charismatic gifts of individual members and to contemporary needs of the Church, when it makes every effort to express the common will of the order and to use every means of getting information and advice.

It must, of course, remain what it is: recognition of the unified leadership of the order and the readiness to follow this leadership even when in an individual case it is not clear that the leadership is doing justice to the individual's gifts or to the needs of the times and of the Church. And this will happen again and again. At a time like that, obedience means trials and under some circumstances it can be a cross. But should we dramatize this? Are there not similar inescapable problems in every marriage and in every walk of life? The problem here lies with the individual religious. Does he really know what he vowed?

We need have no anxiety that the younger generation has no mind for such an obedience. I find unbearable the talk of many older fathers to the effect that if the General Congregation does not do something of special importance, the young men will go and become disillusioned. Our younger generation does not tremble at obedience in itself. I believe they want much more leadership and authority than we older men imagine. But they want it as an achievement of the community, as an expression of a genuine common will which they believe is no longer to be found among the many individualists of the older generation. If they feel, however, that the Order as a spiritual community of brothers wants to perform great services for the present day Church, then this generation also will do what is demanded of it. And things will be demanded of them. For me personally, this is the greatest problem: how will a community with a common will flourish again in our Order? If in one province at least, a strong group has this will, then the Society also has a future.

OBEDIENCE OF JUDGMENT AND INTELLECTUAL HONESTY

*a realistic discernment
is needed*

ALEXANDER F. McDONALD, S.J.

IN THE FEBRUARY 1967 gathering of Jesuits at St. Mary's, Kansas, to discuss the problems of renewal, the question was raised whether obedience of the judgment in the Ignatian tradition was compatible with current canons of intellectual honesty. One speaker suggested that in the climate of modern thought, with its emphasis on cultivating the critical faculty, on independence of thinking, on creativity, and on individual maturity, there was need to abandon some of the conventional notions of religious obedience, particularly those associated with obedience of the understanding. Given the contemporary concern for consensus through dialogue among adults in matters where agreement cannot be attained, is it not sufficient to rest content with obedience of execution, or rather, is it not unrealistic to demand more?

This problem can be dealt with in a number of ways. At the actual meeting referred to above, the main panelist proposed by way of answer, though unfortunately without ample opportunity for development, that a correct understanding of the doctrine of St. Ignatius would reveal it as quite in harmony with the most rigid requirements of intellectual honesty. He suggested, moreover, that we cannot reasonably expect to plumb the depths of religious obedi-

ence or to pluck out the heart of its mystery with the instruments of mere natural reason. The Ignatian ideal always supposes the context of faith. To find God's will made manifest through the directives of legitimate authority is a notion opaque to the human mind and difficult even in theological analysis. Our vowed commitment of continuous free response to God's call in the unfolding charity that is religious life is comprehensible only when viewed in its supernatural dimension in the light of faith.

The purpose of this article is not to attempt a comprehensive discussion but rather to touch only on one aspect of the specific issue of intellectual honesty in relation to obedience of the judgment. I would suggest that the Ignatian doctrine, far from involving a conflict between the two, demands the first as a condition and essential ingredient of the second. No one denies the role that candor, sincerity, and personal responsibility must play as the individual religious weighs the value of what he is commanded to do and assesses the quality of his response to the demands of obedience. If he thinks that a particular directive is immoral, inexpedient, harmful, or just plain foolish, he rightly feels that he must be frank both with his superior and with himself. Honesty requires dialogue and clarification of the situation as an indispensable concomitant of the mature exercise of the virtue and the vow. Nevertheless, it seems proper to point out that St. Ignatius, in his bold challenge to strive for the heights, is calling for intellectual honesty at a deeper and a more difficult level. The practice of obedience in this degree supposes the more rigorous honesty that issues in clear-sighted knowledge of one's own motivation.

A necessary distinction

St. Ignatius' concern for honesty is sufficiently attested to by his statement in the "Letter on Obedience" which defines the area of obedience of the judgment as touching matters "where the evidence of the known truth is not coercive." Less obvious is the fact that he is asking us to distinguish between the evidence of the known truth on the one hand, and, on the other, mere opinion based on limited access to facts or knowledge or else judgment rooted in self or colored by our own emotional involvement. In theory we all admit the need of this distinction; in practice we tend to ignore it. Yet

it is clear that not all our opinions and judgments are coextensive with the known truth. Without belaboring the point, we can adduce many instances from everyday life where even highly intelligent and cultivated people lose their sense of objectivity in matters that touch them in a personal way. Whenever a high school principal, for instance, has to take action in regard to boys whose behavior or academic performance is below par, he must reckon with the possibility of flying into storm clouds of maternal ire or paternal indignation. It takes great intellectual honesty on the part of the parent to allow for the justice of the action taken by the principal. In a sense we are all prone to the same emotional attitude toward our own brain children. We need honesty and discernment to distinguish between objective truth and the rationalizations that can come crowding in like mercenaries of lower nature to protect its position of privilege.

It is possible to push the inquiry back a step further and ask: is the superior himself subject to the same pitfall and to what extent the individual religious must defer to the weakness of the superior rather than his own? Any answer must of course emphasize the need for the religious superior to exercise the same discernment about his own objectivity in arriving at his command decision. He, too, must be a man of prayer, attentive to the promptings of grace, on guard against the influence of unworthy motivation or slovenliness in his effort to reach a well-informed, well-considered directive. One may consult the *Constitutions*, IX, to see how St. Ignatius supposes all this in the men appointed as superiors in the Society. Nevertheless, the individual religious has to realize that obedience for him is in the real order where the ideal situation seldom prevails and where perfection on the part of superiors cannot be made the prerequisite for an honest attempt to do one's best on the part of those in the ranks. The problem for the individual religious is that of keeping his commitment fresh and new, cleansed from rapine in the holocaust, free from any unfounded preference for his own views and from the disordered impulses of the unbaptized parts of the ego. He has to keep himself honest even about the fact that intellectual honesty can sometimes be a pose.

Even a casual glance back through the files of the key documents makes it apparent that intellectual honesty is a characteristic trait

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

in the spirituality of St. Ignatius. In the *Spiritual Exercises* the meditation on the Three Classes of Men is a good example of a consideration in terms of facing the issues honestly. So, too, in the third time for the making of the election, there is a manifest emphasis on the need for objectivity and impartiality of judgment, unweighted by the intrusion of self-love. The same thrust toward stripping oneself of disguise and defence is to be found in the Ignatian description of the account of conscience. It is honest, of course, to call a spade a spade. But how often we find that the spade in our hands turns out to be a hatchet aimed at others, or perhaps a hypodermic needle for the purpose of a hallucinatory trip of our own. Discernment here calls for the strictest kind of honesty. It is this kind that is associated with obedience-of the judgment.

GOD'S CALL FOR SERVICE

*a responsible approach to
Jesuit obedience*

THOMAS J. MCGUIRE, S.J.

THERE SEEMS TO BE A GROWING CONCERN today about a loss of morale in our Society. Many older Jesuits are both confused and antagonized by the drop in vocations and by what seems to them to be a sense of alienation and hostility to authority on the part of their younger confreres. Since this malaise is too widespread to be due to the failings of a few superiors or communities, they attribute it to superficiality and inability to live up to the Jesuit ideal of obedience. Because they themselves understand Jesuit obedience as the core of Ignatian spirituality, as a manly sacrifice of self which has made the Jesuit an effective instrument of the Church, they attribute any difficulties the young have with it to selfishness and to a lack of solid moral courage.

This is, perhaps, a psychologically satisfying way of coping with a confusing phenomenon, but that advantage may be gained at the expense of the Society's future. Unless we can manage to present Ignatian spirituality to the young of today in a way which will appeal to them and to ourselves, our Society will steadily decline in its influence and effectiveness, and the Church will be correspondingly weakened. This paper, therefore, proposes an alternative explanation of the problem and tentatively suggests some lines along which a solution might be developed.

The presupposition on which the paper is based is that the problem is due to misinterpretation or mistranslation. I attribute to this latter term a broader sense than it is usually given. Any set of statements have implicit connections with the culture and times in which they are articulated. If they are literally translated into another culture and another era, they may assume a very different meaning, because of the different context in which they are being understood. To extend the meaning of the old Italian proverb, "*il traduttore è un traditore.*"

Now the Ignatian doctrine of obedience was first articulated in a society, in an intellectual milieu, and in historical conditions very different from those of modern America. Therefore, there is great danger that we mistranslate it and distort its meaning by simply repeating the same patterns of thinking in the very different context in which we live. Perhaps we can go even further and say that in the Society today, the differences in life experience between older and younger generations are so great that the interpretation of obedience put forward by the older group has a very different meaning for the younger. What is being said and what is being heard may be more different than we ordinarily suppose.

Traditional obedience

Perhaps I can concretize this by describing what has been heard by many of my contemporaries. This will involve making explicit the unexpressed connections or implications which the "traditional" interpretation of obedience has for us. I hope that, when this is done, the need for another way of expressing Jesuit obedience will be clear. Let me make it very clear that what I am trying to describe here is the meaning which is conveyed to my generation by the words, the examples, and the ideas which have been used in the past to express Jesuit obedience. It is not necessarily what has been said or intended, but it is what has been heard and what necessarily must be heard within our frame of reference.

In general terms, the interpretation of obedience we have heard places the ultimate moral responsibility for decision and action, not on each individual Jesuit, but on the superior. This can best be explained by considering those cases in which a subject has made representation and is still ordered to follow a course of action he

believes imprudent, though not sinful. (Sin here would be understood in a narrow sense, as some positive act which violates the law of God.)

The interpretation of obedience we have received subsumes these cases under the following logical pattern. All non-sinful commands of legitimate authority must be obeyed. But a religious superior's authority is legitimate because it derives from the pope, and ultimately, from God. And so, the subject can be absolutely sure that he should obey the command of his superior. Coeman's commentary gives a clear example of this line of thinking. "The obedient man," he says, "knows for certain that he is doing the will of God in the pursuit of his own perfection as well as in his work for souls. For the superior is the representative of God and commands with the authority of God, who therefore wills that the superior be obeyed."

The superior's decision is not necessarily correct, or even prudent, but it is best for the inferior to obey it, and best from both a subjective and an objective point of view. From a subjective point of view, obeying the command enables the inferior to deny his own will, and therefore is the most meritorious action he can perform. Objectively, it is best to obey because from this obedience Divine Providence will draw the best overall results.

Critique of the traditional interpretation

Before pointing out the reasons why I and many others object to this interpretation of Jesuit obedience, let me make it clear that I am not implying that any Jesuit has ever held the implications I will try to draw from this interpretation. It is quite possible that in another cultural context this set of formulations would not have had the same implications that it does for us today. Nevertheless, we do live in 20th century America and the implications which this interpretation has for our intellectual milieu must be made clear in order that the interpretation can be rejected as inadequate for our times.

Every element of this interpretation, if I understand it correctly, hinges on the assertion it makes that the subject can be absolutely certain that he should obey a command of his superior, except in matters of sin. If this can be proved, the interpretation is still viable; if not, it must be abandoned.

First, let me approach this claim of certitude directly and point out the objections that can be brought against it. It is widely accepted today that one of the tasks, or, in a sense, the only task which God has given man is to develop himself into a moral adult. This is not a right which a man can voluntarily sacrifice, but an obligation which is inalienable. But if this interpretation of obedience were taken seriously and carried to its logical conclusion, it would reduce a man to a sort of moral infantilism.

I think we can presume that it is better to be certain about what to do than not to be certain. Now obedience, in this interpretation, gives the religious a more certain knowledge of what he should do than any possible unaided use of his own judgment. Concomitantly, if the religious has a certain and detailed knowledge of exactly what God wants him to do in the widest possible areas of his life, he would, by obeying, make a far greater contribution to the apostolate than he could if he were forced to decide for himself what he should do. Therefore, subjects should be clamoring for direction, and superiors should be graciously complying with their requests and giving them commands to govern the smallest details of their lives. I doubt if any Jesuit would ever have accepted such a conclusion and, therefore, perhaps we should no longer be saying that a subject can be "certain" that he should obey his superior.

Over and above the logical consequences of the assertion, if we maintain that the subject is absolutely certain, on the authority of the Church, that it is best for him to obey the command of his superior, we are implicitly claiming for the subject a kind of extended infallibility. We are asserting that all the subject's judgments about what he should do, are, so long as they conform to his superior's commands, protected from error on the authority of God. Besides ignoring the finitude and insecurity of human knowing, this interpretation seems to extend the area of certitude on the authority of God far beyond the narrow limits the Church has set for it.

The conception of providence which is usually associated with this interpretation of obedience stands or falls on the claim that the subject has absolute certitude. Those who put forward this theory of providence do not claim that a superior, whenever he gives a subject an order, is necessarily making the correct decision. They readily admit that the Mystical Body of Christ might have

benefited far more if the subject had been allowed to follow the course of action he himself thought prudent. They strongly maintain, however, that once he has been given a direct command, no matter how imprudent it is, the best thing he can do is to obey it. They say that he can be sure that better results for the apostolate will be produced by obeying and doing what the superior tells him, than by disobeying and doing what he thinks best.

Now there are only three possible ways in which they can maintain such a position. They can, first of all, deny that the external actions, which were previously admitted by them to have certain definite consequences for the salvation of souls, really had such consequences. As a result, obedience would be the only factor producing significant consequences. Secondly, they can argue that God, in some miraculous way, directly intervenes to prevent the consequences of the external actions from occurring. Finally, they can assert that the introduction of obedience adds new consequences to the situation, and these consequences always outweigh the others.

The first position is obviously untenable because it denies that the specific actions men perform make any significant difference to the salvation of souls. If this were true, our priests might just as well dig ditches as administer the sacraments.

The second position reduces to two alternatives. The first is that God rearranges his divine plan every time a religious superior makes an incorrect decision. The other is that superiors are never wrong.

The final position postulates that the subject can be absolutely certain that the factor of obedience introduces new consequences into the situation, that these consequences will always so outweigh the consequences of the external acts, that the balance of benefits will be reversed, and that it will be better to do what the superior commands. This, of course, depends on the presupposition that the subject can obtain absolute certitude about future consequences. If he cannot attain certitude that these consequences will always outweigh the others, then he must use the fallible human judgment God has given him to try to determine what action would contribute most to the service of God.

After making these general criticisms I think we can also say that the notion of authority on which this interpretation of obedience is based is questionable. Authority seems almost reified, as if it were

some quality possessed by God and transmitted by him to the superior. Such a conception seems better suited to a secular feudal society than to the Church. A more properly Christian interpretation might see authority as based on service, as a means to the fulfillment of goals. Its power to oblige the individual would derive from its necessity as a means to these goals. Concretely, the goal of authority in the Society is the salvation of souls. A particular command of a Jesuit superior should, therefore, oblige in conscience precisely to the extent that the subject sees obedience to it as contributing, in the long run, to that end.

In summary, we can say that this "traditional" way of interpreting Jesuit obedience makes the vocation seem, not a generous response to Christ's invitation to join him in doing God's work, but a sort of moral infantilism, a retreat from responsibility. Authority comes to be seen as fundamentally paternalistic, and as an obstacle to the real service of the Church.

A positive formulation

Once we abandon the idea that the subject can ever be absolutely certain that his superior's command is the will of God, another, more practical approach to obedience seems to follow. This approach is in accord with the practical bent of the American mind and has the same basically conservative orientation. Those who take this approach would, in practice, almost always feel obliged to obey a superior, even when he gave an order they thought imprudent. They would differ from past generations of Jesuits, perhaps, in their way of justifying this. It might be explained as follows.

A man joins the Society for apostolic ends, because he believes he can do more for the glory of God within the organization than without it. He knows that authority is required in any organization, natural or supernatural, in order to coordinate the activities of its members, and he realizes that this authority must make final and binding decisions. There will naturally be occasions when he will be ordered to follow a course of action he thinks imprudent. If he disobeys, his action can have consequences on the total efficiency of the Society and could curtail his apostolic service within the Society. Obviously, if everyone disobeyed in such situations, the total effectiveness of the Society would be greatly decreased. An-

other factor which would have to be taken into account would be the human authority of the superior, insofar as the subject had positive evidence that the superior had access to relevant information which was not available to him.

From this point of view, the issue should be decided on practical grounds. If the harm to the Society by disobedience, and thus the foreseeable long range harm to the apostolate, would be greater than the immediate good the subject would accomplish by disobeying, then he should obey. But if he foresaw that greater harm than good would arise from obeying, then he should disobey. Obviously, there is no possibility of certitude in this area, so the subject has to act on the best possible prediction he can form. And just as obviously, the evidence he uses would not be restricted to the public, empirically verifiable data demanded by a rationalistic epistemology. But he must accept the responsibility of using his fallible human intelligence to judge whether it would be better for the glory of God in the long run if he obeyed or disobeyed.

Considerations of personal fulfillment and development can come into this judgment, but only insofar as they are connected with service to the Church. If obeying a particular command would cause a person such harm that his future service to the Church would be gravely endangered, then he might have to disobey.

There is, of course, serious danger of self-deception in this area. These judgments should be made in the spirit of a love of Christ crucified, in order to counterbalance the natural tendency of selfishness to distort the situation. Great prayer would be needed and the issue would have to be of grave moment before it could outweigh the value of maintaining order in the Society. An individual would be rash to disobey if his judgment was not supported by the judgment of experienced and mature fellow Jesuits. Yet even with all these safeguards, some wrong decisions would be made and some individuals would disobey imprudently and use this formulation to justify themselves. Would the Society be defenseless in such cases?

Not at all. No one is saying that a superior should not punish a subject who disobeys in good conscience. On the contrary, he has an obligation to protect the Society and he should have the courage to fulfill it. If he thinks a subject is wrong and doing grave harm

to the Society by disobeying, he might even have to dismiss that subject from the Society. Once we discard the idea that the subject has absolute certitude and admit that his judgment is just as fallible as the superior's, then we must accept the possibility that they can conflict in good conscience.

It should be obvious from this presentation that I am not thinking of disobedience as an everyday event. If the channels of representation are open and superiors are reasonable and courageous men, disobedience would almost never be necessary. The problem is rather with the ultimate moral responsibility of the subject. The expressions of Jesuit obedience which were used in the past no longer make it sufficiently clear that the individual, in obeying a command, is fully responsible for his action, and that he obeys because he believes that his obedience is the best contribution he can make to the apostolate.

My own conviction is that Jesuit obedience is a mature personal response to God's call for service. I hope that this formulation, by making it clear that the unity of the Society is one of the values which must be taken into account in each Jesuit's decisions, will foster a more positive and more responsible attitude toward authority and will increase the practice of obedience. It clearly places the responsibility for maintaining the Society, not on superiors alone, but on the shoulders of each Jesuit. The Society is not just an institution which was created four hundred years ago, but a continuing task which it is now our turn to assume.

NOTES ON AUTHORITY

*less traditional
significances of the concept*

WILLIAM W. MEISSNER, S.J.

I

Authority and Leadership

IN THE SOCIOLOGICAL LITERATURE, there is a great deal of overlap between the respective usages of the concepts of authority and leadership. This undoubtedly reflects the rather complex relationship and interaction between them. My position here is that they are substantially different but closely related notions. Authority, while it embraces a mutual relation between superior and subject, is nonetheless embedded in the formal organization of the group. It is an expression of legitimate power, in terms of which the superior has a legal right to command and the subject has a legal obligation to obey. The concept of leadership, however, is not directly involved in such legalistic overtones. Leadership is a form of the exercise of social power, but it is essentially power that is neither legitimate nor compelling. It is a quality or form of action by which the leader elicits the cooperation of individuals in a common objective and successfully coordinates their activities in achieving the objective.

Thus the respective roles of superior, who is vested with authority, and the leader vis-à-vis the group are distinct, and find their respective bases in different forms of social power. The leader, as

such, can influence the direction of group activity, but he cannot thereby assume authority. The superior, however, may assume the functions of a leader and in many concrete situations is often expected to do so. The basis of authority is *legitimate power*, which is based on the perception by the subordinate that the superior has a legitimate right to direct his behavior. The basis of leadership, however, may be any of the other forms of social power. *Reward power* is based on the subordinate's perception that the leader has the ability to reward his behavior. *Coercive power* is based on the perception that the leader can punish his behavior. *Expert power* is based on the recognition of special knowledge or competence in the leader. And finally, *referent power* is based on the subordinate's identification with the leader.¹ While, reward, coercive, and expert power enjoy a more or less limit field of application, referent power is by far the broadest basis for the exercise of leadership.¹ The identification of the subordinate with the leader or of the member with the group is responsible for most of the cooperative group behavior in human affairs. We will have much more to say about the function of identification in relation to leadership later on.

The literature of sociology and social psychology has spawned studies of leadership with great abandon. The high-powered stimulus of the Second World War with the demand for officer selection and training put a very high premium on the ability to recognize and develop leadership potential. The economic and industrial developments after the war picked up where the wartime efforts had left off and the interest in organizational managerial aspects of leadership provided a focus of continuing research. Unfortunately, the effort expended has not been commensurate with the yield in terms of understanding leadership.

Two varieties

Approaches to the study of leadership tend to cluster into two varieties. Earlier studies tended to favor a trait approach in terms of which the "leader" was regarded as a type of personality who tends to assume a position of dominance within a group in a wide variety of social situations. It became quickly apparent, however,

¹ J. R. P. French, Jr. and B. Raven, "The Bases of Social Power," in *Studies in Social Power*, ed. D. Cartwright (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1959), pp. 150-67.

that the same individual was not dominant in different kinds of social interaction. This shifted the emphasis to trying to discover the personality characteristics of the leader in each of different kinds of situations in which leadership behavior was manifested. The limitations of the trait approach led some students of leadership to alter their approach to the study of situational-interactional factors. This approach focused on the interaction among group members rather than on the leader himself. The leader's traits were regarded as merely contributing factors in interaction with other relevant variables, such as group environment, nature of the group task, characteristics of other group members, etc. This made it possible to get around the disturbing fact that the individuals possessing leadership traits were frequently not designated as leaders. Currently the situational-interactional approach is followed almost exclusively.

The concept of leader is not at all simple to designate, nor is there any closed consensus about it. A list of definitions might include:

- 1) An individual who exercises positive influence on others.
- 2) An individual who exercises more important positive influence than any other member of the group he is in.
- 3) An individual who exercises the most influence in goal-setting or goal-achievement of the group.
- 4) An individual selected by the group as leader.
- 5) An individual in a given office or position of apparently high influence potential.²

The multiplicity of definitions and approaches can be bewildering and frustrating to the social scientist who is inclined to study the phenomenon. The complexity of the factors and their relationships are well displayed in the paradigm proposed by Morris and Seeman.³ Besides the variety of definitions of the leader and of leader-

² R. T. Morris and M. Seeman, "The Problem of Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Approach," *American Journal of Sociology* 56 (1950) 149-55, and C. L. Shartle, "Studies in Naval Leadership," in *Groups, Leadership and Men*, ed. H. Guertzkow (Pittsburgh: Carnegie, 1951) pp. 119-33.

³ R. T. Morris and M. Seeman, "The Problem of Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Approach," *American Journal of Sociology* 56 (1950) p. 151.

ship behavior, the understanding of leadership embraces a complex interaction between individual factors and factors that are at work within the group. The concept of leadership, therefore, opens up onto a wide range of both psychological and sociological considerations.

Interaction

Elaborating on the interactional concept of leadership, Gibb focuses on several main points which he considers essential to the notion of leadership.⁴ First, leadership is always relative to the situation. Not only must the aggregate of individuals be united into a group with common goals by social interaction, but a certain kind of situation is required for the leadership relation to emerge at all. Further, the particular constellation of social circumstances existing at the moment determines which attributes of personality will be required for leadership status and thus also determines which members of the group may be allowed to assume that role. Second, accession of an individual to the role of leader depends on the group goal and the ability or capacity of an individual to contribute to the achievement of that goal. Third, the basic psychology of leadership is that of social interaction. There can be no leader and no leadership without followers. Further, the leadership relation involves a mutual interaction in which the aspirations, ideals, attitudes, and motives of the followers are important determining factors along with the personality, individuality or other leadership potentialities of the leader.

Gibb goes on to an important distinction between leadership and headship. He says:

When once the group activity has become dominated by an established and accepted organization, leadership tends to disappear. Even if this organization originally served the leadership role, any continuance of the organization as such, after the causal set of circumstances has ceased to exist, represents a transition to a process of domination of headship. . . .⁵

⁴ C. A. Gibb, "The Principles and Traits of Leadership," in *Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction*, eds. P. Hare, E. F. Borgatta, and R. F. Bales (New York: Knopf, 1955) pp. 87-95.

⁵ *Ibid.*

The characteristics which distinguish headship from leadership are then listed:

- 1) The position of headship is maintained through an organized system and not by the spontaneous recognition of the individual contribution to the group goal.
- 2) In headship, the group goal is not internally determined.
- 3) Headship does not really involve a *group* at all, since there is no sense of shared feeling or joint action.
- 4) A situation of headship involves a wide social gap between the group members and the head, who works to maintain this distance.⁶

This distinction is important insofar as it parallels the distinction between leadership and authority. Authority is analogous to headship, although it is fairly obvious that Gibb's notion of headship is more on the authoritarian side.

It is interesting, however, that Gibb should note in passing that it is not at all necessary that headship should preclude the exercise of leadership. The remark might be confusing, were it not for the fact that the superior in a formally structured organization exercises legitimate authority (headship) within the formal structure. But the group is constituted not only by its formal structure, but by its informal structure as well. On this level, the superior's influence must be in terms of leadership. These distinctions may contribute some clarification to the relations between authority and leadership, but they are too neat. In terms of this distinction, the superior can only influence the group in virtue of his authority on the level of formal structure, and he can only influence the group in virtue of his leadership on the level of informal organization. It is not at all clear that such is the case.

In regard to Gibb's dichotomy, Janda notes that in the leadership-headship dichotomy, for example, that leadership is predicated on the basis of spontaneous recognition in the group, that the group goal is always internally determined in leadership, that leadership never involves a social gap, etc., can easily be challenged and do not hold up to careful examination.⁷ It is more realistic, in fact, to

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ K. F. Janda, "Towards an Explication of the Concept Of Leadership in Terms of the Concept of Power," *Human Relations* 13 (1960) 345-63.

recognize that the authority relation is not at all limited to the exercise of influence along rigidly formalistic lines. While authority is defined in terms of legitimate social power, it has a privileged access to other bases of social power. Therefore, its influence has an impact on the group and on individual members of the group in a multiplicity of ways.

It is clear that there is no significant consensus among students of group dynamics on these issues. Thus Janda comments: "Leadership phenomena can be distinguished from other power phenomena when power relationships occur among members of the same group and when these relationships are based on the group members' perceptions that another group member may, with reference to their group activities, legitimately prescribe behavior patterns for them to follow."⁸ Here leadership is based on legitimate power. Yet other theorists refer leadership to any power base operative within the group. Bass, for example, holds that "leadership may be viewed as influence occurring among members of the same group."⁹ The position being taken here is somewhat more flexible. Authority and leadership are distinct forms of relation, one of which derives from formal group structure and the other does not. But the superior, whether elected or appointed, who exercises legitimate power, is not thereby excluded from the exercise of other forms of power within the group. In fact, his position by reason of authority gives him a more or less privileged position which facilitates his more diversified influence over the group. I have treated in some detail elsewhere some of the dimensions of leadership within the religious group.¹⁰ I was more or less inclined at the time to treat leadership in terms of legitimate power, but there is obviously no inner exigency to limit the term in that fashion.

If we may refer to a leadership function of authority, this may be more useful in calling attention to the diversity of the bases of influence on which the effective exercise of legitimate authority must rest. The group process and the exercise of authority thus are implemented at a dual level. The level of formal structure, at which

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ B. M. Bass, *Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior* (New York: Harper, 1960) p. 94.

¹⁰ W. W. Meissner, S.J., *Group Dynamics in the Religious Life* (Notre Dame Press, 1965).

the exercise of legitimate authority rests on legitimate power, is continually interacting with, determined by, modified and influenced by, the level of informal organization. At this latter level, whatever one may conceive the structure of authority to be in formal terms, the actual functioning of authority is carried out in terms of social interaction, group processes, which operate at both task and emotional levels, and personal motivations, both conscious and unconscious.¹¹

The place of leadership

From the point of view of effective exercise of authority, the superior can not afford to prescind from the exercise of his leadership function. The mere communication of an order from the legitimate superior does not guarantee obedience. The response of the group to a command of legitimate authority, other things being equal, will be more favorable than otherwise. But if other processes are at work within the group acting to disqualify the superior's command or to diminish the forces which motivate members to comply with the command, then obedience to the command will be mitigated to that extent.

As I have already suggested, the basis of power which is most distinctive of leadership and which, as far as I can see, leads to its unique quality, is that of referent power. The concept of referent power rests on the identification of the subordinate with the leader. The implications and overtones of this aspect of the leader-follower relationship are almost inexhaustible. Moreover, it is an aspect of the problem of leadership that has not received the attention it deserves.

Freud had originally related the concept of identification with that of leadership.¹² His ideas, however, were not very clearly thought out and the current of thinking about leadership took a more sociological bent that carried them in a much different direction. One attempt to develop this notion was that of Redl.¹³ He referred to "group emotions" as the "instinctual and emotional events taking place within persons under the pressure of group formative

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² S. Freud, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* XVIII (London: Hogarth, 1955) 56-143.

¹³ F. Redl, "Group Emotion and Leadership," *Psychiatry* 5 (1942) 573-96.

processes." These can probably better be conceived of as the (largely unconscious) emotional aspects of the group process.¹⁴ He designated the group member around whom the group formative process takes place as the "central person" (leader). The central person can adopt a variety of roles for the basic processes of group formation. This gives rise to a number of types of group formation. It may be of some help to summarize these briefly.

1) "The Patriarchal Sovereign." The relation of members to the central person is based on the members' desire for the central approval. This is a loving relation, which leads to identification with the central person's values.

2) "The Leader." The central person here appeals to the narcissism of the members in the sense that they wish to become like him. Identification here is based on the narcissistic wishes of the members.

3) "The Tyrant." The central person here dominates the group and produces a form of identification based not on love, but on fear—identification with the aggressor. Identification in this instance serves a protective function in the sense that the subject implicitly joins up with the aggressor through identification.

4) "The Central Person as Love Object." The members choose one and the same person as a love object. The central person is here an object of libidinal drives.

5) "The Central Person as Object of Aggressive Drives." The group unites in hostility to a central person.

6) "The Organizer." The central person renders an important service to the members by providing the means for satisfaction of their drives or needs, thus reducing conflict.

7) "The Seducer." The central person renders a service to the members by committing an initiatory act which cuts through guilt feelings, anxieties, and conflicts and permits the open manifestation of latent drives.

8) "The Hero." The central person again resolves the members' conflicts by committing an initiatory act and thus organizing the group action toward a desirable or praiseworthy goal.

¹⁴ Meissner, *op. cit.*, chapter 2.

9) "The Bad Influence." The central person resolves the members' conflicts over undesirable drives by the influence of his example.

10) "The Good Example." The central person serves a similar function, but in the opposite direction, resolving conflicts in favor of moral behavior rather than in the service of undesirable drives.

While this typology is not very useful in categorical terms, it seems to throw some light on the relation between identification and leadership. With the exception of those relations in which the central person serves as the object of group hostility or group affection (types 4 and 5), the organization of the group in relation to the central person involves some form of identification. In all of these types, the central person is also a leader. He is not performing a leadership function in serving as an object of love or hostility, although it must be admitted these latter instances also represent forms of influence on the group. Leadership is not, therefore, coextensive with influence.

The concept of identification is a complex which has rich implications for psychic structure and functioning. Adequate discussion of it would carry as far beyond the scope of this paper. On a more or less descriptive level, however, it represents a fundamental and primitive way in which people relate to each other. It is essentially unconscious and therefore can be expressed on the level of conscious awareness in a variety of ways. In terms of the leadership relation, it can express itself in terms of admiration, imitation, liking. It can be put in terms of the adoption by the subordinate of the interest, attitude, intention, objectives of the leader. The identification of ego-interest with leader-interest is a major unconscious component of the willingness of the subject to be influenced by the leader. The formula is serviceable even in reference to identification with the aggressor, for even here the threat is allayed by the formation of an alliance. Identification provides the unconscious substratum for cooperative and unified action. Thus the leader is generally accepted by the group insofar as he is perceived as contributing to group goals, because of a prior identification of members with the group and its goals. This raises the further point that identifications need not always be considered as occurring between individuals. They are also a feature of the individual's involvement in the group, and the necessary identification with the leader may be secondary and

derivative from the primary group identification. We can, therefore, raise the further question whether even legitimate authority does not in some sense depend on a prior group identification.

In terms of the bases of social power, referent power based on identification is not only the broadest but also the most advantageous of the forms of social power. Reward power is effective within limits, but it achieves effects only as long as the reward is forthcoming. Coercive power also has limited application and has the added disadvantage that it increases resistance in the group but also tends to mobilize hostility. When the style of supervision is punitive, aggression is directly expressed against the supervisor (at least verbally) and indirectly expressed through diminished production.¹⁵ Expert power is effective, though again limited, and one can reasonably inquire, "I think, whether such power is really exercised exclusively of referent or legitimate power.

The relationship between legitimate power and referent power is fairly complex. Translating referent power into terms of positive attitude toward the leader, two major theories have been proposed. A theory based on types of power would predict that the leader's legitimacy results in a positive attitude of the subject to the leader, as contrasted with a more negative attitude which would develop in illegitimate power relations.¹⁶ The second theory, called the power-distance reduction theory, would predict that the smaller the power difference between leader and subject, the more positive would the attitude of the subject be toward the leader.¹⁷ When these theories were tested experimentally, it was found that the power-distance determined the subordinate's attitudes whether the power basis was legitimate or not. However, when the power-distance was large, subjects showed greater resistance to illegitimate than to legitimate power. The power difference would seem, then, to be the more crucial variable, although legitimacy would also seem to have some positive effect.¹⁸

¹⁵ R. C. Day and R. L. Hamblen, "Some Effects of Close and Punitive Styles of Supervision," *American Journal of Sociology* 69 (1964) 499-510.

¹⁶ French and Raven, *op. cit.*

¹⁷ M. Mulder, "Power and Satisfaction in Task Oriented Groups," *Acta Psychologica* 16 (1959) 178-225, and "The Power Variable in Communication Experiments," *Human Relations* 13 (1960) 241-57.

¹⁸ M. Mulder, R. Van Dijk, et al., "Illegitimacy of Power and Positiveness

Religious application

Applying this to the religious group, increasing the power distance between subject and superior should decrease the degree of identification. This effect would presumably be mitigated by the superior's legitimacy, which may as we have suggested be mediated through group identification. The balance of the superior's influence rests on the interplay of his legitimate and referent power. The higher a superior in the organizational structure, the greater will be his legitimate power and the less will be his referent power.

It is apparent from these considerations that the effective exercise of the leadership function of authority is very closely related to the internal processes of the group. Implicit in the approach we have adopted here is the suggestion that the influence of the leader over the group and the correlative coordination of goals and purposes between leader and group ultimately rest on relatively unconscious and emotional processes. The effectiveness of the group's task orientation is contingent on the organization of inner emotional workings, and these in turn are reflective of and derivative from often unconscious strata of the individual psyche. The concept of identification is an operative one here, but we have only touched the surface of it. The exercise of leadership in any effective sense, then, requires a basis in the identification of subject with superior and/or of subject with the religious group. It also involves (but does not require) a decrease in the perceived power-distance between subject and superior. The latter consideration is most pertinent at lower levels of the power structure, where legitimate power is less effective and influence depends more on referent power.

If we were to think about the power-structure of the religious group in more or less absolute traditional terms, increasing the effectiveness of leadership becomes a rather limited possibility; it begins quickly to run into built-in mechanisms of resistance. If we shift the basis of our thinking to a more interactional framework and remember that power is not only legitimate and that leadership can be exercised at all levels of the structure—not only by legitimate superiors—the diminution of power-distance and the increase in identification becomes quite feasible. More effective leadership,

of Attitude Toward the Power Person," *Human Relations* 19 (1966) 21-37.

then, might take the course of a broader distribution of the participation in the leadership function of authority—without any change in the distribution of authority itself.

II

Systems of Social Defense

AUTHORITY HAS BEEN PRESENTED in its formal and informal, as well as its structural and functional perspectives. I have tried to suggest in terms of a socio-psychological analysis that traditional models of authority, which were generated in relation to the legitimate yet highly restrictive context of a philosophico-theological problematic of authority, have served as the basis of our pragmatic day-to-day functioning in the authority context. The traditional models, however, emphasize the formal and structural aspects of authority. I have tried to suggest that many of the contemporary problems which focus on authority issues reflect conflicts and ambiguities more specically at the level of the informal and functional aspects of authority.

In this present phase of the consideration of authority, we can turn our attention to an important and functional dimension of the exercise of authority. It should be said at the outset—and the caution is necessary at nearly every step of a consideration of this kind—that the matters under consideration do not directly concern themselves with the formal structure of authority. Questions of the legitimacy of authority, its nature, its locus, its role and function in the organization of social structure are simply not at issue. What is at issue is a set of psychological problems which are involved in and evolve from the practical exercise of authority in the concrete existential order.

The role of anxiety

The role of anxiety is of central importance in the following discussion. I would like, therefore, at the outset to discuss some relevant points about anxiety in more or less general terms before entering into more specific considerations. Anxiety is one of those difficult to define and impossible to agree on concepts which elicit multiple connotations. Consequently the definitions tend to multiply

and the understandings become as diffuse as the contexts and users of the definitions. I will return to some of the more classic usages. In his early approaches to the problem of anxiety, in his *Three Essays on Sexuality* (1905), Freud tended to view anxiety somewhat restrictively as an overflow of libido. His more mature thought on the subject, expressed in the complex and provocative *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety* (1926), produced the concept of anxiety as a signal of impending threat or danger. One could thereby distinguish realistic anxiety from neurotic anxiety. The former was a reaction to external threat, a fear determined by some object or situation in which life was threatened or harm implied. The latter, however, was not proportioned to any external threat; rather it was a response to some form of internal threat.

In dealing with anxiety, one of the fundamental questions to be considered has to do with the character and sources of the inner threat that produce anxiety. Needless to say, the question is exceedingly complex and there is much to be said about it, as well as much that cannot yet be said about it. It can be said, however, that signal anxiety involves a threat to the integrity of the ego. The sources and specifics of that threat can be multiple. The ego is the agency of conscious autonomy and control. Anything, therefore, that threatens the autonomy, security, control, and stability of the ego is perceived as threatening. This is relatively easy to understand in relation to external sources of threat, but it becomes difficult in the consideration of internal sources of threat.

To begin with, the internal sources of threat are not always conscious. Contemporary psychology has demonstrated, if nothing else, that the dimensions of psychic life reach beyond the boundaries of consciousness, that man has a complex life of wishes, needs, drives, and instincts which operate beyond the reach of his conscious mental life. The crucial problems of development and adaptation evolve out of the continuing and constant problem of organizing, integrating and harmonizing the evolving organization of the more or less conscious mental apparatus with the persisting and continuously vital activity of the less organized and dynamic strata of the mind. This creates a concatenation of developmental tasks at every level of the life cycle, from earliest infancy into advanced old age.

The fact that the vital stratum persists at an unconscious level affects every aspect of human life and activity. There is no room here to elaborate a total psychology of this aspect of man's inner life. I only wish to point out that its existence makes the understanding of anxiety more complex. For it is in this aspect of psychic functioning that anxiety often finds its source. Anxiety can accompany the unleashing of libidinal drives, of aggressive impulses, of forbidden or proscribed impulses of all kinds. Such impulses can be disturbing when they are conscious; they can also be disturbing when they are unconscious. They produce anxiety, as a rule, when consciously or unconsciously they pose a threat to the integrity of the ego.

Diminution of self-value

I will focus on only one aspect of the threat which I think can serve as a basis for our further analysis. One of the significant elements of threat to the ego is the destruction of self-esteem or the diminution of self-value. The disruption of libido produces anxiety because the associated wishes are inconsistent with the self-image the ego maintains and which is essential to its psychological survival. Such impulses are therefore threatening. Similarly, the arousal of aggressive and hostile impulses can be threatening insofar as they violate the maintained self-image. Without going into the basis of the self-image and its genesis, the self-image is teleologically calculated to support and maintain self-esteem and self-valuation. It is an essential component of normal adaptation and mature psychological functioning. It is as essential psychologically as oxygen is physiologically. There is no substitute for it. When it is threatened or in danger, human beings instinctively defend it and struggle to preserve it. When it is damaged, men suffer the agonies of masochism, depression, guilt and suicide.

An important aspect, then, of this state of affairs is that the occurrence of anxiety requires a certain degree of ego development and a matured self-image. The more evolved one's sense of personal self-esteem and the more matured the sense of personal value, the more vulnerable is the person to anxiety. This is, of course, if taken without proper qualification, not an altogether defensible statement. But within limits it has a degree of applicability. There are obviously other factors which influence the occurrence and intensity of

anxiety. The more realistic the self-image, for example, the more flexible can the ego be in the face of the threat of impulse—and consequently the less threatening is the impulse. The point to be stressed is that perfectly normal and well adjusted people are subject to anxiety. Anxiety is part of human existence, because it is the common lot to have impulses, conscious and unconscious, which threaten the intrinsic sense of value linked with every man's personal self-image.

The threat to self-image and its concomitant sense of personal value is in fact a far-ranging and significant aspect of human motivation. It is of extreme interest psychologically to explore the roots of this very general and all too little appreciated aspect of the mental life. But I will content myself here with merely stating the fact. We may return to it in further considerations, but for the moment the focus of our concern is on the broader interactional issues which derive from it.

Anxiety and authority

A basic psychological fact about authority is that for most, if not all, men it constitutes an area of conflict and anxiety. The reasons behind this phenomenon are multiple, and can hardly be exhausted. I would like to separate the exercise of authority from the reaction or response to authority. Both aspects have their conflictual and anxious elements. It is perhaps easier to grasp the element of conflict in the response to authority. The psychological relationship which is inherent in the response to authority on the part of the members of a community or organization recalls and reactivates attitudes and dispositions to authority which reach back through the life history to the earliest and most primitive such relationships. The issues that are implicitly raised, therefore, in the response to authority are issues of dependence, submission, and obedience. These issues and their correlative postures are characteristic of and perhaps caricatured by infantile relationships. The child is pre-eminently dependent, submissive, and obedient. But his dependence is adulterated by ever increasing impulses to progressive independence from parental control and limitation. His submission is increasingly modified by the innuendoes of revolt from parental demands. His obedience is continually and increasingly tempered by resentment and resistance.

There is no question that along the course of the individual's developmental history there is an accretion of such formative influences. Further the residues of such influences remain operative, but they remain operative in a manner quite removed from the conscious intent of the person responding to authority in the contemporary moment. The residues of prior experiences remain active in an unconscious manner so that the individual finds himself responding with emotions and attitudes which do not fit the reality of the immediate situation or relationship. The total response to authority in the present situation is colored and modulated by the activation of parallel unconscious fantasies which derive from earlier and primitive levels of experience rather than from the present context. As a result, the response to authority may incorporate emotional and attitudinal overtones which may derive from unconscious fantasies. Thus the conflictual aspects of the authority relationship which derive from more infantile and primitive levels of the psychic organization can become active in determining in part a present response.

It is, of course, obvious that conflicts over authority are not only unconscious. But the key issue is whether such conscious conflicts do not imply and reflect less conscious conflictual aspects of the total psychic response. A convincing case can be made that such is in fact the reality. While we are often taken up by the conscious aspects of conflicts with authority figures, with the apparent motives and arguments, we so often remain sublimely unaware, i.e., unconscious, of the basic motivational elements. Proof is always difficult to come by, but on clinical grounds evidence can be mustered to support the position that such basic conflicts are the fundamental human lot. We all fall heir to them, since we are all victims of the infantile experience of restriction and submission to the overpowering significant figures (parents) in our most primitive experiences.

The point that I wish to make is that the activation of such primitive and infantile conflicts and their attendant emotions is associated with the arousal of anxiety. Anxiety is a derivation of the arousal of infantile residues which carry within them an inherent threat to the integrity of the ego. The unconscious conflictual fantasies aroused in the authority relation embody very basic and instinct-dependent forces whose activation constitutes a danger to

the integrity and control of more organized aspects of the mental apparatus. It is important, therefore, to try to bring into focus the basic concept that anxiety is built into the authority relation, not by reason of its formal structure but by reason of its informal process.

But, thus far, we have only considered the roots of anxiety in the response to authority. What about its exercise? We must maintain that here too authority carries within it an inherent anxiety. It is sometimes difficult to appreciate, but the fact remains that those who exercise authority share similar conflicts regarding authority as those who must respond to it. It should also be remembered that the number of those who exercise authority and are not required at the same time to respond to it is indeed small.

Responsibility

But we can go further. The exercise of authority implies and imposes responsibility. The superior accepts and strives to fulfill that responsibility. Psychologically speaking, his acceptance of the role of superior carries with it the implicit role expectation that he act and function as the responsible one. He achieves a sense of his own identity as embodying the ideal of responsibility. His self-esteem and sense of value are tied up with his idealized self-image as "the responsible one." The catch is that, like all human beings, the one who exercises authority, the responsible one, is also subject to irresponsible impulses. These irresponsible impulses reflect the activity of the less organized and dynamic levels of his personality. Such impulsivity is inconsistent with the demands of his self-image. They contradict and erode the image of the responsible one. They therefore constitute a threat to the integrity of his self-image. And this threat becomes manifest as anxiety. The basic insight in this approach is that the human lot is under constant subjection to the influence of impulsive, ill-controlled, disruptive and threatening stimuli, which are by and large unconscious and serve to elicit anxiety. The purest heart carries within it the barbs of impure impulses and wishes that disturb its equilibrium and cause it to feel the sting of anxiety. The gentlest soul has within it the fire of anger and hostility that surges within it and produces the searing pain of anxiety. And so too, the most reliable and responsible of men has within him the ever active source of impulses and wishes to irrespon-

sible action which poses for him the threat of anxiety. Characteristically, the impulses—libidinal, aggressive, irresponsible, or whatever—are not felt as such, do not reach consciousness in their true colors. They are masked and distorted beyond recognition, but they leave their telltale mark in anxiety.

Social defense mechanisms

Common knowledge in our age of psychological sophistication gives credence to the role of man's psychological defenses in allaying anxiety. The defense mechanisms as commonly conceived are erected and utilized by the individual psyche to ward off the threat implicit in anxiety and to modulate and modify the pain associated with such a threat. Such mechanisms are intrapsychic; they come to life in the individual psyche and serve to maintain the psychic functioning of each individual, exclusive of his interaction with his fellows.

At another level of analysis, however, on the level of social interaction and transaction within a group, it is possible to consider other defense mechanisms which also serve the ends of alleviating anxiety. Particularly where the anxiety flows from the structure and characteristics of the group, individual intrapsychic mechanisms have a limited utility. The members of the group have a need to use the organization in their struggle against anxiety. Psychologically, individual members of the group externalize their characteristic defense mechanisms and there arises within the group a collusive interlocking of defensive postures which constitutes a massive socially structured defense system.

To focus our analysis more specifically on authority, we can begin with the postulate that the group is composed of individuals who carry within them the basic conflicts about authority which we have already discussed. Each individual carries within him the roots of a conflict which revolves around the generation of irresponsible impulses. The conflict arouses anxiety and puts into operation defensive functions which are aimed at preserving the integrity and adaptation of the ego. The mechanisms are largely unconscious and take the following form. The first step consists in the denial of the conflict itself and of the associated anxiety. The ego uses denial in a purely repressive fashion in this first step. The conflict and the threat of its associated anxiety are simply denied and deprived of

admission to the consciousness. The mechanism is totally unconscious, and operates at a fairly primitive level. The ego cannot tolerate any conscious recognition of the existence and operation of such a detrimental conflict. Nor can it deal effectively in any way with the threat of anxious disruption which attends the existence of such a conflict. Consequently, the conflict and anxiety are almost automatically masked out, blotted out and repressed from consciousness.

The second step in this defensive movement is the splitting or separation of the two aspects of the conflict. Responsibility and irresponsibility are divided and isolated from each other. Thus the two elements which are mutually involved with each other in conflictual opposition can be dealt with in isolation without any regard to the inherent conflict. The third step involves the projection of the repressed and isolated elements outside of the psyche to objects in the environment. This last step, also largely unconscious, completes the essential steps of the process. Thus the basic conflict and the associated experience of anxiety are driven out of consciousness by repression and denial and become unconscious. Thus the sting is withdrawn. Next, the denied conflictual elements are separated from each other and regarded in isolation, i.e., without conflict. And finally the denied and divorced elements are separately projected to disparate portions of the social system outside of the individual, and can be dealt with separately.

Projection

The first two steps, denial and splitting, set the stage for and make possible the third step of projection. It is through projection that the socially structured defensive system arises. The projection works in the following way. The individual member of the group or organization projects his own feelings of responsibility to authority figures above him in the structure of the group. At the same time he also projects the separated feelings of irresponsibility to his subordinates in the social system. Since his responsible attitudes are really reactions against his irresponsible impulses, the more unruly the impulses to irresponsibility, the more harsh, restrictive and demanding must his responsible attitudes become. Consequently, the more intense and persistent his own unconscious impulses to irresponsibility, the more restrictive and punitive does his

responsible self become. The projection of these separated and basically conflictual elements results in a perception of superiors as harsh, repressive, demanding and punitive and in the perception of inferiors as carefree, impulsive, lacking in any sense of responsibility, and unable to be trusted with any commission or responsibility of consequence.

The result of this unconscious set of operations within the social system is or can be rather far reaching, both for the individuals involved and for the operation of the social system. The point should be made that the mechanisms proposed here are general and widely operative human mechanisms for dealing with the disturbing effects of conflict and anxiety. The basic economic principle involved is that it is easier and more tolerable to deal with conflict projected into the interpersonal realm than to deal with it on the intrapsychic level. Conflict between individuals is undoubtedly painful, but it is less painful than the internal conflict, anxiety and erosion of self-esteem that overwhelm the ego's defenses in the intrapsychic arena. The projection of repressive and strict attitudes to superiors creates difficulties in the interpersonal adjustment to superiors. But it also makes it possible to objectify and identify this aspect of the authority conflict and deal with it as though it were an external conflict. The superior can be blamed and struggled against in the external order and thus one aspect of the underlying conflict can be dealt with and the anxiety in part alleviated. Similarly, projection of irresponsible impulses to inferiors permits one to deal with the second member of the underlying conflict and further modify anxiety. Anxiety, then, is alleviated, but it is alleviated at the price of distrust, hostility, external conflict, and disorganization and disruption, not in the individual, but in the social system. The externalization, as it were, of the individual's characteristic defenses and their projection to the social system is intrapsychically adaptive, but it is disruptive on the level of social interaction.

Modified authority

The result of this way of handling conflicts of authority is that at all levels of the social organization individuals perceive those above them as harsh, repressive, demanding, and imposing unnecessarily strict discipline. Conversely, at all levels individuals perceive those

below them in the social organization, their inferiors, as wanting in responsibility, careless, untrustworthy, etc. The result is that there is an unconscious but collusive redistribution of responsibility and irresponsibility within the social system. Responsibility is ascribed to certain roles and irresponsibility is ascribed to certain other roles. In consequence, the functional exercise of authority is modified. Responsibility at lower levels of the organization is diminished and responsibility at the upper levels of organization is increased. The tendency is reinforced by the perception of superiors that they are more responsible and that their inferiors are less than responsible. It is also confirmed by the tendency of inferiors to believe that they are indeed incapable of responsibility and that their superiors are excessively endowed with that esteemed virtue. The whole is elaborated and evolves out of a collusive and interlocking system of denials, splittings, and projections which reconstruct, the organization of functional authority in the social system. It redefines the task and role expectations at all levels of the system, and it does so in complete isolation from the formal organization of the system. The driving force is the internal conflicts over authority and responsibility which give rise to anxiety.

The further complication of this system is that, as a rule, people tend to act as others perceive them. People act objectively according to the psychic roles assigned them by others. And thus, the projective system, unconsciously derived as it is, begins to take on the cast of reality. Inferiors become, in fact, less responsible than their position and capabilities would dictate. Responsible tasks are forced upwards in the hierarchy of authority so that responsibility for their performance can be disclaimed at lower levels. Responsibility must therefore be assumed by (more responsible) individuals at higher levels, and the perception of those at lower levels as irresponsible is thereby substantiated. The impact of responsibility is diminished by a subtle form of delegation to superiors. The result, of course, is that superiors exercise too much authority and inferiors share less and less in the responsible action of the group.

A social system

The process which we are discussing depends on very basic and general human reactions and mechanisms. The arousal of anxiety in the authority relationship is a fundamental human experience,

and it is through the mobilization of universally operative defensive mechanisms of denial, splitting and projection that the socially structured defense system comes into being. The mechanisms can operate in any social structure in which authority functions.

I would like to turn attention to a specific social system which has been carefully studied and in which many of these mechanisms have been identified and their influence on the group and its functions traced. The study was made of the nursing service of a general teaching hospital in Great Britain.¹⁹ It was conducted to help resolve a crisis that had arisen between the demands of patient care and the teaching obligations of the nursing service. The level of anxiety and stress generated in this system was reflected by dissatisfaction, high absentee rate, high rate of illness among the nurses, and a very high dropout rate. The latter was particularly distressing, since fully a third of the nurses initiating their training did not finish and with rare exceptions the dropouts were those women who were most highly regarded as potential nursing candidates.

The study of this social system revealed that it constituted a highly organized and tightly authoritarian system. At the bottom of the pile were the student nurses in their first year. They were responsible to and took orders from all other nurses. The other nurses were part of a pecking-order which was determined by years in training or service. Second year nurses were responsible to third year nurses, etc. In this tightly structured system, the stress and anxiety were handled by a variety of social defense mechanisms which we can list as follows:

- 1) Depersonalization, categorization and denial of the significance of the individual. This was achieved by the use of task-lists, by which each nurse was assigned to perform a certain task for many patients, by the employment of an ethic of equivalence according to which it must not make any difference to the nurse whom or what she nursed, and by the wearing of a uniform which became the symbol of expected inner and behavioral uniformity such that the nurse was regarded as an aggregate of nursing skills rather than as an individual. This depersonalization was reinforced by frequent

¹⁹ I. E. P. Menzies, "A Case Study in the Functioning of Social Systems as a Defence Against Anxiety: A Report on a Study of a Nursing Service of a General Hospital," *Human Relations* 13 (1960) 95-121.

shifts of the nurses from one service to another with an attendant increase in stress and emotional disruption associated with the disruption of interpersonal relationships among members of the nursing staff. The system thereby refused to recognize the importance of warm interpersonal relationships as an aspect of the nurses' work adjustment.

2) Detachment and denial of feelings. There was taught and inculcated an implicit requirement for professional detachment, control of feelings and the avoidance of any disturbing identifications. The good nurse remained unattached ('detached'), did not mind moving from ward to ward at a moment's notice. This was reinforced by a variety of interpersonal repressive techniques ('stiff upper lip') which underscored feelings as professionally unacceptable. The students felt this as evidence that they were not understood by the members of the staff directing them. But this seems not to have been the case. The nursing supervisors recognized the problem and understood it, but sympathetic handling of emotional stress was regarded as inconsistent with traditional nursing roles and relationships.

3) Idealization of nursing candidates and denial of possibilities for personal development. Because of the nature of nursing tasks and the anxiety associated with their performance, the nursing service constantly seeks assurance that the candidates it is accepting are mature and responsible people. There is a consequent idealization of the nursing candidate who is presumed to be mature and competent. The further consequence of this presumption is that the training program focuses on training in the facts and techniques of nursing and pays minimal attention to the needs of nursing students for personal growth and the needs of all nursing students to grow in a sense of personal maturity and identification in a professional role.

4) Social redistribution of responsibility and irresponsibility. By the mechanisms previously discussed juniors are regarded as irresponsible and seniors are regarded as excessively strict and repressive in discipline. Decisions are avoided at lower levels of the hierarchy. This is accomplished by excessive ritualization and standardization of nursing procedures. As a consequence, however, responsible tasks are forced upwards in the hierarchy and the

general effect is that nurses at all levels are performing tasks which are below their level of ability and also below the level of their position. Another consequence is that all initiative and exercise of discretion are discouraged and avoided. It is not surprising, therefore, that the more gifted students should find this situation intolerable and would drop out.

5) Avoidance of change. Any significant social change implies an alteration in the social system as a defensive system. Change therefore implies an exacerbation of anxiety and at least a transient weakening of the defenses against it. The greater the anxiety in the system, the greater is the need for reassurance and reinforcement of the existing social defense system. The adherence to the existing system can take on the aspect of rigidly compulsive adherence to the demands of the system and a inability to tolerate any change. Efforts to introduce change are resisted by conscious and unconscious means.

The steps in the evolution of this defense system were arousal of anxiety, mobilization of defenses to allay anxiety, and finally the institutionalization or organization of individual defenses by unconscious collusive interaction into a rigidly functioning social defensive system. This serves the purposes of reducing anxiety, but I think that it quickly becomes apparent that the prize is won at a tremendous cost, since it creates other stresses which tell on the participating members. It compels individuals to fit the demands of the system without any recognition or provision for the normal human needs for warm, emotionally stable relationships, for the demands of self-esteem, for responsibility and the exercise of initiative and judgment. It moves the conflict into the social area where it can be less threatening and more easily dealt with, but in so doing it creates a rigid and repressive social system. The price is the rather high price of dehumanization and depersonalization.

Implications for religious communities

The present analysis is calculated to illumine some of the informal aspects of implementation of authority in social structures. The religious community is such a structure, and it is a structure in which authority plays a primary role.²⁰ It is not overly bold to assume that religious are human beings and that they share with

²⁰ Meissner, *op. cit.*

other human beings conflicts over authority. It seems safe, therefore, to assume that if we look carefully we shall find many of the elements of such social defense systems operative in religious communities. Generalizations, however, are difficult, because so much depends on the existential factors and on the level of maturity inhering in any given community. We can also presume on good psychological grounds that where individual and group maturity is high, anxiety is minimal and social defense mechanisms play a minor role in the group process.

It may be worthwhile, even so, to reflect on some characteristic postures of the religious group to find out whether they may not reflect the operation of defensive systems. I will follow the previously indicated points. The denial of the significance of the individual has been a cardinal point in the spirituality of religious groups and is still often proposed as a sort of ideal. The place where this emphasis is most clearly made is in relation to obedience. The good religious is ready to do whatever is asked of him, wherever and whenever. This implies that one religious is as good (or as bad) for the performance of a given task as any other. There is no question that an extreme adherence to this posture is less and less seen currently, but one is sometimes prompted to wonder whether it does not cling to life as a kind of agrarian ideal, whimsically clutched but enjoying little realistic application. The other side of this posture, which used to be ignored but is becoming more and more of an issue, is that it required depersonalization and a degrading of the person. One could perhaps justify such a posture in terms of sacrifice to the common good in some fairly primitive contexts, but the modern context more and more often requires judgment, initiative, and responsibility in members of religious communities in order to accomplish the purposes of the community. This means that not only the individual must pay a price, but also the community. It is difficult on such terms to justify the posture.

Religious groups have a curious cult about feelings. They are suspicious and undesirable. Detachment and control (denial?) of feelings is so much more virtuous. One often senses an avoidance or denial of feelings, as if everyone was agreed that they didn't belong somehow and collusively to avoid them. Avoidance of feelings is often inculcated both intrapsychically and in the context of interpersonal relationships.

A striking parallel to the nursing system is the idealization of candidates that is often seen in religious groups. Selection of candidates, tests, interviews, and other screening devices are employed to assure the religious group of the best available candidates. One can raise the question whether the consequence does not also involve a presumption of maturity. There is no question that religious groups are embarrassingly impoverished when it comes to provision for the handling of developmental emotional problems in its members. This has particular application to formative years in which young adolescents are received as candidates and then subjected to spiritual formation over a period of years. Unfortunately the emphasis is all too frequently on subjection to institutionalized patterns of behavior, including the matter of prayer, rather than on developmental and emotional problems and their proper working-through. I maintain the importance of the former, but I must also insist on the importance of the latter. The extant provisions for such problems are generally discouraging, if not nonexistent. Those who appeal to the institution of spiritual fathers as adequate for these needs point directly to the existing inadequacy.

Responsibility and irresponsibility

By far the most serious and far-reaching implication for the religious community is the redistribution of responsibility and irresponsibility. Over the long haul of life in religion, this aspect of the defensive system can have a continuing and far-reaching attrition. The toll is taken by forcing the individual religious into an overly submissive and irresponsible position in which through an appeal to "obedience" he avoids responsible action and mature judgment. He too easily can resign his responsibility to his superior, and then, embittered by this situation blame the superior for this state of affairs. This is all too easy since the superior is already perceived as repressive and demanding. There are a good many delicate issues that can be explored here, but they lie beyond our present scope. It can be said, however, that the avoidance of responsibility, however it comes about, is an immaturity. True obedience does not tolerate the avoidance of responsibility. Disobedience is of two kinds. One can disobey by deviance and rebellion. One can also disobey by submission and passivity. The latter form of disobedience is too often not recognized as such.

A further effect of this redistribution is the slow, gradual, almost imperceptible erosion of the individual's sense of personal value and self-esteem. This effect is also contributed to by mechanisms for depersonalization. The result is a form of self-depreciation which produces indifference, depression, an unwillingness to exercise initiative or imagination, a lack of spontaneity and an inability to function effectively and efficiently. We forget, as I have already suggested, that self-esteem is necessary for any kind of responsible and successful activity. If the system erodes self-esteem, it also erodes the capacity for productive and creative activity, whether it be in teaching or preaching, or learning or whatever. One often hears the complaint over the apparently large numbers of religious who become unproductive and lead their religious lives without active involvement with others whom they contact. If the present analysis has any merit, it at least raises the question whether in such a circumstance we are not witnessing the attrition of a social defense system.

A final point is the matter of resistance to change. I think that little need be said on the matter here. It is easy to say that religious groups are resistant to change and to adopting a critical attitude, as many do. But there are unanswered questions as to what change really is and how much change is appropriate for the religious group. I have suggested elsewhere that change and adaptation are necessary for the survival of the religious group.²¹ Change must be measured by a relative measure. That change is good which improves the effectiveness of the religious group in its common objectives and purposes. Resistance to change is therefore a matter of degree. Religious groups are changing, but the question can still be asked whether the change is enough, or fast enough. It is also true that there is resistance to change in religious groups. Where there is resistance, we can honestly ask ourselves whether it is derived from the operation of unconscious motivations and reflects the compulsive rigidity of a socially organized defensive system.

As a concluding comment, I would like to add that the present analysis is directed toward a particular aspect of the authority relation. Whether it is operative in a given community or to what extent it is operative can only be judged by evaluating the observable

²¹ *Ibid.*

effects produced by such a system. It may have an overwhelming influence on the life of a community, or it may have a minimal effect. It is, however, I would think, always identifiable. If it does loom large enough to present a problem, what does one do about it? The question is a sort of automatic response of concerned religious. Solutions are hard to come by and I will avoid giving one. It can be said, however, that dissolution of the defensive system requires the willingness and capacity of those involved to tolerate the inner anxiety which originally motivated the generation of the system to begin with. The capacity to tolerate such anxiety and conflict is one measure of individual and group maturity.

REPORT

FREEDOM-AUTHORITY-OBEDIENCE

Edited by RICHARD A. BLAKE, S.J.

In early January of 1966, Father Provincial John J. McGinty asked Fr. Donald Campion to consult with some members of the New York Province and then to draft a paper on freedom-authority-obedience for presentation at a meeting of the rectors of the Province at Cold Spring Harbor, January 17-19. As a result of their discussion on this paper, the rectors requested that Father Provincial commission a group to make a further study of the questions raised. The Committee given this task by Father Provincial in February included Frs. Thomas E. Clarke, W. Norris Clarke, John W. Donohue, James W. Gaffney, Robert O. Johann, George C. McCauley, George J. McMahan, John J. McMahan, Martin F. Mahoney, and Matthew J. O'Connell, with Fr. Campion serving as chairman.

The Committee members subsequently met on occasion in small groups and exchanged ideas through written memoranda. At a meeting in mid-April, a decision was made to expand the basis of discussion by distributing a set of three provisional papers drafted by Frs. Johann, O'Connell, and J. McMahan. Every house in the Province then held at least one community discussion on the papers and related questions. The Committee received written reports on these meetings for its guidance. A number of individuals, including members of the Committee itself, also submitted written comments or criticisms. In June, the Committee reviewed all these materials and decided to have its chairman draw up a comprehensive report to the Province on the results of this ongoing community dialogue. In the compilation of this report, which takes the form of a chronological record rather than an attempt at a final synthesis, Fr. Donald J. Hinfey rendered invaluable assistance.

THE PRESENT CONDITION of life in the Church is characterized by great concern for the relationship between individual Christian freedom and the exercise of authority. This broad problem comes to sharpest focus in religious life, since obedience to authority is there offered through a vow, which, though freely pronounced, seems to limit an individual's Christian freedom to a striking degree. As a consequence, the problem is more urgent for religious. Even though the atmosphere of uneasiness which presently pervades many areas of religious life may incline some to sweep the issue under the rug or to look the other way, it is one that must be faced with courage. No one is sure how this question will be resolved, but no one is exempt from the task of trying to resolve it.

THE PROBLEM AND ITS CONTEXT

In his paper for the Rectors' Meeting, Fr. Campion pointed out that Vatican II has made a reconsideration of Jesuit obedience imperative, not indeed because it has been abrogated by the Holy Spirit, but because its roots in theology, philosophy, history, and sociology must be seen more clearly today. He then set down some guidelines for this reconsideration which he drew from the Council documents. We are obliged, he noted, to ponder the Council's call to return to the Gospel for light on appropriate renewal and adaptation of every aspect of religious life. Further, we must take account of the dignity of the human person as understood by the conciliar Fathers, as well as their emphasis on the freedom of the Spirit in dealing with all men. Above all, it becomes necessary to examine what all this means in terms of the Christian attitude which ought to characterize relations between superiors who are servants and those who are members of their communities.

Fr. Campion identified two essentials without which the questions raised for today's religious cannot be adequately answered: *dialogue* and *vocation*:

If dialogue is to be a true characteristic of the exercise of authority and a corresponding response of obedience, certain conditions or presuppositions must exist. Both sides to the dialogue must be committed wholeheartedly and intelligently to ideals of the community. Both must be willing to admit at least the possibility of being wrong. Both sides must be prepared to lay their cards on the table, to enter into candid discussion and to be willing to trust each other with the facts. In all this, it is clear, one is saying that both superior and subject must treat each other as an adult, as a man of good will and one sincerely seeking to follow God's will as his informed conscience dictates. All of this, since we are talking of a dialogue between Christians and religious, is to take place in a setting to which the superior brings a desire to serve

rather than to be served, and the subject brings humility and a fundamental desire to move from self-centeredness to altruism.

Why the stress on dialogue and on awareness of the nature and existence of charisms in the Church? One's reason could be little more than a desire to communicate with men of today's Church and world where such ideas are prevalent. More positively, one could emphasize them out of conviction that to do so is the will of God manifested to us by the Church in Council and that to do so is, humanly speaking, the more effective way of governing in a community of men. To round out that picture, it must be remembered, as Fr. Karl Rahner remarks, that, despite the way some people talk, the Holy Spirit is free to give charisms *even* to those who hold office in the institutional or hierarchical Church!

My commitment to a life under authority in a religious community cannot be described as the signing of a blank check. Yet it is a commitment to a particular way or style of life in the Church, one made out of conviction that this is the will of the Spirit for me. I make this commitment, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, because the Church certifies that ordinarily and more surely the Spirit will henceforth speak to me in and through this group. Religious obedience, then, is not just the carrying out of this or that command, or these regulations. It is a commitment to a style of life that differentiates me from all other Christians.

In answering the question why this "style of life" involves obeying men, Fr. Campion pointed out:

The most fundamental consideration seems to be one that lies at the heart of the notion of a vocation to religious life in the Church. It is fundamental because it goes to the roots of our understanding of the whole meaning of the Church itself. As the opening paragraph of the second chapter in the *Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)* puts it: "It has pleased God . . . to make men holy and save them not merely as individuals, without mutual bond; but rather has it pleased Him to make of them a People that acknowledges Him in truth and serves Him in holiness" (No. 9). More specifically with respect to the function of authority and obedience within a group thus "called" by God, we have the testimony of the New Testament (and some Scripture scholars see similar evidence in the Old) that it has pleased God precisely to have men saved through other men and that our following of Christ or of God's will is by his design normally to be a *mediated* following.

What all this boils down to may be stated simply enough: in religious life, both superior and subject have grave obligations to remain open to the movements of the Holy Spirit. For the superior this means, among other things, being particularly attentive to the Spirit speaking through members of the community—hence the importance of *dialogue*. For the subject this means, among other things, being aware that the Spirit has spoken through one's vocation to a particular way of life and that henceforth genuine movements of the Spirit for him will be in accord with that way or style. In other words, the subject must understand that so long as the group or community itself

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

remains approved in the Church, the presumption must be that an authentic impulse of the Spirit will be for him a summons "*secundum ejusdem societatis constitutiones*"—hence the importance of *vocation*.

Sacramental and traditional views

Early in the labors of the Province Committee, Fr. Thomas Clarke indicated some points for fruitful reflection and discussion when he called attention to the sacramental and mystical quality of law and authority: "They announce a special, self-communicating presence of God to his people and the response of the people." He wrote, too, that while the superior is in place of God, he also is in place of the community whose voice and expression he ought to be.

Fr. T. Clarke also remarked that law has effects on the intellect as well as on the will, because the mind is illumined by it to know God's ways. In connection with this, the reality of sin and its effects in our world perhaps heightens the need man has for "external" guidance, for light from without. Yet, authority must listen to, and not still, the prophet's voice, since one can only judge others legitimately if one is willing to submit to judgement.

Others of the Committee in this early phase had explored matters more immediately in the light of "traditional" Jesuit formulations on authority and obedience. The minutes, recorded by Fr. John W. Donohue, from a meeting of one small group in March contained the following:

It was agreed that some of the difficulties some members of the Society have with the ideals of obedience and authority are due, in part, to the bad effects of an outmoded rhetoric. It is quite possible, for instance, that Fr. Campion's concept of "dialogue" is substantially what the *Constitutions* advance, at least germinally, in their concept of "consultation." The danger is that certain superiors, themselves misled by the imperfectly understood rhetoric of the 16th century, may fulfill their role in such a fashion as to reinforce the difficulties young people feel. . . .

It was pointed out that a paper by Fr. Hugo Rahner . . . contains an effective presentation of what might be called the "classical Jesuit concept" of obedience. Fr. Rahner argues that the obedience is to Christ but is secured by means of the pope and, through the pope, by means of the superiors who mediate the pope's will. . . . Fr. Rahner concludes, in what is the heart of the matter, that the obedience to Christ crucified is just as fully achieved when it is an "obedience to an order which is in no way sinful but which may be foolish and irrational."

If there is indeed a theoretical "crisis" of obedience today (as distinguished from a purely practical one which may be caused chiefly by the defects of superiors or subjects or both), it was agreed that it is located precisely here. Today, the realm of conscience and the ideals of freedom and personal re-

sponsibility have so expanded that, for many, the acceptable concepts of obedience, consultation, representation and so on, have also changed. It seems that many people today feel that they are morally obliged *not* to follow an order which is "foolish and irrational." Responsible persons, they feel, are not free to follow foolish commands. . . . Surely Jesuits have always understood that their obedience must be rational. For older generations, however, this rational element was sufficiently safeguarded, in face of an order which appeared foolish, or at least less wise, by the conviction for which Fr. Rahner argues, *viz.*, that the ideal of obedience to Christ is secured as well, perhaps better, by obeying the less wise command of a superior who is the mediating vessel of Christ's will as by obeying a command which is clearly prudent. Some younger Jesuits are said to feel, though, that this is not enough to safeguard the rational character of the human act of obedience. They think it is unreasonable for them to obey orders which are pointless, and unreasonable for administrators to urge such orders.

ANALYTIC MOMENT: CLARIFICATION AND FORMULATION

A major stimulus to further reflection and discussion in the Province on freedom-authority-obedience came from an essay by Fr. Robert O. Johann in which he stressed that the notion of authority must be understood, not univocally, but analogously, with varying application depending on the nature of the community involved. Under the title "Authority and Fellowship," he wrote:

If the debate in religious circles about the conflicting claims of freedom and authority has not always been fruitful, the reason lies, I think, in the limited and univocal concept of authority too often adopted by both sides. It has been assumed without question that authority can be defined in abstraction from the sort of community in which it operates.

Authority and community do, of course, go together. Community is something intentional. Persons form a community only in the measure they freely respond to a unifying intention, *i.e.*, to an act intending each of them, not in isolation, but as related to the others. This actual intention of unity, institutionally embodied and acknowledged by the plurality of persons as having a claim on them, is the power which forms community. Such power, in general, is authority.

But a community of persons can be conceived in radically different ways that profoundly affect both the role of authority and the type of response it calls for. For example, community may be conceived either as an end in itself or as a means to something else. In the latter case, we have what may be called *organic* community. It arises from a coordination of all the various functions performed by members of the group to achieve some further good in which each one has an interest but which can be attained only by their concerted efforts. In such community, persons are not united as persons but rather as workers or functionaries.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

In contrast with this, we have *personal* community where the unity of persons is viewed as an end in itself. Here persons are united, not in terms of their functional relationships to a further goal, but in terms of their very reality as persons. The ultimate good they seek is their loving interrelation as persons, the good of communion and fellowship. To this end, everything else is subordinated. Thus, while organic community aims at the maximum functional efficiency consistent with the fact that its functionaries are also persons, personal community aims at maximum personal reciprocity and diversifies itself in functions only as needed for such reciprocity.

In communities so different, the formative power of community (authority) is also bound to be different and act differently. In one case, authority is indeed the power in charge of unifying actions through rules. In the other, however, it is the power dedicated to unifying persons through love. Instead of seeking primarily to impose order, authority in personal community looks to promote consensus—a genuine thinking, feeling, and willing together of all the members. Whereas in organic community, the main task of authority is to control and direct the common enterprise through binding decisions. Here it is, first of all, to embody and show forth a love that encompasses all the members and, secondly, to offer itself wholeheartedly in the service of their union as a continuing catalyst concord, a kind of focusing agent for the converging desires of the individual members to be each one for all the others as fruitfully and inclusively as possible.

Moreover, just as authority differs in the two communities, so also does the response it calls for. Since persons are involved in organic community only in terms of an aspect of themselves, namely, their function as workers, their commitment to such community and its controlling power can never be absolute or total. It is quite properly limited to what the achievement of the goal requires. On the other hand, the universal love that animates personal community calls for a total response in kind. Any self-seeking is incompatible with the intention to be wholly for others.

This is something that needs emphasis today. If, in the light of our distinction, religious authorities are inconsistent when they operate "organically" and still expect total obedience, religious subjects are no less mistaken when they think partial commitment suffices for personal community. In other words, the current demand for less legalism and more love cannot be taken onesidedly. It cuts both ways.

Another member of the Committee, Fr. Matthew J. O'Connell, next elaborated a theological context in which Fr. Johann's distinction on types of community might be applied specifically to religious life and Jesuit life. He wished to avoid looking on religious life as a series of "discrete moments," each one of which is an act of obedience to a superior. What is necessary, he observed, is that the whole life of Christ in relation to his Father and his life in relation to his fellows be seen as an exemplary totality and unity. Obedience to the Father is seen as part of the totality and rising from it. The same should apply to obedience

in religious life. The community of persons is the totality in which decisions and obedience to decisions have life and meaning.

Fr. O'Connell stressed that the superior is an agent for community in such a community as Fr. Johann envisages. Yet if union and love are the good of such a community, how does the work of the community—an area where obedience's function is most obvious—avoid being an afterthought, on the one hand, or, on the other, avoid being constitutive of its unity to the point that the community becomes a functional entity? He suggested that perhaps the dilemma can be resolved by considering the nature of the Church and the nature of a religious order within the Church. He wrote:

The Church is a community which is an eschatological reality, and whose finite inner form is love: love in response to the love of God for men, love that reaches out to draw other men into this response to God in Christ and to make the boundaries of the visible Church coincide with the totality of that humanity which is loved by God and called to love in return.

The Church is thus an anticipation of the community of the blessed. But only in a limited way can it be said to be a replica of the heavenly Church of the world-to-come. It is a replica or anticipation because the Spirit at work in this community's response to God is the Spirit whose activity creates the *eschaton* in the Church as it has already created it, fully and definitively in Christ and definitively, even if not yet fully, in the other blessed. But it is a replica in only a limited way because the Spirit's work is not yet fully accomplished:

1) in the members of the Church. Therefore the ideal of "*ama et fac quod vis*" is not fully realizable, and we have the role of law, as law is envisaged both *philosophically*: the need of authority to make practical decisions, and *theologically*: law as light, law as the expression of ideals, and law (universal and particular decisions of authority) as the embodiment of divine providence for the pilgriming Church of a particular time and place.

2) in the world. The communion of the members of the Church is, therefore, not yet the final communion of those who contemplate the unveiled glory of God. It is the communion of those who contemplate God at work in history (especially in Christ) and are led to enter into the active love of Christ and his Spirit that would extend the communion which is the Church to the boundaries of humanity itself. . . .

If this is so, then the "work" of extending communion becomes thematic in the communion itself. The communion in "work" even becomes the center around which the communion itself develops. Is this to state a contradiction? Only if "work" is taken in too narrow and functional a way. The real "work" of the Church is not this or that particular kind of apostolate, but precisely the extension of that communion which is the very essence of the Church (Church as community). This is a work in which the quality of the person, as caught up totally into communion with the other members of the Church, is decisive for the work to be done.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

Within this all embracing work, there is work in the narrower sense of particular apostolic occupations whereby and wherein one accomplishes the ultimate work, e.g., teaching, nursing, etc. There can, obviously, be no complete dichotomy between the goal and the way to it, between the ultimate work and the particular job, because it is through the latter that the former is (at least partially) accomplished. But it is the former which is a constitutive element of the communion itself, not the latter. If the particular job is made central and decisive, then the community will tend to be thought of in more or less exclusively functional terms.

A religious order is the Church *in parvo* (there are numerous qualifications required, but these need not be made for our purposes here). It is a group of persons who are united as persons, as men committed to a total response of love for God and men in answer to the call of God. Because of this total commitment, religious life, like the Church, is an anticipation of the eschatological state of man, but it is precisely only an anticipation (not a partial verification, but an analogous verification). Those who enter into a religious community are pilgrims, moving toward the perfect communion of heaven. The communion which is a religious order serves here on earth that ultimate communion of the blessed, both within the order (in its members) and in the double apostolate of deepening the communion of charity within the Church and of extending it to others.

The communion which is a religious order is, like the Church, hierarchically structured. This means simply that Christ is re-presented, by those in authority, in his role as source of love, as model, as guide, as energizing force. (Cf., for example, the picture given by St. Ignatius of the ideal General of the Society in the *Constitutions*, IX [Epitome 781].) The primary (immediate) goal of the superior's activity is to help create communion and community; he also has a functional activity with regard to the particular works whereby the community implements its commitment to the Church and to the establishment and spread of that communion of love which is the "reign of God." But this functional activity is necessarily secondary (in the hierarchy of the superior's responsibilities, even if not perhaps in the division of his daily time and effort), because, unless the community is a true community, it will not serve the Church as a community (an order), but only as a conglomeration of individuals.

The central act of the superior can be said to be the Eucharistic liturgy, which he celebrates at the head of the community or which another celebrates in his place. The Eucharistic liturgy is central both really and symbolically, or both in significance and efficacy. For it gives ritual expression to what the Church and therefore the religious order is: the gathering of men united to each other and to Christ, and caught up into the movement of love for the Father which is the being of the Word and which is reflected with all the perfection possible to a creature in his humanity. In giving expression to what the Church is, the Eucharistic liturgy effectively draws the members of Christ more fully into the movement of charity.

If the primary role of the superior is to foster communion, the primary

response of the members of the community is their effective commitment (with all that this implies of self-dispossession, of emergence from egoism) to communion or the union of charity understood according to all its dimensions.

Fr. John J. McMahon, also a Committee member, drew from the *Constitutions* some indications of St. Ignatius' thinking on the question of union in the Society. These notes, attached to this report as Appendix A, were distributed to all members of the New York Province, together with the essays of Frs. Johann and O'Connell, in late April.

Immediate reactions

One of the more detailed responses to the three papers prepared by Frs. Johann, O'Connell and J. McMahon came from still another Committee member, Fr. James W. Gaffney. He found Fr. Johann's distinction on the types of community to be valuable for abstract analysis and for giving an orientation to one's thought on the general subject, but he looked for more notice of the facts, more attention to psychology and sociology. He remarked a similar lack in Fr. O'Connell's otherwise useful comments on the Church as a community pledged to enlarge itself. He wondered whether the distinction between "ultimate work" and "particular job" was really a valid one. Fr. Gaffney wrote:

Under one aspect, at least, my basic difficulty with Fr. Johann's paper is taken up by Fr. O'Connell in his effort to clarify "the relation between 'communion' and 'work'." I find this effort a helpful one, but with certain reservations. In the first place, I think that here too the sharp dichotomy between "unity" and "work" is too easily assumed to be a realistic one; collaboration and personal union are not, in the concrete, adequately distinct, any more than one's reality as a person is adequately distinct from one's reality as a worker. Accordingly, I disagree with Fr. O'Connell's apparent agreement with Fr. Johann that "unity" and "work" (understood as cooperative work) are well described by such terms of subordination as "primary" and "secondary." I suspect, too, that this issue is not likely to find a satisfactory resolution on the basis of theology unless preliminary work is done rather in the categories of psychology and sociology; psychological and sociological preconceptions are inevitably brought to the theological discussion and it is important that they should be conscious and plausible preconceptions. It might be that Fr. O'Connell's very useful correlation of the communal and missionary aspects of the Church would gain in definiteness if more psychological and sociological notions were employed. As it is, I have difficulty comprehending the logic by which a complete dichotomy is denied between the "ultimate work" and the "particular job" while at the same time it is affirmed that the former is and the latter is not "a constitutive element of the communion". . . . I would give some stress to this because of my conviction that in many instances the deterioration of commitment to the community derives mainly from the deterioration of respect for particular jobs. Here again, I have in mind the

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

sense in which the work is the *raison d'être* of unity, such that unity disintegrates to the extent that the work comes into disrepute.

In a second paper, entitled *From Jesuit Fellowship to Jesuit Authority*, Fr. Gaffney urged the potential value of a careful review of the famous *Deliberation of the First Fathers, 1539*. The decision taken at the close of this deliberation to yoke the first fathers of the Society under obedience to one of their number was the result of much prayer, thought, and democratic discussion. Fr. Gaffney suggested:

Perhaps it would not be irrelevant to conceive our own task in this time of widespread perplexity over those very issues of Jesuit fellowship and Jesuit authority, as one of replicating as far as our circumstances allow the task that they performed; determining, if we can, by a program of meditation and discussion, whether and in what sense we can admit the priority of their premises, approve the correctness of their conclusions, and trust the efficacy of their procedures.

Fr. W. Norris Clarke, another Committee member, also drafted an extensive response to the Johann-O'Connell papers. The positive statement of his views will be described in the last part of this report. It may help, however, to insert at this point his summary of special difficulties encountered today in discussions of Jesuit obedience of the judgment.

According to a growing consensus of our better interpreters of the spiritual life and Jesuit spirit, as I judge the trend at least and as seems to me the truth, obedience of judgment should mean this: that we use all the efforts of our good will to overcome any personal bias and prejudices, and open our intellects to understand the superior's command in the best possible light, give the maximum benefit of doubt to it and the best chance possible of proving itself efficacious. The will is used to bend the perhaps biased intellect, to let whatever *truth* and *good* there is appear to the full. It should not be used somehow to twist the intellect away from truth and reality to see things as they are not: this would be contrary to human dignity and the inviolability of the light of human intelligence on which the dignity of the person rests.

Difficulties in this Province (most of these are not peculiar to our Province but to our times):

1) *Lack of communication* between superiors and members. The result is that subjects do not understand the direction of superiors and do not see it as genuinely expressing the lived consensus, the lived unity of the community as a whole; nor do superiors always have an adequate feeling as a result, of just what the consensus and needs of their communities really are. Thus the authority is imposed from above as though arbitrarily from outside and not truly expressing the lived unity of the Society, its present lived wisdom.

2) *Appeal to tradition* for its own sake: Commands may appear to come (or

actually come) from the sheer motive of tradition, that we have always done things this way. In a world like ours of unprecedentedly rapid change, plus the keen awareness of young people of this, this appeal has very little effective convincing weight any more. In a world of change—philosophers, educators, social thinkers agree—the authentic principles of stability should be goals, ends, basic attitudes, not customary ways and means of achieving these, no matter how well these have worked before. There should be sense that commands proceed from the inner spirit of the Society informed by the present lived wisdom in practice of the community. The superior can no longer be an autonomous source of practical wisdom.

3) *Among the young, lack of adequate experience, understanding, esteem of authority-obedience as a lived concrete value* in their own lives before entering the Society. Overpermissive parents, teachers, abuse of principle of democracy, majority vote on everything.

4) *Overconcern, preoccupation with personal development, self-fulfillment, fear of commitment to "lose themselves" in higher cause in order to find true self. Unconscious self-centeredness.*

Absolutizing Society and subject

As an example of the tenor of the organized community discussions held in the Province on the Johann-O'Connell-McMahon papers, it may be useful to call attention to items recorded in a report on discussions attended by Jesuits of the Fordham University community. One notes that some felt the notion of authority as service had, in practice, been lost sight of until the Second Vatican Council called us to reconsider the question. Further, it was remarked, just as in sacramental theology the *ex opere operato* concept tended to mechanize the personal relationship which sacrament demands, so, too, in the matter of authority and obedience a similar notion had long prevailed and dimmed "the ideal of authority and obedience as an active, living dialogue on both sides."

According to one report of the Fordham discussion, some younger Jesuits voiced a fear of "absolutizing" the Society to the detriment of the greater good of the Church. They felt that if, after representation, consultation, and prayer, the individual's conscience told him he could not obey some precept of a superior, he should not obey it. Here seemed to be the truly crucial area in the entire debate today. In this connection, it was asked whether or not we may extend the idea of sin to include going against the greater good of the Church. It may be that this is the truer conception, but the report remarked that it remains matter for discussion.

In brief essays written after the main labors of the Committee had been completed, Fr. Johann dealt with the problems inherent in a tendency to "absolutize" subjectivity when discussing authority-obedience. He wrote:

. . . if morality means anything, it means not presuming to decide on my own about the justice and goodness of actions that affect others. The determination of the good is essentially a communal effort and presupposes on the part of all a willingness to submit to the requirements of community.

Obedience to legitimate authority is one such requirement. It does not, to be sure, guarantee the intrinsic reasonableness of my actions (nothing can guarantee that, although open and free discussion is a help). But obedience does make possible the insertion of my actions into a joint effort and alone assures their consistency with common life.

Subjectivity, therefore, is not an absolute value. It is essentially correlative to community. When it commits itself to the requirements of social process, its innovating capacity is a force for social reconstruction and reform. Only its contribution can forestall social sclerosis. But when subjectivity cuts loose from these requirements, it sinks into subjectivism and the harm it then does is more than subjective.

SYNTHETIC MOMENT: TOWARD TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

When the Province Committee on Freedom-Authority-Obedience met in mid-June to review the status of its own thought and discussion, as well as that of so many interested members of the Province, on the questions proposed for consideration, the Committee's members agreed the moment was not at hand for attempting a grand synthesis or drafting final conclusions. Instead, the chairman was asked to draw up a report along the lines followed in these pages. Several strongly recommended, however, that the report include extended excerpts from a tentative summation, *Jesuit Obedience: Rationale and Mystique*, prepared by Fr. W. Norris Clarke, of the Committee. (Fr. Clarke's comments on special difficulties with respect to obedience in the Society have been recorded above.) The following paragraphs present his positive formulations. It will be obvious to any reader that they spring in part from a dialectical response to the stimulus of the earlier papers by Frs. Johann and O'Connell.

1) The meaning, need and value of obedience should all flow directly from the aim and nature of the Society. Our aim is the double one of personal salvation attained through an apostolic mode of life working in the Church for the salvation of others. In this integrated double goal the stress should be on the apostolic life as the primary center of our conscious concern. In view of our dignity as persons and sons of God, our own personal self-realization as images of God must not be diminished or destroyed in the process of working for the salvation of others: a human person can never be used as a mere instrument for attaining some other goal, no matter how noble.

However, the spirit of the Society is that this personal self-realization, though

a necessary condition for our remaining in the Society, should not be the central focus of our conscious concern. This should rather be apostolic love for others in the spirit of the world-redemptive love of Christ for the world in the Church. Self-realization should be able to be achieved primarily through this apostolic vocation, and should be subordinated to it in our conscious motivation. If a particular person, for whatever reasons, cannot live this way, but rather takes his own development as his central concern and motivation, with apostolic service as means to this, or subordinate in concern and motivation to this self-realization, then such a person is not really the type who can share the authentic spirit of the Society (or any apostolic order) and should not be encouraged to enter it, or be encouraged to leave as soon as possible when this becomes clear.

2) Granted the aim and nature of the Society as stated above, authority and its correlate of obedience flow immediately from this as providing the form which unites the multiplicity of members into the living unity proper to a human society. A society or community is impossible without unity and a principle of unity, and in a human society this unity and its informing principle must be incarnate in some visible way like man's own spirit. The superior is this visible incarnation of the unity of the Society, and obedience is the response of the members to this exigency of unity, their yielding to be so formed into one. Insofar as one truly loves the Society and its end and freely takes on this end by entering the Society, he should genuinely love and take on freely this bond of unity which is obedience, and freely live under it.

3) The purpose of authority is thus to help us achieve our goal in entering the Society and the goal of the Society as a whole. It is thus to achieve the common good or end. But since this includes both personal salvation as well as that of others, in the relation specified in No. 1 above, the superior's obligation and purpose is to act as effective unifying agent for this double goal held in careful balance, but with the apostolic effectiveness of the Society always receiving the primary focus of his direction, as should be the case in each member too. Despite the truth and fruitfulness of Fr. Johann's distinction between societies ordered primarily toward a goal outside of them and those whose own interior communion of love is their primary end, I do not think the Society can be classed as primarily the latter type. Though internal charity is an extremely important part of the Jesuit spirit and necessary for its healthy life and even attaining its apostolic aim, I think it would be unrealistic and somewhat misleading to conclude that the formation of a community of love is our primary aim or actually the dominant psychological motivation for our entering the Society. This is the motive dominating family life, friendship, perhaps even the Church as a whole (?). But the authentic and actual, historically verified Jesuit spirit seems to me to be that we enter to devote ourselves to the love and service of God in the Church and are willing for this end to give up the type of love we could have had in family, choosing our own friends, etc. We hope to find the latter too, but are willing to sacrifice it if necessary. In a word we are apostolate-centered men and any attempt to make the internal community of Jesuits themselves our primary concern would

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

be unrealistic and misguided. Yet it must be blended in as an important secondary concern.

4) The necessary role of unifying form and visible expression of the unity of the Society which is the meaning of authority and obedience must, however, be adapted to fit the kind of beings that are to be united. These are free human persons and redeemed sons of God. Hence they must be governed in a way that not only respects but actively fosters their human dignity, their freedom in committing themselves to the aim and life of the Society, and full unfolding of their talents and initiative. And since free obedience out of love and zeal for the common end is the only type appropriate to the members, authority should be exercised in such a way that it respects and tries to evoke to the full this kind of response from the members.

This implies a mature type of obedience and obedience appropriate to mature, highly educated and talented men, not that of the master-servant, the officer-soldier, or even the father-child relation, but a unique *sui generis* one. The model of the medieval monastery, where the abbot was often the only or principal wise man and many or most of the monks were simple and uneducated men, is not apt for the Society.

5) The above implies that to be truly effective, authority in the Society must be exercised so as to have the support to the greatest degree possible of the free willing consent of the governed. (This is a sound, almost necessary principle for the healthy functioning of any permanent type of human society.) This implies careful attention paid to "feedback" between the community and the superior, or adequate communication lines, so that the superior has the feel of the community opinion on significant issues, their agreement or not with his policies, leadership, projects, etc. This does not mean that he only does all the time what the community wants by popular majority vote, but that there be for the most part a flexible, healthy, reasonably human, lived consensus of the *sanior* and (hopefully) *major pars populi*. This should be a positive goal of high importance. In the modern world where the superior is usually no longer *the* expert but only the guide of many highly skilled specialists, this constant rhythm of interchange is essential both for effectiveness and contentment.

6) But despite the above need to maintain unity with his community and their living consensus behind his rule, if the superior is to be the effective form of unity of the community, *he* must after all consultation make *decisive* decisions, command where necessary, and enforce his decisions with firm mature vigor. There is certainly a point beyond which he must apply his authority with intransigence. Otherwise he will sacrifice respect and no longer fulfill his role as effective visible form of unity. At this point those under him must simply obey, and should do so cheerfully, understanding the necessity and intrinsic good of obedience and freely taking on its burden. Endless yielding to representation or pressure is demoralizing for all concerned and yields no lasting good fruits.

7) "Blind obedience" if taken literally would be quite contrary to the dignity of the human person and therefore unsound theologically as well as philo-

sophically. *I* must always judge in the case of every act I do whether it is right *for me* to act thus now, nor can I put off this responsibility on anyone else; otherwise it would cease to be an authentic human act, as St. Thomas himself says: "It is not up to the subject to pass judgment on the precept of his superior, but rather on whether he should obey the precept, for it is this which is his concern. For each one is held to examine his own acts according to the knowledge which he has from God, whether it be natural, acquired, or infused: for every man must act according to . . . reason" (*De Ver.*, q. 17, a5 ad 4m).

The language of "blind obedience" and other such phrases belongs to the rhetoric of a past age that no longer brings us light, and should be dropped from our spiritual instruction. It can only do harm today. Therefore the subject should always make the responsible judgment: (a) whether he who commands has the right to command and the human fitness to command here and now (not senile, temporarily irrational, etc.); (b) whether what is commanded is a sin or vitiates his conscience; (c) whether the command comes within the scope or domain to which obedience extends. In case of doubt he should, out of sincere respect for authority and humility, give the benefit of the doubt to the superior and only refuse when the case seems clear-cut to him. The above is traditional doctrine. Traditional practice and prudence would also dictate the following addition: (d) one can and often should refrain temporarily from obeying, especially in the case of a command from a distant and higher superior, when it seems clear that the command is impractical and would cause greater harm than good, or go against some higher good or objective that is, or should be, clearly willed by a reasonable superior; this occurs in the case of the superior's lack of knowledge of the immediate concrete situation or of some implication of his command, or one's own knowledge that the superior is going against some directive of a higher authority, etc. The sound application of this principle requires mature prudence, sincere good will, and devotion to the spirit and aim of the Society, and humble detachment from one's own self-interest in the issue. N.B.—The following principle, reported to be held by some, is *not* a sound one: as long as one agrees with the goal of the superior, the common good, it does not matter if one chooses one's own means to the end, even quite contrary to the explicit command of the superior.

8) The above flow from the application of human reason (philosophy plus prudence) to the problem. The wish to imitate Christ adds a deeper supernatural dimension. Just as he lovingly submitted his will to that of his Father and was obedient even unto the death of the Cross, so we should wish to become more one with him and participate in his obedience to his Father by obeying our superior as the Father, with greater love, humility, and self-detachment than reason alone would dictate, in the spirit of a mystical death to self (guided by prudence).

Matching the above specifically Christian mystery—dimension of obedience in the *subject*, there should be a corresponding "mystique" or supernatural dimension in the mode of governing of the *superior*. This should be a conscious

imitation of the model of governing given by our Lord himself: "not as lording it over one's subjects" but as one who serves, *servus servorum*, with humility and charity, truly seeking the greater good of the person commanded as integrated with the common good of the Society.

CONCLUSION

In place of the synthesis which is not here possible, indications may be given, by way of conclusion, of major areas whose elaboration would, it seems, provide such a synthesis or, at least, a document to serve as basis for profitable reflection. There is need of:

1) a broad philosophico-theological statement on authority and obedience in the Church:

- a) *philosophical*: authority and obedience as a phenomenon proper to man as person (therefore in community);
- b) *theological*: authority and obedience in the life of Christ and in the life of the Church, as both of these are presented in the New Testament; a broad sketch of the concrete forms which the authority-obedience relationship has taken over the centuries (in the Church at large and in the religious orders), as a revelation both of the essentials of this relationship and as a manifestation of the diversity of possible embodiments of the essentials.

2) a positive statement on Jesuit obedience (avoiding an older rhetoric which at best is a psychological block for many today, at worst connotes untenable ideas on obedience), stressing:

- a) the *role of obedience* in the Jesuit apostolate and in the personal fulfillment in Christ of the individual Jesuit apostle;
- b) the *role of the superior*: as instrument and expression of the Society's unity in Christ-at-work-in-the-world; as therefore the servant of the community and of the individual Jesuit;
- c) the *role of authority-obedience as active dialogue* at the service of of the Society's apostolic work, and the accompanying need to set up institutional means for achieving this active dialogue (means that would vary according to type of community—one thinks of the obvious need, for instance, to study in detail the special psychological and sociological characteristics of community life and the appropriate authority-obedience relationships in a house of studies—composition of community, national culture, local milieu).

3) an attempt, well-grounded in a responsible moral theology, to face the question of "religious disobedience." (By a "responsible moral theology" is meant one aware of the evolving sensitivities of social and

individual conscience, and of the reflection of these in the documents of Vatican II; concretely, the increased sense of individual dignity, of social responsibility, of inalienable responsibility for personal judgment and action.) This question would not seem to be quite the same for the Society as for the Church. But to handle the question of "religious disobedience" correctly, adequately, and creatively for the Society, it must first be resolved on the larger scale of the Church.

APPENDIX

UNION IN THE SOCIETY

The purpose of these brief notes is to indicate the main lines of the thinking of St. Ignatius on union in the Society. Only the *Constitutions* are referred to. Three headings are made: The Importance of Union, Helps to Union, and the Difficulties.

Importance of union

The importance of union in the mind of St. Ignatius can be judged from the fact that he devotes the Eighth Part of the *Constitutions* to a consideration of the means for promoting union. Moreover, he states that to foster union was one of the primary intentions he had in writing the *Constitutions* (135).

"The Society cannot continue to exist or be governed and hence cannot attain its end, if the members have not been united among themselves and with their head" (655). The statement is not too strong; for a house divided against itself cannot stand.

"United by the bond of fraternal charity, the members will be able better and more effectively to devote themselves to the service of God and the help of the neighbor" (273). Hence, union is to be sought after, with the greatest possible care. It is to be sought after; it just does not happen.

Helps to union

1) Superiors have a special role to fulfill in fostering union, that is, the union of minds and hearts in charity and mutual love (821). Superiors should possess, as far as possible, the qualities Ignatius desired in the general (817).

Among these "gifts of God," they will have and manifest "love and care for their subjects" in such a way that the subjects become convinced that their superior has the knowledge, the will, and the ability to govern them well in the Lord (667). It will also help union, if the superior commands with circumspection and in an orderly way. He will more-

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

over show concern for the duty of subjects to obey by using all possible good will, modesty, and love in the Lord. At times he will leave something to their own choice when he sees that this will probably help them; at times he will yield to their wishes and go along with them, when he perceives that this will be more suitable (667). One beholds here the loving mind and heart of Ignatius for his men; he is concerned about building up union. One can understand why he wished the superior to be conspicuous for the splendor of charity and humility, virtues that will make him lovable to God and men (725).

2) Subjects likewise have a contribution to make to union. They will practice real obedience (84). For union in the Society is brought about in large measure by this kind of obedience, which must always be maintained in its vigor (659, 821).

Subjects moreover will have due regard for proper subordination. We must swim in channels. Superiors and subjects will observe this order: subjects will recur to their local superior; local superiors will recur to the provincials; provincials will recur to the general (662).

3) Both subjects and superiors have a common contribution to make towards union. "The chief bond of union in the Society is the love of God and our Lord Jesus Christ." If, therefore, the superior and the inferior are strongly united to the divine and highest Goodness, they will very easily become united among themselves (671). To be united to God means to make a total gift of oneself to the service of God, without the option of ever taking it back (283). The "*sune et suscipe*" of the *Exercises* and partial commitment are incompatible. Ignatius wanted no part-time religious in the Society.

Other helps to union are: careful selection of candidates (657); frequent exhortations on union (280); consensus and conformity in interior and external matters (273, 671, 676); knowledge of the language of the region where one resides (214); contempt of material gain (671); manifestations of conscience (91-97).

Difficulties

As regards difficulties, St. Ignatius writes that the more difficult it is to bring about union between the members and the head and among the members themselves, since they are scattered widely in many parts of the world, the more vigorous must be the search for the means that will build up union. Moreover, usually the men will be learned and of great influence (655, 666). In view of these and other difficulties, St. Ignatius presents his programs for union in the Eighth Part of the *Constitutions*.

Whatever is opposed to union, is not to be permitted (273).

The lethal enemy of union is love of oneself (*sui ipsius amor*) (671).

Anyone who is discovered as the author of division or dissension in a community must be separated from it; if this remedy does not suffice, he should be dismissed from the Society (664, 665).

He warns that "very difficult characters" are not to be admitted into the Society (152). Men who have not gotten their vices under good control will not brook order, much less union which in Christ our Lord is so necessary for preserving the good estate and the way of acting of this Society (657).

J. McMAHON, S.J.
Auriesville, N.Y.

READERS' FORUM

Priest and Poet

Congratulations to you for the extreme readability lately of articles and reviews in WOODSTOCK LETTERS. I like especially the timeliness of many subjects discussed, often timeless old subjects, and the situation of these discussions in a Jesuit context, welcome in particular to readers of your review.

Many old Jesuit ideas come up for discussion, rethinking, and re-evaluation, in these *aggiornamento* days. Much now is proposed both for discard and for adoption. Liturgical worship, community-life solitariness, university proceedings and franchise, "new" and "old breed" differences are a few of the many old subjects that here and there are by now nearly rather thoroughly discussed. One trained as a Jesuit in a literary tradition of humanist scholarship rejoices to find that speculation about art in any of its forms still goes on at a high level in our courses (or houses) of formation and in our reviews.

In all our much-needed restatements of value and concern, the central question for anyone who makes an act of faith in the 21st Ecumenical Council of the Church, Vatican II, and

in the 31st General Congregation of the Society needs, one supposes, to be that of a thoroughgoing renewal of Christian conscience. One looks for an updated sense of shared purpose, inspiration, and motivation, so as to live a religious life with Christ and in Christ for the salvation of the world. The Society's mission is an extension of Christ's ongoing mission, the corporate Church.

Dialogue by itself may not far advance such a realized sense of personal renewal, especially not so when its conclusions on basic issues are still for the most part left "up in the air": old wine in new wineskins? or new wine in old wineskins? or a new form of rhetoric whose ferment has little to do with wine or vines or vineyards, old or new, in the exacting senses of the Gospel metaphor "I am the vine; you are the branches"? Dialogue is, of course, in itself valuable for persons who live in community. A realized sense of renewal takes time, to be sure, and makes special and different practical demands on different individual temperaments, in particular on different priests. Jesuits are wondering: when will *les mots officiels* become *les mots actuels*, the operative words of the Society's government and occupation. No one needs now just to wait for others, nor to do much further

talking. One seldom advances without some risks and losses; whenever one has made a choice of ways, there remains in memory ever afterwards "the road not taken": "Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—/ I took the one less traveled by, / And that has made all the difference." One can seldom go back.

John L'Heureux, S.J.: priest and poet

With notable well-earned authority, Fr. John L'Heureux, S.J., now (I understand) a welcome artist in studies at Harvard University, has addressed himself without clichés (WL, Summer, 1967) to a subject of perennial concern for almost all Jesuit men of letters: "The Word: For Priest and Poet." Admirably he calls attention to both differences and likenesses between the two charisms, priestly and poetic, each an uncommon grace. He does not gloss over difficulties from either side when he asks if these two charisms might sometimes in one person intersect and interact. He does not sound as though by his own answers he thought he were forever settling the questions he asks: "Does the charism of the priest leave room for the grace of the poet?" As he would presumably be the first to agree, much that he says by way of premise, example, and conclusion is arguable, highly selective as to definition and a bit off-center by way of example. Personally, I should not agree with his final reasoned judgment, "When a priest becomes a poet (an unlikely event) he functions only minimally as a priest." Unlike me, Fr. L'Heureux speaks with a double authority; his conclusion is understandable; maybe he is right. Still, in the light of English speaking poets as capable as Blessed

Robert Southwell and Gerard Manley Hopkins (who once thought as Fr. L'Heureux now thinks, but later changed his mind), as capable as Peter Levi and Daniel Berrigan, all dedicated and energetic Jesuit priests, and in the light of the poetries from other religious families, like William Dunbar's, a 16th century Franciscan, or Bro. Antoninus', William Everson's, a 20th century Dominican, one may all the same wonder if Fr. L'Heureux may not have pushed his thesis too far. Does his philosophical analysis account for actual history? Oppositions and antagonisms are admittedly rife between these two vocations of priest (or religious) and of poet, but they are not always irreconcilable. I should wonder if in spite of understandable difficulties and differences they ever need absolutely to be at total war. Such a dual vocation need not, I believe, with the grace of God and with prayer, lead to schizophrenia.

Leo Cardinal Suenens, speaking to artists on behalf of Pope Paul VI, in one of the concluding messages of Vatican II, December 8, 1965 (the only official notice I remember that the Church has ever taken of artists at an ecumenical council) reminded them: "You are our friends. The Church has long since joined in alliance with you. . . . Today, as yesterday, the Church needs you and turns to you."

A trapped man

So, too, the Church needs as never before the word of her priests. As Fr. L'Heureux says, "the poet and the priest create through words." Lucky for the Church, and for all men, when two Pentecostal gifts of empowerment, or charisms, are bestowed on one per-

son. Almost all this that I have written to you is arguable, and much, I expect, is unintentionally—as Fr. John Courtney Murray might say, “adventurously mistaken.” But on this last point I feel sure, and know, that I am in the right. There is a quality of uniqueness about any worthwhile vocation. The hard and honest irony and the verbal complexity by which a modern poet goes about telling his vision to others is not a quality that needs to be denied to the creative word of the priest. Our Blessed Lord often used irony. Strains and risks are built-in difficulties that the priest-poet, like other poets, must face and overcome pretty much alone. Unless one first sees something of consequence, there may be little point in telling others what one sees in words. What would be the merit of any vocation that did not experience tension or strain? What would be the value of any rare God-given gift, or charism, that did not impose some obligation of service? In a literal sense, the poet (priest, or not) is a trapped person whose charism obliges him to go on reasoning “obliquely on sensitive particulars” no matter what the high cost (headaches and heartaches) of personal strain. Willy-nilly, that is a conviction that all poets share. One cannot simply

refuse to admit the existence of a daemon, good or bad. The Jesuit’s subtle training in the discernment of spirits may oblige a priest to recognize that his particular daemon wants him to speak God’s creative word in poetic lines. The “verbal discipline” exacted of a poet could turn out to be a form of asceticism, like scholarship, that might help a priest in his imitation of Christ. There is poetry and there is drama in every offering of the Mass.

As priests and poets go on working together in the endeavor to build God’s kingdom here in this imperfect world, I see no compelling reason to imagine why their two gracious charms of speech, or of tongues, as in Fr. L’Heureux’s own case, may not sometimes speak happily in concert.

“Bring me my bow of burning gold!
Bring me my arrows of desire!
Bring me my spear! Oh clouds, unfold!
Bring me my chariot of fire!

“I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my
hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem,
In England’s green and pleasant
land.”

WILLIAM T. NOON, S.J.
LE MOYNE COLLEGE
SYRACUSE, NEW YORK

