



INDEES

IN
PIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

BX3701 .S88

v.40: no.4(2008:winter)

01/22/2009

Current Periodicals

**The Value and Viability of the
Jesuit Brother's Vocation**

An American Perspective

WILLIAM REHG, S.J.

THE SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

The Seminar is composed of a number of Jesuits appointed from their provinces in the United States.

It concerns itself with topics pertaining to the spiritual doctrine and practice of Jesuits, especially United States Jesuits, and communicates the results to the members of the provinces through its publication, *STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS*. This is done in the spirit of Vatican II's recommendation that religious institutes recapture the original inspiration of their founders and adapt it to the circumstances of modern times. The Seminar welcomes reactions or comments in regard to the material that it publishes.

The Seminar focuses its direct attention on the life and work of the Jesuits of the United States. The issues treated may be common also to Jesuits of other regions, to other priests, religious, and laity, to both men and women. Hence, the journal, while meant especially for American Jesuits, is not exclusively for them. Others who may find it helpful are cordially welcome to make use of it.

CURRENT MEMBERS OF THE SEMINAR

R. Bentley Anderson, S.J., teaches history at St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. (2008)

Richard A. Blake, S.J., is chairman of the Seminar and editor of *STUDIES*; he teaches film studies at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. (2002)

James T. Bretzke, S.J., teaches theology at Boston College School of Theology and Ministry, Boston, Mass. (2006)

Gerald T. Cobb, S.J., teaches English at Seattle University, Seattle, Wash. (2007)

Patrick J. Howell, S.J., is rector of the Jesuit Community and Vice-President for Mission and Ministry at Seattle University, Seattle, Wash. (2006)

Mark S. Massa, S.J., teaches theology and is director of the American Catholic Studies Program at Fordham University, Bronx, N. Y. (2006)

Thomas Massaro, S.J., teaches theology at Boston College School of Theology and Ministry, Boston, Mass. (2006)

Michael C. McCarthy, S.J., teaches theology and classics at Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, Cal. (2008)

Thomas J. Scirghi, S.J., teaches liturgy at the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, Berkeley, Cal. (2007)

Thomas Worcester, S.J., teaches history at the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass. (2007)

Michael A. Zampelli, S.J., teaches theater and dance at Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, Cal. (2007)

The opinions expressed in *STUDIES* are those of the individual authors thereof. Parentheses designate year of entry as a Seminar member.

Copyright © 2008 and published by the Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality

Business Office

Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits
3601 Lindell Blvd.,
St. Louis, MO 63108
Tel. 314-633-4622 ;Fax 314-633-4623
E-mail ijes@jesuitsources.com

Editorial Office

Faber House
102 College Road
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3841
Tel. 617-552-0860; Fax 617-552-0925
E-mail fleminpb@bc.edu

THE VALUE AND VIABILITY OF THE JESUIT BROTHER'S VOCATION

An American Perspective

William Rehg, S.J.

STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

40/4 • WINTER 2008

the first word . . .

Counting one's blessings at the end of the year should include not living in Cleveland. No, this isn't a set up for a recycled "mistake on the lake" joke, nor a reference to the once incendiary nature of the Cuyahoga River. Actually, the one time I visited the city, some twenty years ago, it was undergoing an impressive downtown redevelopment program, and the brethren tell me that John Carroll University ranks among the most beautiful Jesuit campuses in the country. I've got nothing against Cleveland. I'll expand the blessing to include not living in Cincinnati or Columbus or Youngstown or Ashtabula, or any other place in Ohio. Now let's be more positive. I'm adding my Massachusetts address as another reason for year's end gratitude.

My reasoning should not be construed as East Coast chauvinism, much less an endorsement of the eternal New England winter. It's all politics, pure and simple. During an endless national campaign, living in a highly contested state like Ohio would push anyone close to the brink. In a safe state like Massachusetts, where a Labrador retriever could be elected dog catcher on the Democratic ticket, canvassers and campaign committees, pollsters and pundits ignore us. We're not worth their time and money. We have no relentless barrage of automated phone calls during dinner time, no well scrubbed college students with clipboards ringing our doorbells during the climactic scene of N.C.I.S., and no mailboxes so stuffed with handbills that the seasonal L. L. Bean catalogues must relocate to a safe haven under the door mat. In this media Green Zone, radio, television, and newspapers go about their normal business of selling us toothpaste, light beer, and gas guzzlers as though there were no election on the horizon. If I had to suffer what the contested electorate of Ohio endures every four years, I would have applied for transcription to the province of outer Samoa during the Ford administration. (Provincials, please note: just kidding.)

When did political discourse become so obnoxious? Other adjectives suggest themselves: toxic, misleading, deceptive, nasty, or as we clergy would have it, simply uncharitable. The question has another side to it, of course. When did many of us develop a simple revulsion for what campaign rhetoric has become. Some years ago, when my assignment included writing weekly political editorials at *America*, all of us on the staff lived politics: Watergate, the Vietnam War, Reagan Democrats, Iran's revolution, Camp David, Europe after the Berlin wall—you name it. As a staff we watched the presidential debates with a sense of obligation bordering on "the Easter duty" and kept a record of points scored as though it were the Super Bowl. I remember regularly

staying up as the “returns from outlying districts” tipped one state or another. It was exciting stuff, and I loved it. Now we have strategies of “wedge issues” designed to divide candidates and their constituencies. Thus the “debate” degenerates into “gotcha” games, twisting one’s words and contexts into absurd distortions, and relentless negative ads, designed to show, assert, or insinuate the worst of an opponent.

This year I skipped the debates altogether and passed over the more partisan columnists and political comedians that I usually enjoy in the off-season. Was it merely terminal grumpiness? The news summaries of campaign events provided enough information for me to make an informed decision on candidates and issues. Even that Spartan diet of low-media consumption probably made me a better informed voter than all but a few experts in every election before 1960. (That was the year the election turned on Kennedy’s sparkling Irish smile and Nixon’s sweaty upper lip. It’s been downhill ever since.) At least this year my abstinence insured that I was being neither brainwashed nor bludgeoned into a political decision. And it was a good prescription for the psychological ulcers.

Sometimes I have the feeling that we’re all living in George Orwell’s *1984*, that once futuristic novel set in a timeframe of nearly 35 years ago. Writing in 1949, when intellectuals were starting to re-evaluate their infatuation with the Soviet Union in the light of Stalin’s atrocities and the Cold War, Orwell commented that who controls the present, controls the past, and who controls the past controls the future. As I understand it, he was suggesting that anybody who controls present day media giants, and that would include the government, big business, and churches as conveyers of information, has the power to rewrite and reinterpret history. And once history becomes distorted and the distortion is repeated often enough, then it justifies taking dangerous roadways into the future. In the novel, Orwell’s hero Winston Smith rewrites history to suit the aspirations of The Party. Orwell might have been onto something: language can be more destructive than the H-Bomb. Campaign language certainly flirts with that danger.

Language sat at the top of Orwell’s concerns for many years. In his wonderful essay of 1946, “Politics and the English Language” he makes the point that sloppy language leads to sloppy thought and sloppy thought leads a writer or speaker into sloppy language. Of course, political strategy often deliberately takes advantage of this lethal circle. Candidates prefer to obfuscate the issues, rather than clarify them and risk alienating any sector of the electorate, including the obsessed fringes of their base. They “stay on message,” which means repeating frothy generalities in response to any question rather than committing themselves to “yes,” “no,” or honestly but unthinkably, “I don’t know,” or “That’s too complicated for a simple answer,” or “I’ll have to work that out with my expert advisers.” As a result, a question about the economy leads to an endorsement of the middle class, a fair tax structure, collaboration with other countries on trade issues, and so on. What’s not

to like? Is anyone against the middle class or fairness or trade? Candidates learn well from the parrots. The worst blunder is making a statement that can be recorded and repeated out of context in a thirty-second attack ad put on the internet by ideological zealots.

Orwell expresses special disdain for sloganeering, that is, clusters of meaningless words that masquerade as ideas. He likened them to prefabricated hen houses. What would he say about those elaborate backdrops with a catchphrase repeated every eighteen inches or so from one edge of the platform to the other. Not even he could figure out what these phrases mean. Every candidate favored "change" this year, but for all we know they might have been advocating a clean pair of socks or a pocketful of coins. When he was Governor of New York, Mario Cuomo once made a wise comment in a radio interview. He said that election discourse in an age of negative campaigning could be reduced to "The other guy's a bum; vote for me."

Let's not let ourselves off too easily. I wonder what Orwell would say about today's electorate. Are we getting the kinds of campaigns we deserve? The issues become more intractable as our attention spans shrink and predispose candidates to offer thirty-second solutions in simple declarative bromides. Remember Jack Nicholson's outburst in the courtroom scene near the end of "A Few Good Men" (1992). In response to Tom Cruise's prosecutorial demand: "I want the truth," Nicholson's character shouts "You can't handle the truth." It's easier to hang a label on an opposition candidate than to try to handle the truth, a fact that political marketers exploit in every election.

Are these crotchety reflections coming from an embittered conservative or a gloating liberal? If they serve their intended purpose, readers shouldn't be able to decide. I wanted them to resist being shoved into ideological categories. I once read that stereotyping involves stuffing persons or ideas into a carefully designed box and then reacting to the box rather than its contents. That's pretty good. I've been puzzling over just how much campaign-style rhetoric has spilled over into other areas of discourse and led to what Walter Ong once called "the decay of dialogue." Using meaningless words, like liberal and conservative, progressive and traditionalist, orthodox and heterodox, loyal and disloyal really leech the life out of serious discussion about contentious issues in the Church and in the Society. People of belief, Christians, Catholics and Jesuits really agree about a lot of fundamentals, even though we may differ on some. Wedge issues simplify one's thought process. The other guy is wrong, I'm right and there's no reason to continue the discussion. Orwell reminds us how sloppy, inaccurate, and misleading language divides us. Now that the election season has passed, the frustrations of the campaign may help us look critically into our own discourse among the people of God.

Confession is good for the soul. The previous paragraphs really offer little by way of introduction to this issue. The compulsion to say something about the two-year election campaign proved overwhelming. (For my penance I'll watch one hour of Fox News and read three editorials in the *New Republic*.) The essay that we offer in the following pages is an important one that deserves better treatment from the editor.

In this issue of *STUDIES* Bill Rehg has provided a brief history of the role of the Jesuit brothers throughout the centuries as a context for a series of sharp insights into the meaning of religious life for all of us. For many years we Jesuits have thought about the intrinsic tensions between priesthood and our secular-looking activities, like social work, teaching or administration. By switching the focus of attention from priesthood to the tensions between a brother's work and religious commitment in a sacerdotal order, he lets us re-examine the fundamentals of our lives together as Jesuits from a slightly different angle.

The challenges he specifies arise for all of us. As lay people take over more of our "priestly" roles as catechists, parish administrators, theologians, and chaplains, should Jesuit priests identify themselves through their sacramental or cultic function? This question grows ever more pointed. We will continue to face a priest shortage and subsequent pressure to become involved in parish ministries. Are teaching and research becoming luxuries Jesuit priests can no longer afford, or are they integral parts of our Jesuit ministry precisely as priests? Furthermore as lay people attend our schools of theology with the goal of assuming ministries in the Church, in our formation do we inadvertently stress the sacramental ministry as the one function that gives us an identity separate from our lay companions? In our training and thinking, should we emphasize differentiation or commonality, and how will this perception influence our fostering of vocations and formation goals?

You'll find the essay enjoyable to read and thoughtful. Bill does not offer us easy solutions, but he does provide a great deal of material for our reflection and prayer.

Richard A. Blake, S.J.

Editor

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2
II. The Jesuit Brother in the Old Society	5
III. From Restoration to Mid-Twentieth Century	8
IV. The Brother before Vatican II: Three Examples	15
V. The Jesuit Brother at the Crossroads	20
VI. The Late Twentieth Century	23
VII. Why Jesuit Brothers Today?	26
Letter to the Editor	39

For Brother Thomas J. Naughton, S.J. 1949 – 2000

*William Rehg, S.J., entered the Missouri Province in 1976, and in 1988 his request to change grade to the status of brother was approved. After completing his doctorate at Northwestern University, since 1992 he has taught philosophy at Saint Louis University, where he wrote two monographs, *Insight and Solidarity: The Discourse Ethics of Jürgen Habermas* (1994) and *Cogent Science in Context: The Science Wars, Argumentation Theory, and Habermas* (2009), and translated Habermas's *Between Facts and Norms* (1996). As a member of the Jesuit Seminar on Spirituality, he was author of an issue of *STUDIES* entitled "Christian Mindfulness" (34, no. 3; May 2002).*

The Value and Viability of the Jesuit Brother's Vocation

An American Perspective

In the past, when American Jesuits gathered in large communities, often in rural settings, brothers dedicated themselves to the maintenance of the institutions through their skilled labor. Now, as they assume roles once reserved to priests, their role in the apostolate raises questions not only about their place as coadjutors in an order of priests but about the nature of the priestly ministry of the Society itself.

The extinction of this grade of Brothers would be a great loss, a mutilation with grave consequences for the body of the Society and for its apostolate.

—Pedro Arrupe, S.J.

Note: This essay is a heavily revised version of a chapter for a collection of essays on religious brothers in America, to be published by the Religious Brothers Conference, and I thank them for giving me permission to use material from that chapter. I thank John Padberg, S.J., David Miros, John Fava, S.J., Eleonore Stump, Kevin Burke, S.J., Charles Jackson, S.J., Raymond Schroth, S.J., and members of the Studies Seminar for their willingness to read earlier drafts of this essay and comment on it; David Miros for his assistance at the Midwest Jesuit Archives in St. Louis; Joan Gaulen of the New Orleans Province Archives; Louis Mauro, S.J., for his recollections of the beginning of the National Jesuit Brothers' Committee (NJBC); Philip Pick, S.J., and Raymond Reis, S.J., for their recollections of Brother Rueppel; and John Fava, S.J. for lending me the NJBC file. Finally, an e-mail exchange with Thomas Kretz, S.J., and conversations with Thomas Buckley, S.J., and James Boyton, S.J., also stimulated my thoughts.

I. Introduction

A Jesuit brother—how’s that different from a priest?” “What made you want to be a brother?” I suspect that such queries are familiar to most Jesuit brothers in the United States. The religious brother’s vocation in general remains something of a mystery, even to most Catholics. In addition to this air of mystery, the Jesuit brother’s vocation is more or less invisible, at least in the United States. How many Catholics even know that the Society of Jesus admits brothers? I certainly did not when I applied to the Society in 1976. At the time, that would not be surprising for a Catholic layman unschooled in Jesuit education. Though significant changes in the brother’s vocation were afoot, most Jesuit brothers in those days still worked in the various background support roles that had once been associated with the “hidden life” of Jesus. Today the reason for invisibility more likely lies in the simple dearth of Jesuit brothers. As the brothers have taken on more public roles, their percentage among Jesuits in the United States has steadily dropped, sliding to five percent by 2008.¹

So one has to wonder: is the brother’s vocation in the Society of Jesus evolving—or merely disappearing? This question arises for the Society as a whole. After fluctuating around 25 percent through the nineteenth century, the overall proportion of Jesuit brothers worldwide began a gradual decline around the turn of the last century, and it now stands at around 9 percent.² But that question is both too quick and too large. It jumps past the considerably varied situations of brothers around the globe and calls for a foreknowledge that lies beyond us in any case.³ Yet we can say this: the Jesuit brother’s vocation will disappear if it does not present an attractive option for men considering reli-

¹That is, 157 of 2,869 Jesuits in the United States; see “The Society in Numbers,” *News and Features*, Documentation N. 88 (April 2008): 5.

²That is, 1,758 out of 18,815 Jesuits worldwide (“Society in Numbers,” 14). In 1900, there were 3,944 brothers out of 15,073 Jesuits worldwide (26.2 percent) (Charles J. Jackson, S.J., “One and the Same Vocation: The Jesuit Brother, 1957 to the Present,” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 30, no. 5 [November 1998], appendix). For demographic figures going back to 1599, see George E. Ganss, S.J., “Toward Understanding the Jesuit Brothers’ Vocation, Especially As Described in the Papal and Jesuit Documents,” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 13, no. 3 (May 1981): 61.

³For example, the “Society in Numbers” shows robust percentages of brothers in the Brazilian provinces in 2008: 17 percent of 224 Jesuits (BNE), 16 percent of 201 (BRC),

gious life. Here, then, we find a more immediate, manageable question that concerns all Jesuits, American Jesuits in particular, and Jesuit brothers above all: how do we understand the brother's vocation, and what makes that vocation attractive?

The viability of the Jesuit brother's vocation today depends on how we answer that question. In this essay I address the question as it arises for us Jesuits in the United States, against the background of a historical experience that began in sixteenth-century Rome, but then distinctively evolved in the United States over the last two centuries. The United States provides a particularly interesting context, where we find pronounced changes in the understanding of the vocation, accompanied by a striking decline in numbers. Although cultural factors beyond our control play a large role in this decline, we do exercise control over how we present the brother's vocation to applicants and novices. However, a positive presentation of the brother's vocation faces special challenges today, and we can no longer take its attractiveness for granted—not in a Society that understands itself as sacerdotal, and not in the wake of historical changes in the brothers' situation, which I describe below. In a fundamentally priestly Order, we should expect most Jesuits eventually to be ordained. But then why, in today's world, do we need brothers at all? For men who have generously offered their lives to Christ in the Society, the brother's vocation will present an attractive option only if it is clear that brothers make a distinctive, valuable contribution precisely as brothers, which complements that of Jesuit priests. But what is that contribution, and why is it so important, as Father Arrupe maintained? Might brothers play a crucial role precisely in the *sacerdotal* charism of the Society?

People of diverse backgrounds, talents, and education had been attracted to the newly formed Society, and Ignatius wanted to make room for them.

To grasp the brothers' distinctive contribution, we must examine both the theory and practice of the Jesuit brother's vocation, that is, both the changing spirituality of the brother and the actual practice of Jesuit brothers in their historical context. By "practice" I mean the kinds of

and 28 percent of 245 (BRM), whereas the Indian assistancy (ASM), for all its vocations (totaling 3,999 Jesuits), fewer than 7 percent of them are brothers.

work open to brothers and the models of holiness they have provided—what brothers generally do and how exemplary brothers did what brothers do. In fact, my own attraction to the Jesuits was heavily conditioned by an inchoate sense of what Jesuits did, seasoned by some attractive role models. I approached the vocation question with a mix of feelings: an attraction to serving Christ as a vowed religious, a lack of interest in typical priestly ministries. When I first gave the Jesuits a call in 1975, I knew they did a lot of different things, and so I could probably find something interesting to do. But my immediate question for the Jesuit I first contacted was this: are there Jesuit brothers? At the time, the brother's vocation attracted me precisely because of what brothers did not do, namely the sacramental ministries of priests. To be sure, during a stint with the Glenmary Missioners in Appalachia I had already noticed something attractive about the way their brothers modeled religious life. I later encountered that same style in some Jesuit brothers: a lack of churchy officiousness, a get-your-hands-dirty earthiness (quite literally in the case of the brothers working in grounds keeping and maintenance). Perhaps, in retrospect, I was attracted to something quite positive, the way these brothers managed to combine religious commitment with a kind of layman's unpretentiousness.

Bound up in these personal reactions, I believe, are questions concerning the understanding of the brother's vocation and its practice, both in general and in the lives of particular brothers who model religious life. To get a better sense of where we are today, I begin by examining two contrasting contexts: that of the brother in the pre-suppression Society (sec. 2), and that of brothers in the United States up to the Second Vatican Council (secs. 3 and 4). I then turn to postconciliar developments (secs. 5 and 6) and conclude with some tentative reflections on how we might understand the specific character of the brother's vocation as an attractive option that places Jesuit brothers in a position of "complementary equality" with priests (sec. 7). To document the brothers' evolving situation, I allow general data on their numbers and work to illuminate statements about the vocation itself; descriptions of particular brothers then give flesh to bare statistics. Each of these elements pertains to the attractiveness of the brother's vocation: the theoretical statements of the vocation appeal to the desire to follow Christ; lists of occupations delineate the diverse paths by which brothers could live out that following; and individual examples give us a feel for the unique, creative ways by which brothers have enlivened those paths.

II. The Jesuit Brother in the Old Society

The founding document of the Society of Jesus, the *Formula of the Institute*, understood the Society as an apostolic order of priests. First approved by Pope Paul III in 1540, the *Formula* was soon revised and approved again in 1550 by Pope Julius III. Although the 1550 *Formula* held that "all the members should be priests," it also provided for the admission of "coadjutors," that is, co-helpers, some of whom would be priests ("spiritual coadjutors") and others, brothers or "temporal coadjutors."⁴ The latter would, as Ignatius later put it in the *General Examen*, help with "necessary exterior matters." Though he seems to have understood such matters as normally comprising "low and humble services," he immediately notes that brothers "may be employed in more important matters in accordance with the talent God gave them."⁵

Ignatius understood the coadjutors as one of four "grades" or classes in the Society. In its broadest sense, membership in the Society included the professed priests (with four solemn vows of poverty, chastity, obedience, and obedience to the Pope concerning missions); the coadjutors (with three simple vows); the men with simple vows in training for priesthood (i.e., scholastics); and the novices. These distinctions referred not so much to a status hierarchy as to a division of labor, in which every Jesuit was a co-helper in realizing the aims of the Society.⁶ As Father General Kolvenbach explains, "In creating priests of four or three vows, and coadjutors who were priests and non-priests, Ignatius was intent only on uniting all these men in the apostolic body of the Society while respecting the diversity of graces, and in integrating into one and the same vocation and mission the different responses to different calls of the Lord."⁷ People of diverse backgrounds, talents, and

⁴*The Formula of the Institute of the Society of Jesus*, in *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, trans. with introduction and commentary by George E. Ganss, S.J. (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Studies, 1970), [6]; here the bracketed number refers to the bold bracketed numbers in Ganss's translation, a practice that I will use as well for the *General Examen* and the *Constitutions* proper. For the early understanding of the brother's vocation, see especially Ganss, "Understanding."

⁵*The General Examen and Its Declarations*, [112], [114].

⁶Ganss, "Understanding," 9–13.

⁷"Opening Address of Father General," Loyola Symposium on the Vocation and Mission of the Jesuit Brother, 1994, in *CIS: Review of Ignatian Spirituality* 26–1, no. 78

education had been attracted to the newly formed Society, and Ignatius wanted to make room for them. He had also come to see the need for coadjutors. The robust percentages of brothers in the Old Society (i.e., the Society before its suppression in 1773) reflect this combination of desire and need.⁸

The work and accomplishments of the brothers in the Old Society reflect Ignatius's idea of the brother: most worked at the temporal jobs necessary for maintaining houses; many at the "humble" tasks open to the illiterate; a few at highly visible displays of talent, such as Andrea Pozzo (1642–1709), renowned for his illusionistic paintings of church ceilings and writings on perspective. To get a sense of the range of occupations, consider the jobs held by brothers in the 16th cen-

ture Italian Province: cook, tailor, shoemaker, carpenter, architect, printer, nurse, miller, bricklayer, painter, sculptor, gardener, baker, stonemason, and barber.⁹

It is important to note that Ignatius expected both priests and brothers to engage in uplifting spiritual conversation.¹⁰ The great example

In light of their work in the Old Society, the brothers' opportunities after the restoration appear relatively constricted, as their "role came to be identified more and more with that of a domestic servant."

of this among brothers is St. Alphonsus Rodriguez, who worked as a porter (i.e., the house receptionist and guestmaster) most of his Jesuit life, yet was renowned for his profound spiritual insights and guidance. However "temporal" or "humble" the brother's external work, opportunities for informal evangelization could present themselves. This point will prove important for understanding the brother's vocation: regardless of his particular work, this sort of opportunity directly links the brother's call to religious life with the apostolic mission of the Society. At the same time, more public opportunities for evangelization could also belong to

(1995): 13.

⁸See Ganss, "Understanding," 6 and also 61 for a tabulation of different provinces, which shows figures ranging from around 23 to 45 percent.

⁹Listed in A. Lynn Martin, *The Jesuit Mind* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), 53, n. 36, from a compilation in Mario Scaduto, *Catalogo dei Gesuiti d'Italia, 1540–1565* (Rome, 1968).

¹⁰*General Examen*, [115].

the brother's primary mission. Such was the case in China, where brothers—often men of mixed or Chinese descent from the Portuguese colony of Macau—played an integral role in spreading the faith among the Chinese. Along with lay catechists, brothers went into villages ahead of priests to drum up interest; they taught doctrine, and they gave spiritual talks to devotional Chinese confraternities. In addition, brothers in China worked side by side with senior priests in teaching incoming European missionaries during their first two years of language studies and introduction to Chinese philosophy, law, and history.¹¹

Why would a man attracted to the Jesuits' life and mission enter to become a brother rather than a priest in those days? Many lacked the necessary background education for priestly studies; others lacked the stomach for more academic work or entered too late in life to start the long trek toward ordination. Some may have been motivated by the idea of humble service, which lies at the heart of the Ignatian spirituality and the Jesuit charism. In some mission territories, status may have been dictated by ethnicity. This was the case, for example, in China before 1688 (for a complex set of reasons).¹² Many brothers had acquired useful craft skills or artistic talents as laymen, and I suspect they wanted to dedicate those talents to God's service in the Society. For example, Francis Stadlin (1658–1740), a master watchmaker, entered the Society at the age of twenty-nine out of a desire "to consecrate his talents and mechanical skill to the glory of God." At the age of fifty he volunteered for the China Mission, where he put his stamp on the Chinese watchmaking industry. Giuseppe Castiglione (1688–1766) trained with Italy's master painters (including Pozzo) before entering the Society at the age of nineteen; in 1715 he went to China, where he painted at the imperial court for fifty years, introducing Western techniques to China and becoming respected under the name of Lang Shih-Ning. Castiglione conversed on familiar terms with the Chinese Emperor, and at one point persuaded him to refrain (temporarily) from persecuting Christians. Castiglione's companion brother in China, John-Joseph da Costa (1680–1747), entered the order with a master's degree in surgery and pharmacy in 1700. He served as a physician to the imperial court as well as to the poor, train-

¹¹See Liam Matthew Brockey, *Journey to the East: The Jesuit Mission to China, 1579–1724* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 40–41, 75, 251–52, 260–75, 293.

¹²Thus a number of the Macanese brothers were ordained when finally granted permission (Brockey, *Journey to the East*, 142–151, 280).

ing Christian women “in the ailments of children so that they might win access to private homes and baptize all dying children.”¹³

However, we should not assume these men entered precisely to give their worldly talents to the Society, as the case of Pozzo shows. Already a successful artist with the benefit of a Jesuit high school education, he made an unsuccessful attempt at the Carmelite life before entering the Society at the age of twenty-three. After his novitiate, however, he wanted to give up painting for the sake of the spiritual life—until superiors showed his work to the painter Luigi Scaramuccia, who then convinced them to nourish Pozzo’s talent.¹⁴ What we can confidently say, therefore, is that such brothers entered the Society with considerable training in hand, which they eventually accepted as an important part of their unique contribution to the Society’s mission.

These examples illustrate Ignatius’s recognition that the talent of some brothers could warrant more visible forms of apostolic engagement. More generally, they reveal a rather striking diversity of apostolic opportunities open to the pre-suppression brother. However, Ignatius also fatefully noted that the brother ought not “to seek more learning than he had when he first entered” the Society.¹⁵ He framed this counsel with a view toward the brother’s contentment and inner peace with his grade, since further studies in the sixteenth century normally pointed toward ordination. Moreover, as a counsel rather than a prohibition, it allowed for exceptions based on discernment in the particular case.¹⁶ By the early seventeenth century, subsequent Jesuit legislation had given this statement the force of a strict prohibition. Adopted in 1616, Common Rule 14 stated: “Let no one of those who are admitted for domestic service learn either to read or write, or if he have any knowledge of letters, acquire more; and let no one teach him without leave of the General.”¹⁷ By the twentieth century, that rule would provide the clearest sign that the brothers’ situation had to change.

¹³Da Costa did some of this baptizing himself; see Pius L. Moore, S.J., “Coadjutor Brothers on the Foreign Missions,” *The Woodstock Letters* 74 (1945): 5–20; quotations from pp. 14 and 15; see also R. J. Verostko, “Castiglione, Giuseppe,” *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), 3:192.

¹⁴Bernhard Kerber, *Andrea Pozzo* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1971), 4–8.

¹⁵*General Examen*, [117].

¹⁶Ganss, “Understanding,” 22.

¹⁷Quoted from Ganss, “Understanding,” 36; see also 35–37.

III. From Restoration to Mid-twentieth Century

Though by no means a systematic survey, the first section indicates the vast range of services rendered by brothers before the suppression. The brother's vocation made room for everyone, from the unlettered to highly trained professionals in engineering, medicine, and the fine arts. Brothers served the Society in both everyday domestic tasks and the education of Jesuit missionaries; they worked in kitchens, evangelized converts, trained native soldiers, shaped the art world, and conversed with emperors. Regardless of role and skill level, however, all brothers were expected to bring Christ to others through spiritual conversation. In light of their work in the Old Society, the brothers' opportunities after the restoration appear relatively constricted, as their "role came to be identified more and more with that of a domestic servant."¹⁸ In this and the next section, I document this development, which provides the immediate background for the changes I examine in subsequent sections.

The Society's restoration in the United States preceded its worldwide resurrection by a decade, at least *foro interno*. With the mediation of Bishop John Carroll, a handful of ex-Jesuits in Maryland were permitted in 1804 to affiliate with the Society in Russia, which had escaped suppression when Czarina Catherine forbade promulgation of the papal brief of suppression. In 1805 they renewed their vows, and in 1806 they accepted a group of novices.¹⁹ Thus began a century of expansion and institutionalization. In 1823 a group of Belgian Jesuits in Maryland, including seven novices, answered the call of Bishop DuBourg and traveled by flat boat to St. Louis, and then moved on to establish a mission in nearby Florissant. By the early twentieth century, the Missouri Province stretched across the Great Lakes region to the Rocky Mountains. Meanwhile, French, Italian, and German Jesuits were busy establishing missions across the continent. By mid-nineteenth century Italian Jesuits

¹⁸Graham D. Wilson, S.J., "Jesuit Identity and the Jesuit Brother: A Contemporary Understanding of the Charism of the Society of Jesus," M.A. Thesis presented at the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley (1996), 66; although Wilson (who has since left the Society) does not pinpoint the exact period of this trend, his claim matches the developments one can trace through province catalogues for the post-restoration Society in the United States.

¹⁹R. Emmett Curran, S.J., "From Mission to Province: 1805–1833," in *The Maryland Jesuits, 1634–1833* (Baltimore: Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen, the Maryland Province Society of Jesus, 1976), 47.

had established the Rocky Mountain and California-Oregon Missions (much of which became the California Province in 1909), the French had Jesuits in the New Orleans Mission in the southern United States (which became the New Orleans Province in 1907), and Germans were at it in the Buffalo Mission (areas of western New York and Ohio, which eventually became part of the New York and Detroit Provinces).²⁰

Judging from the numbers, brothers constituted a major presence in the expanding American Society. The 1869 prospectus for American provinces and missions shows percentages of brothers ranging from 38 percent (Maryland) to nearly 47 percent in the New Orleans Mission—significantly larger than the worldwide membership of about 29 percent. I suspect that these hefty percentages partly reflect the heavily institutional character of Jesuit growth in the United States. Schools played an important role in the cities, where Jesuit colleges educated students from the elementary to the university level; associated with parishes, these colleges were the center of a range of activities.²¹ Among the native peoples, Jesuits also ran schools, which became the primary base of engagement with Native Americans once the reservations were established.²² These Jesuit institutions had need of brothers, and the waves of Catholic immigrants supplied a steady pool of laborers and tradesmen to fill that need.

One can track this institutional growth in the catalogues. To take my home province as an example, the 1824 Missouri catalogue has one entry (the Florissant Mission) with ten Jesuits; 1830 lists three entries staffed by fifteen Jesuits; 1840, five entries (if we count a group of small

²⁰This quick sketch oversimplifies, of course. For example, the French Jesuits also worked in New York City, which became part of the New York–Maryland Province in 1879. For a brief chronology, see John Francis Bannon, S.J., *The Missouri Province S.J.: A Mini-History* (St. Louis: Missouri Province, 1977), 101f. I have also consulted *The New York Province of the Society of Jesus, "A Brief History of the New York Province,"* at <http://nysj.org/s/316/nypsj.aspx?sid=316&gid=1&pgid=883> (accessed October 20, 2008).

²¹Raymond A. Schroth, S.J., *The American Jesuits: A History* (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 62, includes "spiritual programs, retreats, and charitable and social societies" among the various works that flowed from the colleges and college parishes. For a sense of the educational programs, see the description of St. Ignatius College in John Bernard McGloin, S.J., *Jesuits by the Golden Gate: The Society of Jesus in San Francisco, 1849–1969* (University of San Francisco, 1972), chap. 11.

²²On Jesuit work with the Native Americans in the West, see Gerald McKevitt, *Brokers of Culture: Italian Jesuits in the American West, 1848–1919* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), chaps. 6–7.

residences as one) with 82 Jesuits. In Missouri, institutional growth was heavily centered at the larger schools and the novitiate. Thus, Saint Louis University grew from 24 Jesuits (8 of them brothers) in 1840 to a community of 55 Jesuits (with 21 brothers, including a brother novice in residence) in 1870; by 1900, when a theologate opened at the university, the community of 158 Jesuits included 101 scholastics and 12 brothers. Meanwhile, the novitiate community at St. Stanislaus grew in that same period from 22 Jesuits (with 8 brothers, 6 of them brother novices) in 1840 to a novitiate and juniorate community of 56 Jesuits (with 18 vowed brothers, and 6 brother novices) in 1870; by 1900 the community of 143 Jesuits included 32 brothers in vows and 4 brother novices.

The point behind these statistics is this: as American Jesuit presence grew through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, a pattern of institutional concentration became fairly typical across the United States. As a result, through much of the twentieth century most Jesuits lived in large communities associated with educational apostolates and houses of formation. These houses normally came with attached agricultural operations, and their daily rhythm of life bordered on the monastic. The idea that formation houses were best located in secluded country settings, free from the distractions and temptations of city life, reinforced these trends.²³ Although the secluded houses of formation apparently ran the largest of the agricultural operations, boarding schools also relied on attached farms. In fact, at the industrial boarding schools on the Indian missions, agriculture was essentially part of the curriculum.²⁴

The larger novitiates and formation houses—those of Missouri, California, and Maryland–New York Provinces—operated rather impressive farms and vineyards. As Gerald McKevitt describes Wood-

Brothers also seem to have played a large role in the enforcement of house discipline, that is, waking the community and checking people to see they were praying at the allotted times.

²³Felice Sopranis's four-year visitation, beginning in 1859, played a key role in the agrarian view of formation; Sopranis also emphasized a shift from parish missions to centralized urban ministries; see McKevitt, *Brokers of Culture*, chap. 4.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 151, 158, 229; see also Edward J. Meier, S.J., *Unknown Soldiers of Christ: How Jesuit Brothers Aid in Extending Christ's Kingdom* (St. Louis: Queen's Work, 1930), 15.

stock College in the latter nineteenth century, it “supplied most of its own needs. Fields of crops, orchards, gardens, a vineyard, herds of cattle, barns, a slaughter house, carpenters’ shops, laundry, a hothouse for the cultivation of plants” sustained an independent operation.²⁵ These large operations continued to the mid-twentieth century. According to Edward Meier, in 1930 the novitiate at Florissant, Missouri, produced 12,000–15,000 gallons of Mass wine per year from its extensive vineyard; in addition, the novitiate had a large orchard (producing 1,200 gallons of applesauce and 800 gallons of canned peaches per year), beehives, and chickens.²⁶ In 1940, the Los Gatos novitiate sported twenty-four brothers (six of them novices); of these, at least five brothers were involved in wine production.²⁷

These large educational and formation communities had need of personnel engaged in the temporal aspects of maintaining both the physical plant and attached agricultural operations. Brothers were needed not only to oversee farming operations, but for cooking and baking, plumbing and electrical work, carpentry, shoe repair and tailoring, book binding (for the house library), infirmary care, and sacristan duties.²⁸ It thus comes as no surprise to find that the larger novitiates tended to contain comparatively larger proportions of brothers. The 1911 catalogue for the English-speaking American Provinces tallies 31 brothers (of 185 Jesuits) at the Maryland–New York novitiate, 37 (of 144) at Florissant, and 16 (of 66) at the California novitiate. The proportion of brothers at the Indian missions was even higher, however—in some cases early half.²⁹ There the brothers not only ran the farm and physical plant, but also did a significant amount of the teaching, which was focused on vocational training in any case, that is, farming, mechanics, and the like. As a result, “[t]hose who exercised the most consistent influence over male scholars were Je-

²⁵McKevitt, *Brokers of Culture*, 79.

²⁶Meier, *Unknown Soldiers*, 13.

²⁷From the 1940 California Province catalogue; in that same year, the Missouri novitiate also had four brothers working in that capacity, of a total of forty-eight brothers, thirteen of them novices.

²⁸Meier, *Unknown Soldiers*, 9–17; McKevitt, *Brokers of Culture*, 79, notes that the staff of “nearly thirty” brothers at Woodstock “performed the duties of cook, gardener, vintner, cattleman, carpenter, butcher, blacksmith, plumber, and porter.”

²⁹E.g., the 1938 Missouri Province catalogue lists ten brothers (of twenty-one Jesuits) at the Pine Ridge community, and eleven (of twenty-three) at the St. Francis Mission.

suit brothers"—the young native Americans saw them laboring at both the traditionally male and female activities.³⁰ Some brothers also taught at the urban colleges and universities. For example, Bartolomeo Tortore and Giuseppe Carignano taught art at Santa Clara College (California) and Gonzaga College (Spokane), respectively.³¹

However, by the mid-twentieth century if not before, it seems that the teaching brothers tended to be the exception in the American Society. As the catalogues show, the brothers' primary contributions lay in domestic and institutional support work. For that work they proved indispensable. Brothers also seem to have played a large role in the enforcement of house discipline, that is, waking the community and checking people to see they were praying at the allotted times.³²

*Hidden though their lives might
be, brothers could still make
an impression, both inside and
outside the Society. How else
could the above lists of "notables"
come about?*

In any case, the figures show that most brothers labored at tasks we would call "blue collar," though some took on white-collar clerical positions such as house treasurer or assistant to the province socius. Others, like the house infirmarians, worked in positions that would later become professionalized.

Gilbert Garraghan's list of memorable Missouri Province brothers supports this overall impression and fills out the numbers with flesh-and-blood. There we read, for example, that Charles Lynch (1860–1919) was mechanic, foreman, and utility man at Saint Louis University; after working nineteen years in the mill at Florissant, Thomas Brady (1837–1912) spent thirty years at St. Mary's College in Kansas as a painter, glazier, and shopkeeper. Others, like Thomas Mulkerins (1858–1934), worked in parishes—in his case, fifty years as sacristan at Holy Family Church in Chicago, eventually writing the history of the parish in

³⁰McKevitt, *Brokers of Culture*, 160–61.

³¹Ibid., 229; one should not assume the brothers taught at the higher-ed level, since Jesuit colleges at the time followed the European model that integrated four years of high school with collegiate studies in a seven- to eight-year program (ibid., 21 ff).

³²For example, at Saint Louis University in 1940, six of the thirteen brothers were assigned such tasks.

1923.³³ Bannon's list of Jesuit "notables" of the twentieth century gives a similar impression, which suggests that the typical work of brothers did not significantly change through the first half of the century. Among the brothers he includes in his list,³⁴ we find an assistant to the socius (Charles A. Desnoyers, d. 1937), a "saintly Brother Clothes-Keeper at Campion" (Augustine Gaul, d. 1938), an infirmarian (Eugene L. Jennings, d. 1957), a community treasurer (Eugene F. Leber, d. 1950), a baker at Florissant (Patrick A. Terry, d. 1947), a parish sacristan (Theodore van Ryn, d. 1934), a chauffeur at Florissant (Louis C. Verhelst, d. 1947), and a steward and buyer (Joseph Raemdonck, d. 1951). No doubt many of these men were quite gifted at their work. For example, Bannon describes George B. Blum (d. 1973) as a "remarkably gifted brother—bookbinder, engineer, electrician, plumber, mechanic—who held SLU together with 'scotch tape and bailing wire.'" Two of Bannon's honorees carried on the brothers' legacy in the arts: John B. Louis (d. 1938) at painting, Albert J. Schell (d. 1969) at poetry.

The figures and examples give us some sense of the actual practice of the brother's vocation. That practice fostered a particular theory of the vocation that focused on laboring in the background. Thus Meier explicitly aligns the brother's vocation with the "hidden life," the "life of prayer and labor" practiced by St. Joseph, Mary, Thérèse of Lisieux, and Jesus before his public ministry: "Jesuit Brothers know that they are serving God's cause in the 'Hidden Life' while Jesuit priests serve in the 'Public Life.'"³⁵ John LaFarge likewise understands the brother's vocation in terms of "the life of constant, domestic labor" practiced by Jesus in his workshop at Nazareth. Note, however, that in taking this view of brothers, both authors also affirmed the equality of brothers as Jesuits: Brothers are "full-fledged members of the Society."³⁶ As Meier has an imaginary novice put it, "Brothers are just as much Jesuits as we [training to become priests] are." Thus the brother "serves with equal glory if he serves

³³Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, 3 vols. (New York: America Press, 1938) 3:589–91.

³⁴Bannon, 87–100; although Bannon's and Garraghan's lists are drawn from the Missouri Province, they illustrate the typical work of brothers across the United States.

³⁵Meier, *Unknown Soldiers*, 5–6.

³⁶John LaFarge, S.J., *A Report on the American Jesuits* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1956), 119, 113; also 113–22.

well.”³⁷ After GC 31, the question of the brothers' equality will become a central topic of discussion among Jesuits. More on that below.

However, these lists do not reveal the full range and depth of ministerial opportunities open to these brothers. Hidden though their lives might be, brothers could still make an impression, both inside and outside the Society. How else could the above lists of “notables” come about? We can also find rather interesting exceptions to the rule of domestic labor. In the next section, then, I describe three brothers in a bit more detail.

IV. The Brother before Vatican II: Three Examples

If one peruses the obituaries of Jesuit brothers in the Society before the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965), one gets the sense that many of them made their mark precisely inside the community, by their dedication and holiness in the Jesuit life. Take Patrick Hagerly (1860–1940), for example.³⁸ Raised in Ireland with little schooling, he made his way to Massachusetts and worked as a tailor and blacksmith before entering the Society. Having failed at his first assignment as cook, he was sent to Woodstock and worked briefly in the clothes room. 1894 found him at Georgetown University engaged in what would become his lifelong profession, infirmarian. After final vows in 1906, he moved back to Woodstock, where in 1918 he worked “tirelessly” in nursing the community through the influenza pandemic. In 1922 he moved to the College of the Holy Cross in the newly established New England Vice Province, where he rendered first-aid services “to a thousand boys and almost a hundred members of the Faculty.” There Brother Hagerly's dedication made an impression beyond the community: “The Faculty knew and loved him, and he easily won his way into the hearts of the students, who could appreciate a thoroughly tireless and spiritual man.” The obituary then adds a striking remark: “To many a student this indefatigable Brother was not unlike a very saintly priest.”

With Hagerly we see a brother who, similar to Brother Alphonsus Rodriquez, models the Jesuit vocation to other Jesuits. His story also

³⁷Meier, *Unknown Soldiers*, 4 and 5.

³⁸See “Brother Patrick Hagerly, S.J.,” *Woodstock Letters* 70 (1941): 273–78.

shows how the brother can, his background notwithstanding, minister to the laypersons he contacts. Hagerty's work at Holy Cross was no longer entirely "hidden" in a secluded country college, but rather had a public, even priestly character.

My second example further highlights the public opportunities open to the traditional preconciliar brother. As Garraghan remembers him, George Bender (1842–1925) worked as "prefect, instructor, storekeeper, and bandmaster" at St. Mary's College.³⁹ His work thus brought him into daily contact with students and faculty, and thus had a public character. But these facts conceal a more colorful story. Like Hagerty, Bender was an implant, an Irishman born in Liverpool who took to sea at the age of fifteen, found his way from a foundering ship in Nova

Unlike Hagerty and Bender, [Rueppel] did not simply follow the default track for applicants of his background, but went against the grain, and apparently against some official resistance, choosing not to pursue ordination but rather to enter as a brother.

Scotia to the shoe factories of Massachusetts; from there he joined the army and fought for the North under Generals McClelland and Grant. After converting to Catholicism in 1865, Bender entered the Society at Florissant in 1866. But for an eleven-year stint at the St. Charles and Osage Missions (1881–1892), he spent his entire post-novitiate life at St. Mary's College (which began

as an Indian school). Like Hagerty, Bender made an impression both on Jesuits and laity. As Jesuits remembered him, "[h]is life was made up of little things and humble, unpretentious labor but the thought of God and Our Blessed Mother was never far from his mind." He thus modeled the vocation: "His observance of the Rule, his exact fidelity to his vows, his ever cheery word and smile made him an inspiration to all."⁴⁰ At St. Mary's, Bender displayed his musical talents in the college orchestra (apparently he played the bass fiddle or cello). At his golden jubilee in 1916, he was honored in part simply for his disposition: "Many

³⁹Garraghan, *Jesuits of the Middle United States* 3:589–91.

⁴⁰Joseph L. Scott, S.J., "Brother George Bender, S.J.," *Province News-Letter* 7, no. 6 (February 1926): 47–48; Scott notes that Bender's devotion to Mary preceded his conversion, and he would react with indignation to charges that the Protestants did not honor Mary.

a dark and brooding heart he has sent singing with a gentle word well placed and many a gloomy situation has he lighted up with the sunshine of his personality."⁴¹

In lifting sagging spirits, Bender too "was not unlike a very saintly priest." He and Hagerty thus exemplify the way that many brothers, like St. Alphonsus before them, modeled not only the religious but also the apostolic, priestly character of the Jesuit vocation before Vatican II, namely, by their quality of life in roles that brought them opportunities for informal contacts with laypersons. To be sure, Bender's institutional roles—instructor, prefect, band member—may have given him more of a public presence at St. Mary's than Hagerty had at Holy Cross. Neither, it seems, entered with much education, though Hagerty eventually acquired the basic medical skills necessary for an infirmarian and Bender was apparently able to teach at a high-school level. Both men fit the typical brother's profile of the time: immigrants suited by their blue-collar background for serving the Society's institutional needs.

My third example, George Rueppel (1864–1947), appears to be something of an exception to that profile. Born in Germany, Rueppel had the benefit of a classical education, graduating from the Gymnasium two years ahead of his class. After an argument with his family over Bismarck's politics, he emigrated to the United States, pursued "about a year" of further collegiate studies (apparently in experimental physics), and eventually entered the Missouri Province novitiate in 1882 after a number of deferments. One can surmise the reason for the Jesuits' hesitation to admit him: given his age and education, the expected path in those days would point toward ordination. But Rueppel, though "more than once given the option" of studying for the priesthood, "preferred the status of lay-brother."⁴² His first assignments were indeed in the background: prefect of the refectory at the College of the Sacred Heart (later Campion) in Prairie du Chien (1883–84) and infirmarian at Cani-

⁴¹"In Honor of Bro. George: Golden Jubilee of Pioneer Brother of Society of Jesus Celebrated at College," unidentified newspaper clipping, Midwest Jesuit Archives (MWJA), Missouri Collection, Personnel File; I have also consulted *St. Mary's College Bulletin* 4, no. 4 (July 1908): 63; and undated photographs of Bender with the orchestra (MWJA, Missouri Collection).

⁴²"Bro. George E. Rueppel, S.J." *Missouri Province Newsletter* (January 1948): 38–39, quoted here from p. 38; see also Leo P. Wobido, S.J., "Brother Rueppel . . . Pioneer, Broadcaster," *The Jesuit Bulletin* 26, no. 6 (December 1947): 3–7

sius College (1884–86).⁴³ From then on, his science background came into play as he moved from college to college across the Buffalo Mission. While still at Canisius, Rueppel first began to teach;⁴⁴ he also directed the college's observatory (1886–1894). After teaching at St. Ignatius College in Cleveland (1894–1901), he showed his versatility at the College of St. John Berchmans in Toledo, where he taught mathematics, accounting, German, religion, geography, physics, and botany.⁴⁵ He arrived at Saint Louis University in 1908, where he ran the meteorological station and, in 1921, founded WEW, the first broadcast station west of the Mississippi (and the second in the country).⁴⁶

Rueppel was remembered for his resourcefulness and versatility: "Besides engineer, he was also station manager, program director, continuity writer, platter turner, announcer, talent scout, auditioner, and star performer."⁴⁷ He also served the city of St. Louis as a legal expert, called in to verify claims about the weather in court. As an announcer and "platter turner," he delivered at least one memorable faux pas: turning a platter over, he introduced the next piece as "Kiss Me Once" on the backside." Jesuits also remember him as a conscientious, genial personality, ready to explain his work to those who inquired.⁴⁸ His obituary gives us only glimpses of his spiritual life: his development of spiritual radio programs (which later became the "Sacred Heart Hour") and his

⁴³Dates are from his personnel file, Missouri Collection, MWJA.

⁴⁴There he is listed as "Teacher in Commercial Course"; "Some Brothers Serving on the Buffalo Mission of the German Province," MWJA, Missouri Collection, location: Buffalo Mission Materials, Folder: Canisius College Archives Inventory.

⁴⁵The German Province Catalogue (1907) lists the following: "Doc. Math. in 3 et 4 cl., ration. expensi et accepti, ling. germ., relig. in 1 et 2 cl., geogr., phys., bot., Praef. Alumn., an. 21 mag."

⁴⁶Wobido, "Brother Rueppel," 7, notes that Rueppel taught at SLU. He clearly was active as a scientist from the start; according to the SLU Website (at <http://www.eas.slu.edu/People/BJMitchell/TextPages/Rueppel.html> accessed September 8, 2008), he installed a Weichert seismograph in 1909; in 1930 he joined the Department of Geophysics that had been established in 1925; see "Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences: Department History," at www.eas.slu.edu/Department/history.html (accessed September 8, 2008).

⁴⁷Wobido, "Brother Rueppel," 5.

⁴⁸Interviews with Raymond Reis, S.J., and Philip E. Pick, S.J., St. Louis, August 23, 2008, and August 30, 2008, resp. Both men remember Rueppel's friendliness; Reis recalls his work with the courts. The faux pas was related to me both by Pick and John Padberg, S.J. (St. Louis, May 26, 2008).

"repeated recourse in financial crises to Our Lady, St. Joseph, and the Little Flower."⁴⁹

What especially interests me about Rueppel is his choice of the brother's status. Unlike Hagerty and Bender, he did not simply follow the default track for applicants of his background, but went against the grain, and apparently against some official resistance, choosing *not* to pursue ordination but rather to enter as a brother.⁵⁰ Unfortunately, the details of Rueppel's choice remain elusive: we do not know exactly what attracted him about the brother's vocation. But we can say this: his choice to enter as a brother had an intentional character that appears exceptional in his day (though not unprecedented).⁵¹ Although every decision to enter religious life expresses an intention, for most Jesuit brothers of the time, it seems that ordination was never a live option, given their educational backgrounds. In some cases, men who started on an ordination track chose to become brothers because they wanted to remain Jesuits after encountering an obstacle that precluded ordination.⁵² Not so with Rueppel: when he applied to the Jesuits, he insisted on an additional choice, intending not simply to enter the Society, but to enter it precisely as a brother *rather than* as a scholastic. To my knowledge, in the American Society today this sort of "intentional brother" has become the normal route for brothers, including those who first entered as "indifferent" to grades.

Rueppel's decision makes the distinctive attractiveness of the brother's vocation explicit, underscoring the value of non-ordained religious

⁴⁹Wobido, "Brother Rueppel," 5 and 6.

⁵⁰The defaults still held when I entered the Society in 1976 (with a college education): though I had expressed a desire to enter as a brother, I was advised to enter as a scholastic.

⁵¹According to his obituary, Martin Whelan, S.J. (1837–1904), a gifted painter, theater director, and composer, was reputedly offered the chance to study for ordination, but "through humility he declined the proposal" (E. I. Devitt, S.J., "Brother Martin Whelan," *Woodstock Letters* 33 [1904]: 101–4, quoted here from p. 104; another example is Brother Thomas O'Neill (d. 1895), who also declined the classical studies necessary for ordination; see John J. Killoren, S.J., NiNi Harris, Nancy Merz, David J. Suwalsky, S.J., Thomas C. Nickolai, and William Barnaby Faherty, S.J., *Jesuit Roots and Pioneer Heroes of the Middle West* (Florissant, Mo.: St. Stanislaus Jesuit Historical Museum, 1988), 102–3.

⁵²For example, Francis Xavier Carvalho, S.J., was about to be dismissed because of problems with his hearing, but out of his "remarkable love for his vocation . . . he begged to be retained as a temporal coadjutor" ("Brother Francis Xavier Carvalho," *Woodstock Letters* 34 [1905]: 416–18, quoted here from p. 417.

life on its own terms. But as we saw above, “typical” brothers like Hager-ty and Bender also modeled the brother’s vocation as an attractive option. In doing so, they displayed a deep love of Jesuit religious life—a love we hope to find at the heart of every Jesuit. In their charity and evident hap-piness as brothers, these men provided their communities with living re-minders of the value of the religious life as such, whether one is ordained or not. In these preconciliar brothers we glimpse the attractiveness and viability of the brother’s vocation in their day.

As they labored in their temporal roles, often in the background, brothers before the Second Vatican Council found support in a spiritual-ity that emphasized the dignity of labor and the hidden life. To a signifi-cant extent, that spirituality reflected what most brothers in the United States actually did, and what the Society needed them to do, in the high-ly institutionalized, quasi-agricultural Society of those days. The spir-

GC 31 also called for further work on the question of the brother, which eventuated in the unprecedented World Congress of Brothers in 1970. Again, from the “Final Conclusions” of that congress we can see the old wounds as well as the positive implications of GC 31.

ituality of brotherhood thus provided an interpretation or theory of the brother’s voca-tion that was grounded in the reality of the Society, the actual practice of Jesuit brothers. This alignment between the tradi-tional spirituality of the broth-er’s vocation and the realities of Jesuit life suggests a par-tial explanation of the larger percentages of brothers in the nineteenth- and early twenti-eth-century American Society.

The large, semi-agricultural institutions had need of a sizable lay staff; the spirituality of the hidden life of labor provided an attractive reason to enter for men not otherwise equipped for, or inclined toward, the rig-ors and tedium of study. No doubt the quasi-monastic spirituality of the post-suppression Society only heightened the resonance between mate-rial reality and the spiritual aspirations of brothers. With the Society so receptive to brothers, and with men like Hager-ty and Bender attractive-

ly modeling the spirituality of labor, one can see why devout Catholic working men might be attracted to the Jesuit brother's vocation.

The apparent alignment between theory and practice, however, also conceals a more ambiguous situation in at least two ways. First, the hidden/public dichotomy oversimplified things. As we have seen, the work of some brothers was hardly hidden. Even those who did not teach could have a considerable presence in an institution—a presence that even exuded a priestly character. Conversely, a significant number of Jesuit priests worked in the background as much as did the typical brother: as community ministers, *socii* to provincials, librarians, and so on. What is more, the explicitly sacramental activity of many priests often ended with their private celebration of a morning Eucharist. This trend led one Jesuit, when asked why the Society lacked brothers, to reply that plenty of brothers were entering the Society—it's just that "we're ordaining them all."⁵³ In the end, what actually distinguished Jesuit priests and brothers, both in theory and in practice, was the level and kind of education: priests were expected to have completed a long course of training, whereas brothers were explicitly forbidden to do so by Common Rule 14. That rule in effect codified the second mismatch between ideal and reality: assertions of equality notwithstanding, brothers increasingly felt their second-class status. To understand developments in the situation of Jesuit brothers after the Second Vatican Council, we must briefly trace the reactions to this second mismatch.

V. The Jesuit Brother at the Crossroads

Common Rule 14 had already become a problem in the early twentieth century. With the tremendous growth in the general availability of education, the rule increasingly appeared paternalistic. It also hindered the development and training that would be expected for laypersons in the kind of trades practiced by many brothers.⁵⁴ In 1923, therefore, GC 27 made a slight change: Now brothers needed only the permission of the provincial, rather than of the General, to ac-

⁵³I believe this quip has been attributed to John Courtney Murray.

⁵⁴Ganss, "Understanding," 37; Ganss notes a correlation between the drop in brothers' percentages and the growth of general education in Europe and the United States in the early twentieth century (*ibid.*, 31).

quire “more learning than they had when they entered.”⁵⁵ However, it was not until 1957, at GC 30, that the Rule was altogether dropped.

Nonetheless, problems in practice remained, as was clear from the *postulata* for GC 31. Convened in 1965, that congregation faced the tremendous task of renewal in the wake of Vatican Council II. The *postulata* dealing with the brother’s vocation, as well as discussion at the congregation itself, showed a concern “that the nature and character of their vocation be elaborated more clearly, that a proper practical esteem for their vocation become operative through fraternal co-operation among Ours, through fitting equality in a common and familiar way of life, and through the suppression of any undue discrimination.”⁵⁶ In response, the congregation strongly affirmed that brothers “have a full share” in “one and the same” *apostolic* vocation with the Jesuit priest. GC 31 eliminated social distinctions between brothers and priests in community life (e.g., separate recreation rooms, unequal domestic chores) and called for a new mind-set on the part of all.⁵⁷

GC 31 also called for further work on the question of the brother, which eventuated in the unprecedented World Congress of Brothers in 1970. Again, from the “Final Conclusions” of that congress we can see the old wounds as well as the positive implications of GC 31. The Congress acknowledged “an awareness of inequality, an awareness which sometimes results visibly in bitterness.”⁵⁸ In response, it emphasized that brothers and priests share in one and the same apostolic vocation, albeit through complementary activities:⁵⁹ “[H]ence there are no second-class Jesuits, but only companions *in Jesus in one same* apostolic work.”⁶⁰ Thus an idea of complementary equality lay at the center of the Congress’s various recommendations, which in effect spell out the con-

⁵⁵See *ibid.*, 37.

⁵⁶Information Office, “Notes on Brothers,” *XXXI General Congregation Newsletter*, no. 16, 2: On the Temporal Coadjutors (Rome, July 15, 1965), introduction; see also “The Preliminary Report by the Preparatory Commission for GC 34: The Jesuit Brother,” *CIS: Review of Ignatian Spirituality* 26–1, no. 78 (1995): 144–50.

⁵⁷See Jackson, “One and the Same Vocation,” 6–8; GC 31, Decree 7, esp. nos. 1, 2, and 6, in *Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1977).

⁵⁸Brother’s Congress, “Final Conclusions,” private Jesuit document, distributed by James J. McQuade, S.J. (June 6, 1970), no. 28 (NJBC file).

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, nos. 1–4, 6–9.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, no. 4.

tent of such equality: Brothers should be trained for apostolic activities and encouraged thereto, they should receive the requisite professional development, they should have the same educational requirements for entrance as priest candidates, and they should obtain theological formation.⁶¹ More radically, the Congress also proposed two juridical implications of equality: that brothers have an equal share in governance and that the distinction of grades be abolished.⁶²

As Pedro Arrupe, then Superior General, noted in his letter on the Congress,⁶³ the juridical recommendations "involve the competence of a General Congregation or even the Holy See." Since then, some of the juridical recommendations have become reality, such as the capacity of brothers to participate as electors in a general congregation. Other changes, such as the abolition of grades and capacity of

brothers to be superiors, pose greater difficulties and have not taken place. In the postconciliar discourse on the Jesuit brother, however, the notion of complementary equality concerns

above all the recognition that the brother's vocation shares fully in the apostolic charism of the Society. What such equality requires juridically is a derivative matter. Thus the Brother's Congress took care to note that its recommendations were not driven by "an aggressive pursuit of equal rights" or "a desire for power," but rather by the brothers' need for social recognition—their acceptance as genuine companions with an apostolic vocation on a par with (though distinct from) that of priests.⁶⁴ Father Arrupe grounds such recognition on a theological premise: that from a faith perspective, "we should see clearly the neces-

But must not an understanding of the brother's vocation also identify a distinct positive contribution to the Jesuit life and mission?

⁶¹Ibid., nos. 15, 16, 19, 34, and 35. In fact, although the Congress spoke of the "complementary" activities of priests and brothers (e.g., nos. 3–4), it did not actually use the phrase "complementary equality" in its conclusions. But that idea is clearly present in the concern to eliminate inequality and undue discrimination against brothers, to open up apostolic and educational opportunities for brothers, and to develop a "genuine community integration based on the equality and personal worth of each one" (no. 32). The same idea, though not the phrase, also informs GC 31.

⁶²Ibid., esp. nos. 6, 9–12.

⁶³Pedro Arrupe, S.J., "Letter to the Whole Society," June 29, 1970, no. 7; official Latin version in *Acta Romana Societatis Jesu* 15, no. 4 (1970): 567–70.

⁶⁴Brother's Congress, nos. 28–29.

sity of regarding as equal, in terms of Gospel values, the services and ministries which the members of the Society perform."⁶⁵

Subsequent changes in the situation of brothers have begun to implement the call for complementary equality in GC 31 and the Brother's Congress. Brothers have branched out into a range of apostolic activities. This development, which is especially striking in retrospect, went hand-in-hand with changes in the brother's formation, spearheaded by the brothers themselves. Laudable as such changes are, however, a deeper question concerning complementary equality remains, which I take up in the last section.

VI. The Late Twentieth Century

The decades following GC 31 and the Brothers' Congress witnessed a gradual shift in the work of brothers toward more visibly apostolic activities that hitherto had largely been the work of Jesuit priests. A survey of American brothers conducted by Father Francis Gillespie in 1986 reveals a slight shift.⁶⁶ Although the largest percentage of the respondents (30 percent) still labored in the traditional support roles (maintenance man, mechanic, grounds keeper, minister, porter, cook, sacristan, etc.) and 10 percent occupied traditional white-collar roles (treasurer, business manager), a small group (7 percent) identified their ministry as teacher or professor, and 11 percent placed themselves in other white-collar roles (manager, administrator, registrar, etc.). This survey probably underestimates the extent of the shift, however. The rate of response (205 out of 350, or 58 percent), together with the fact that the work of 31 percent of the respondents is listed as "other," means that of the 350 brothers queried, the work of more than half of them remains unidentified. Brother Lawrence Huck's 1995 survey of brothers is more explicit about the range of ministries, which extend beyond the traditional roles to include engineer, researcher, pastoral minister, counselor, hospital chaplain, high-school teacher, and

⁶⁵Pedro Arrupe, S.J., "Contribution of the Brother to the Life and Apostolate of the Society," in Arrupe, *Challenge to Religious Life Today*, ed. J. Aixala, S.J., 2nd ed. (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1979), 279-93, quoted here from p. 288.

⁶⁶Fran Gillespie, S.J., "Brothers of the Society of Jesus: Results of the 1986 Attitudinal Survey" (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, 1987).

assistant novice master.⁶⁷ Huck's list matches my own experience: since I entered the Society in 1976, I have known brothers who have worked as high-school and college teachers, administrators, pastoral workers, vocation directors, chaplains, social workers, physicists, deacons, retreat directors, and even as the de facto equivalent of house superiors, a role reserved de jure to priests.

To be sure, many brothers still labor nobly in the traditional background roles. But to get a better sense of the expansion of brothers' activities and some of their more visible accomplishments, let us review some particular examples of the new brother (as of 2008). Consider Guy Consolmagno, who entered the Maryland Province in 1989 with a doctorate in planetary science; he is the author of a number of books and currently works at the Vatican Observatory.⁶⁸ Charles Jackson, currently the associate director of the Loyola Institute for Spirituality in southern California, has held a top administrative post in the Jesuit Curia in Rome (undersecretary of the Society and consultant on matters relating to the brother), where he helped shape reflection on the brother's vocation.⁶⁹ Before his untimely death in 2000, Thomas Naughton brought his masters'-level training in social work to help the dying in hospice care; he also held the post of assistant rector at the house of studies in St. Louis. Already known among Jesuits for his culinary skills, Donald Schlichter was honored in 2007 by the Religious Brothers' Conference for his work as a hospital chaplain in Denver. Until recently James Holub, who entered in 1990 with a background as a CEO, worked with inner-city gangs, founding HomeBoyz Interactive to help gang members develop marketable computer skills.⁷⁰ Finally, some brothers carry on the tradition of brother artists. For example, Charles Onorato's beautiful paintings have been ex-

⁶⁷Larry Huck, nS.J., "The Jesuit Brother: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," A survey of Jesuit Brothers living in the U.S. from October 1994 through June 1995 (NJBC file).

⁶⁸See Vatican Observatory Staff (2008), "Guy J. Consolmagno, S.J.," at <http://clavius.as.arizona.edu/vo/R1024/GConsolmagno.html> (accessed January 8, 2008).

⁶⁹For example, see his essay on the brothers, cited in n. 2 above; also Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., "Father General Addresses the Brothers of the U.S.," transcript of videotaped interview with Brother. Charles J. Jackson, S.J., May 27, 1997 (NJBC file).

⁷⁰Jim Holub, S.J., "Jesuit Brother Helps Gang Members Find a Way Out," Callings 3, no. 2 (Winter 2001), available at <http://www.jesuitswisprov.org/callings/CallingsWntr01.pdf>.

hibited on the internet.⁷¹ And Michael Breault has a foot in Hollywood, working as a vice president at Loyola Productions.⁷²

The above described trend toward greater public visibility and participation in formal apostolic roles realizes the desire of the Brothers' Congress that brothers be as fully involved in apostolic activities as possible for the non-ordained. Could we say that this trend represents a return to the brother of the Old Society? I think not, at least for the United States. For one, brothers today are expected to have a higher level of education than those in the Old Society. There is no longer any room for the illiterate. But note also that the recent expansion in works has extended not so much to the craft trades in which presuppression brothers ex-

But sacramental ministry does not exhaust the Society's understanding of its apostolic charism: non-sacramental activities are likewise "essential," written into both the founding documents and history of the order.

celled—though brothers today still have a strong presence in the fine arts—but rather to ministerial and academic roles that were exceptional for brothers in the Old Society. Perhaps we should regard the recent shift as making more explicit and public the apostolic character of all the brothers' activities, which as we have seen can have a priestly character even when they involve back-

ground support roles. Indeed, of all the Jesuit funerals I have attended, one of the largest was that of Brother Philip Malone, who died at an advanced age after working most of his life as a sacristan at St. Francis Xavier (College) Church in St. Louis—a “humble” background role, indeed, but one that brought Brother Malone into contact with numerous people. In his gentle accessibility, Brother Malone, like Patrick Hagerty before him, displayed the priestly character of the Society—a point to which I return in the last section.

⁷¹See Jesuits of the California Province (2008), “Jesuit Art Gallery: Painting to Delight the Eye,” at <http://www.jesuitscalifornia.org/NETCOMMUNITY/Page.aspx?&pid=554&srcid=554> (accessed January 8, 2008).

⁷²See Jescom (2008), “Loyola Productions, Los Angeles, California,” at <http://sjweb.info/jescom/gallery/placeShow.cfm?PubID=11554> (accessed January 8, 2008); also Loyola Productions (2005), “The Team,” at www.loyolaproductions.com/company/team.htm (accessed January 8, 2008).

In the United States, the gradual shift in the brothers' range of activities was accompanied by major changes in their formation. The National Jesuit Brothers Committee (NJBC) played an instrumental role in this development. First begun in 1978 by Jerry Sullivan with a meeting in New Orleans, the NJBC disbanded in 1979, but was called back to life at the request of the U.S. Provincials in 1980. Bylaws were drawn up and eventually ratified in July 1983 at a meeting in Washington D.C.⁷³ The provincials wanted to know what kind of formation the brothers desired—hence the first major project of the NJBC, to prepare a document on the brother's formation.⁷⁴ This document called for more active recruitment of brothers. It also laid out a program of brothers' formation that tracked the formation of scholastics, but without requiring those specific examinations and degrees necessary for ordination: a two-year novitiate, professional and academic training with Jesuit peers, a two- or three-year period of regency, at least a year of theology, and tertianship.

The year following the publication of the document on brothers' formation, the NJBC sponsored the first of its annual theology institutes, held in Boston in June 1987.⁷⁵ In general, the institutes have provided workshops aimed at the brothers' ongoing education in theology, spirituality, and other aspects of Jesuit life. They also have given brothers a forum for reflecting on their Jesuit identity and channeling common concerns and proposals to Jesuit leadership, such as that for full juridical incorporation.⁷⁶

VII. Why Jesuit Brothers Today?

Iclose by returning to the leading question: what makes the brother's vocation an attractive, viable option for young men attracted to religious life? Although each brother has a unique story of his call to the Society, in choosing to become brothers they affirm the value of the

⁷³NJBC, "Significant Events of the Last Ten Years," in Minutes of the May 13–14, 1989, Meeting, Brebeuf Preparatory School, Indianapolis, Indiana (NJBC file); conversation with Louis Mauro, S.J., over the beginning of NJBC (January 10, 2008).

⁷⁴NJBC, "The Jesuit Brother: A Statement by the National Jesuit Brothers' Committee" (1986).

⁷⁵NJBC, "Significant Events."

⁷⁶Dennis J. Ryan, S.J., and A. Joseph Martin, S.J., Letter to Walter L. Farrell, S.J., President, Jesuit Conference, June 26, 1989 (NJBC file).

brother's vocation as a specific way of living the Jesuit life that opens up attractive opportunities for service, love, and evangelization. As we have seen, those opportunities have evolved over the centuries. In the Old Society, the range of brother's training and work was tremendously diverse. Open to both unlettered peasant and skilled craftsman, the brother's vocation made room in the Society's mission for all those who otherwise would have been excluded by a strict ordination requirement. Similarly, the post-restoration Society, though perhaps less imaginative in the work it typically assigned to brothers in America, gave Catholic workingmen the chance to contribute their humble labors to the heady challenges of institution building and native evangelization. In both of these earlier contexts, a particular spirituality—emphasizing humility and labor—affirmed the brother's vocation as an attractive option for men who lacked the education or desire for ordination, but who wanted to contribute their labor and talent more directly to the apostolic work of the Church than they could as non-religious laymen.

Can we say something similar about the brother's vocation today? Similar, yes—but that means we must also understand the differences in the brothers' situation since Vatican II. In particular, we must further clarify the nature of the complementary equality that had emerged as a concern by the 1960s. In this last section I hope to contribute to that task, keeping in mind that a definitive analysis would be premature.⁷⁷ Consequently, I limit myself to some touchstones that strike me as plausible points of departure. I start with one of the greatest interpreters of the Jesuit charism today, Pedro Arrupe.

1. In a 1978 talk, Father Arrupe expressed concern about the "extinction" of the Jesuit brother. He maintained that the brothers' contribution, "both to community life and that of the apostolate, is irreplaceable"; consequently, the "extinction of this grade of Brothers would be a great loss, a mutilation with grave consequences for the body of the Society and for its apostolate."⁷⁸ What is that irreplaceable contribution? Arrupe focused on the brothers' importance for the "apostolic community of the Society," distinguishing three specific contributions

⁷⁷As George Ganss remarked in 1981, the brother's vocation "cannot be treated conclusively in any one paper, book, or year"; rather "discussion for decades will probably be necessary" Ganss, "Understanding," 2; see also pp. 1–3); Father Kolvenbach reaffirms the need for this provisional attitude in his 1997 interview with Jackson (see n. 69).

⁷⁸Arrupe, "Contribution of the Brother," 281.

that correspond to three dimensions of Jesuit life: *koinonia*, *diaconia*, and *kerigma*—that is, the contributions brothers make to a stable and loving community life, their readiness for gratuitous service of the community, and their witnessing to the community, above all by example.⁷⁹ As the examples of brothers like Patrick Hagerty, George Bender, and Phil Malone demonstrate, the brother's capacity for making such contributions transcends the particular kinds of work assigned to them.

Father Arrupe then added, "We are talking about dimensions for which every Jesuit is responsible."⁸⁰ If that is so, then in what sense do brothers make a "specific" contribution? No doubt brothers enrich Jesuit life along these three dimensions, perhaps in an exemplary manner. But must not an understanding of the brother's vocation also identify a *distinct* positive contribution to the Jesuit life and mission? As communities become smaller and more and more brothers work in outside apostolates that are as demanding on time as the work of priests, it becomes increasingly important that every member contributes along all three dimensions. Valuable as Father Arrupe's remarks are, more must be said about the distinctive character of the brother's vocation. Otherwise the idea of the complementary equality of brothers and priests remains unconvincing. Nor need we worry too much about the brothers' extinction.

2. It once was more straightforward to explain that distinctiveness. When Meier and LaFarge reflected on the brother's role before Vatican Council II, the traditional rationale for Jesuit brothers still had some plausibility, its oversimplifications notwithstanding: the rural novitiates, mission schools, and other institutional works of the Society had need of support personnel (not to mention cheap labor), just as Ignatius had found out by 1550. The value of the brother's vocation thus had a firm pragmatic basis. In fact, the reason for the Jesuit priesthood, as for Ignatius's own path to ordination, was likewise pragmatic: to accomplish his aims in the sixteenth-century Church, ordination was all but mandatory. That is, his original desire to "help souls" through conversation and instruction in the Christian life led him into territory then reserved for priests, as Ignatius found out through his run-ins with Church authorities while still a layman. To be sure, the sacramental ministries of the priest immediately entered into the *Formula* as one of the core aims of the young Society.

⁷⁹Ibid., 282–5.

⁸⁰Ibid., 286.

The traditional rationale for brothers broke down with the general improvement in lay education, the expansion of lay roles in the life of the Church after Vatican II, and the end of Jesuit farms and vineyards. The changed situation has affected brothers more than priests, who still have a clear role in serving the sacramental aims of the Society. The brothers no longer seem to have a clear function in the *economy* of the Society: the blue-collar tasks from which brothers once freed Jesuit priests have either disappeared altogether or are now in the hands of laymen, whereas all the new activities open to brothers, as well as their traditional white-collar roles, are carried out by priests as well. The upshot is a gradual erosion of the lived practices that grounded pre-Vatican II statements regarding the “complementary roles” of priests and brothers. Those practices once gave complementarity (if not always equality) a clear sense: the craft labor of brothers was both necessary and distinctive of their vocation, and it clearly complemented the work of priests. Lacking such practices and

Even after ordination we continue to address one another as “brothers.” This mode of address reflects the fact that all Jesuits commit themselves to live in a community of equals, as “friends in the Lord” who remain brothers to one another.

practical needs of Jesuit life, complementarity has become problematic. Meanwhile, the greater opportunity for married laypersons in ministerial roles that were once reserved largely to priests and religious has undercut the distinctive character of the brother’s vocation from the other direction. At least in part, the decline in the percentage of brothers in the United States is the result of

this two-sided loss of distinctiveness at the level of lived practice: today, the brother’s role differs from the priest’s merely by its lack of sacramental (and jurisdictional) power, and his distinctive labors have lost their monastic patina and have been taken up by lay employees. Consequently, any viable interpretation of the brother’s vocation, if it is not to hang in midair, must confront this new reality. To do so, it must begin with the brother’s lack of sacramental power and then find the distinctive positive contribution that lack conceals.

3. In working out such an interpretation, one must avoid a potential pitfall. Both in its documents and history, the Society has understood itself as a sacerdotal order. This point has been forcefully invoked by

popes to resist Jesuit desires to abolish grades in the Society.⁸¹ Given that the Society understands itself as essentially sacerdotal, and that brothers are not priests in the sacramental sense, does it follow that brothers are necessarily second-class citizens? Not if the "sacerdotal character of the Society" refers to a property of the Society as a corporate body rather than to a claim about every member of that body. In fact, when he affirmed the Society's priestly character as "essential," Pope Paul VI carefully referred to the order and not to every member; in doing so, he linked the sacerdotal character of the Society with its apostolic charism.⁸² To be apostolic in the full sense—that is, to do what the first apostles did—the Society must bring the Word and sacraments to those to whom they are sent.

But sacramental ministry does not exhaust the Society's understanding of its apostolic charism: non-sacramental activities are likewise "essential," written into both the founding documents and history of the order.⁸³ The *Formula* includes not only sacramental work and preaching among the Society's tasks, but also religious education and corporal works of mercy. This is reiterated in Ignatius's guidelines in the *Constitutions* regarding preferred ministries, which include "undertakings . . . directed toward benefits for the body through the practice of mercy and charity."⁸⁴ And the history of Jesuit endeavors testifies to the wide range of temporal activities undertaken by its members, priests and brothers, over the centuries: work in education, the arts and sciences, medicine, law, social outreach, and so on.

Indeed, as far as apostolic importance goes, in many areas of endeavor the sacramental activities have little place, either because the needs are first of all "bodily" and temporal, or because the clientele is non-Christian or even hostile to the Church. In such areas, the "more uni-

⁸¹The traditional understanding of ecclesiastical jurisdiction provides a further, and perhaps more important, reason for papal resistance to the abolition of grades; on the recent history, see Jackson, "One and the Same Vocation," 13–17; also John Padberg, S.J., "The Society True to Itself: A Brief History of the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 15, nos. 3–4 (May–September 1983).

⁸²Pope Paul VI, "Address to the Members of the 32nd General Congregation," December 3, 1974, in *Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations*, 525–6.

⁸³On the importance of the Society's history for understanding its charism, see John W. O'Malley, S.J., "Five Missions of the Jesuit Charism," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 38, no. 4 (Winter 2006).

⁸⁴*Constitutions*, [623b].

versal good"—Ignatius's first criterion for preference of ministries⁸⁵—is achieved precisely through non-sacramental forms of engagement.

4. The previous point suggests we think of the Society's priestly character as pertaining first of all to the order as a whole, as characteristic of its mission to the world. The example of brothers like Patrick Hagerty, however, suggests a move to the individual level: that we might think of brothers as exercising a priestly ministry—not only as members who support a corporate sacerdotal mission, but precisely in the way that they themselves, as individual brothers, bring Christ to the world and the world to Christ.

Graham Wilson's reflection on the brother's vocation gives this line of thought a further interesting twist. Wilson reiterates that all Jesuits, both brothers and priests, share in the Society's "single fundamental charism—availability for universal mission."⁸⁶ In order to serve that universal (apostolic) mission, it is necessary that some Jesuits be ordained and others, non-ordained. But Wilson takes a further step: as religious, Jesuit *priests* "share in the brotherhood that is the Society."⁸⁷ This suggests a way of understanding the equality of Jesuit priests and brothers, with respect to both identity and mission.

On the one hand, we can say that as *religious*, all Jesuits, priests included, are brothers. Indeed, most Jesuits spend a decade, give or take, as non-ordained religious, and even after ordination we continue to address one another as "brothers." This mode of address reflects the fact that all Jesuits commit themselves to live in a community of equals, as "friends in the Lord" who remain brothers to one another. Here then, we find equality in our identity as religious. On the other hand, as available for the Society's universal, *apostolic mission*, all Jesuits, brothers included, are priests—in a specifically Jesuit sense of the term, which distinguishes the priesthood of Jesuits from that of laymen, yet transcends the differences between Jesuit priests and brothers at the level of sacramental ministry. This follows simply from the statements we have seen above: If brothers and priests both share fully in the apostolic charism of the Society (as affirmed by GC 31), and if that charism defines the sacerdotal character of the Society (as Pope Paul VI held), then we must regard the apostolic work of brothers as a priestly work. Conversely, we

⁸⁵Ibid., [622a].

⁸⁶Wilson, *Jesuit Identity*, 83.

⁸⁷Ibid., 81.

must understand ordained Jesuit ministry as primarily apostolic, in a sense that contrasts with diocesan priesthood. More on that below.

The developments on the side of mission represent a significant evolution in the understanding of the brother's vocation. In linking that vocation with availability for the Society's apostolic mission, recent congregations have dissolved the pre-Vatican II categories that aligned priests with public ministry and brothers with background support roles: the brother's vocation is now *directly* apostolic and public. The practice of the American brothers has followed suit, as documented above. At the same time, the historical overview reveals that the directly apostolic character of the brother's vocation was present implicitly all along, both in theory—recall Ignatius's expectation that all Jesuits would engage in spiritual conversation—and in the exemplary practice of brothers like Alphonsus Rodriguez and Patrick Hagerty.

5. Still, the question of complementarity remains. As a corporate body, the Society is, at its core and precisely as sacerdotal, committed to both sacramental and non-sacramental ministries. As sharing

in the Society's apostolic mission, priests as well as brothers have always engaged in non-sacramental temporal works, bringing what we might call their "lay talents" to the service of the Society's mission to the world. But today the distribution in work has crucially shifted, at least in developed countries like the United States, such that the brothers can no longer claim the old-style craft labors as their distinctive contribution to Jesuit life. In practice, complementarity has passed over to the Society's "partners," who now fill the shoes of the old-style brothers and are officially recognized as co-workers, partners in the apostolic mission of the Society.⁸⁸ Thus the question becomes acute: how do brothers

If brothers and priests both share fully in the apostolic charism of the Society, and if that charism defines the sacerdotal character of the Society), then we must regard the apostolic work of brothers as a priestly work.

⁸⁸"Apostolic partners" is the current term used in the United States for the many non-Jesuits—lay, religious, ordained, Christian and non-Christian—who support the Society's mission in one way or another; see Provincials of the United States Assistancy, *Assistancy Strategic Discernment: Decisions and Commitments of the United States Provincials* (Washington, D.C.: Jesuit Conference, Society of Jesus in the United States, 2008), 27. For official recognition of lay "collaboration," see *Documents of the Thirty-Fourth General Congregation of the Society of Jesus* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1995), Decree

complement priests? If one cannot say, then suspicion of the brother's second-class status returns. Granted that both sacramental and non-sacramental works are essential, the Jesuit priest, but not the Jesuit brother, is available for both. This difference could suggest that the priest is, in a practical sense, "more" of a Jesuit, official protestations to the contrary notwithstanding. Moreover, if non-ordained laity can fill the brothers' shoes without pinching, then are brothers so "irreplaceable," as Father Arrupe maintained?

The issue here is not one of whose work counts for more. Rather, it regards the *practical attractiveness* of the brother's vocation for men who want to make themselves entirely available to the service of Christ. If we assume such generosity on the part of men entering the Society, why would they "stop short" with brotherhood, if by becoming priests they are more available to Christ and the Society? Otherwise, why not give

their lay talents to the service of Christ as non-religious laymen?

Precisely because the brother opts out of clerical status, he remains on a par with his lay colleagues, even as his vows bind him to his ordained brothers in religious community.

Here too we can see an evolution in the Society's self-understanding. At the Society's inception, Ignatius could indeed say that the professed fathers constituted the Society in the "most precise sense."⁸⁹ But the statements of Meier and LaFarge imply that this view was on the way out by 1960. GC 31 and the Brothers' Congress in 1970 officially rejected it. Nonetheless, as I noted earlier, claims of a complementary equality have little meaning if we cannot identify the positive complementarity the brother supplies in practice—why men with all the smarts to become priests can be just as generous, as brothers, in the Society's service to the Church—in a way that also complements the role of non-ordained partners.

Because the question here regards the brothers' *complementary* availability for the Society's apostolic mission, it does not suffice to say the brother shares in the priesthood of the Society. To get at the practi-

Because the question here regards the brothers' *complementary* availability for the Society's apostolic mission, it does not suffice to say the brother shares in the priesthood of the Society. To get at the practi-

13; also *The Decrees of General Congregation 35* (Washington, D.C.: Jesuit Conference, Society of Jesus in the United States, 2008), Decree 6.

⁸⁹Quoted from Ganss, "Understanding," 10.

cal meaning of the complementary equality of priests and brothers, we must say more. We must identify the brother's *distinctive* contribution that complements that of the priest precisely because it supplies something the priest cannot.

6. In addressing this question, there are two fairly solid starting points, both of which were on the table before Vatican Council II. First, the presence of brothers in the Society anchors the order in the Church's religious tradition, which began primarily as a lay movement. LaFarge makes this point, and Father Kolvenbach develops it: "In some ways the religious brother embodies religious life in its essence, and so is able to illustrate that life with particular clarity."⁹⁰ The Jesuit brother, in other words, witnesses to the value of the Jesuit vocation precisely as a religious vocation, apart from any position one might have as a priest in the ministerial hierarchy. We have here the sought-for absence of sacramental power that has a positive value. Just because the Jesuit brother is not a priest, just because he opts out of the clerical power structure, he is in a position to display the value of religious life as such, without admixture. Moreover, this very same commitment to the religious life also distinguishes his vocation from other lay states of life.

The second point concerns the lay aspect of the brother's vocation. Though LaFarge associates the brother with labor, the connection he sees between brothers and laymen applies to any non-sacramental work. The brother's "practical view of the dignity of labor, though based on the concept of the supernatural mission of the Son of Man, offers nevertheless a wonderful contribution towards bridging the distance that sometimes seems to separate the priest from the layman."⁹¹ The NJBC Statement on the Brother echoes LaFarge's sentiment: "The brother is in fact a valuable bridge for the Church as both lay person and religious."⁹²

Putting these two ideas together, we might see a positive attraction to the Jesuit brother's vocation in these distinctive characteristics. Like all Jesuits and unlike non-religious laymen, the brother commits himself completely to God as a vowed member of a religious commu-

⁹⁰Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., Preface, *Loyola Symposium on the Vocation and Mission of the Jesuit Brother*, 1994, in *CIS: Review of Ignatian Spirituality* 26-1, no. 78 (1995): 3; see also LaFarge, *Report on the American Jesuits*, 118.

⁹¹LaFarge, *Report on the American Jesuits*, 115.

⁹²NJBC, "The Jesuit Brother," 1.

nity, freed from the obligations of family and self-support to serve the Church's apostolic mission without reservation.⁹³ Unlike priests and like non-religious laymen, he wants to do this entirely through the gift of his lay talents, as someone working shoulder-to-shoulder with other non-ordained members of his profession or trade or lay ministry, as someone who meets these other members eye-to-eye, equal in ecclesial rank.

7. To summarize, then, Jesuit brothers and priests are equals, both as members of a religious community and as available for the apostolic mission of the Society. But Jesuits exercise their common vocation in complementary ways. Precisely because the brother opts out of clerical status, he remains on a par with his lay colleagues, even as his vows bind him to his ordained brothers in religious community. This position, I suggest, allows brothers to make a distinctive contribution to Jesuit life. That contribution is not only distinctive, however. It is essential, indeed in a surprising way that bears on my earlier question regarding the brother's role in the Society's *sacerdotal* charism.

As we have seen, Father Arrupe contended that the brothers play an "irreplaceable" role in the communal and apostolic life of the Society. The idea of complementary equality allows us now to develop Father's insight: brothers play an essential role today precisely in virtue of their distinctive apostolic position as non-ordained religious. On the one hand, as non-ordained religious they make an invaluable contribution to the identity of the Society as a religious community. Precisely as non-ordained, brothers remind all Jesuits of the value of the religious life on its own terms. Not that brothers are necessarily better community members than Jesuit priests. Rather, I mean that by regarding brothers as equal members of the Society, we at least tacitly affirm our commitment to life in religious community as a central feature of our identity as Jesuits.

On the other hand, by regarding brothers as equally available for direct apostolic work, and thus as sharing in the priestly work of the So-

⁹³In saying the religious brother (or sister) is free of the obligations of self-support (or income), I refer to an ideal: the idea that the religious community should choose its works primarily according to a criterion of apostolic service rather than income. The reality, of course, is more complicated, and members of some communities have been forced to seek employment primarily to bring in income. Note also that some forms of the lay state might fit this ideal, e.g., the Catholic Worker Movement, a lifestyle both communal and poor.

ciety, we say something about the specifically Jesuit character of the work of our *ordained* members. We remind ourselves that sacramental ministry in the Society is primarily apostolic, oriented by the Society's evangelizing, missionary charism and its current apostolic preferences. Unlike the sacramental ministry of diocesan priests, which aims primarily to sustain the existing community of faith, the sacramental work of Jesuits is oriented toward an outward-looking apostolic mission, that of bringing Christ to the world through "the defense and propagation of the faith and for the progress of souls in Christian life and doctrine."⁹⁴ This apostolic orientation does not exclude parish work by Jesuits, but it does have implications for our acceptance of parishes and, more broadly, for our choice among opportunities for sacramental work in general. It is no accident that Jesuit parishes tend to be located in needy areas, consistent with our apostolic commitment to solidarity with the least.

If the above points are on target, then we can readily agree with Father Arrupe: the extinction of brothers would constitute "a mutilation with grave consequences for the body of the Society and for its apostolate." The reason is that the brother plays a key role in preserving both the religious identity of the Society and its apostolic orientation. More provocatively, we can say that without brothers, not only the Society's religious identity but also the distinctively Jesuit character of its sacerdotal charism is in peril.

8. The upshot, in a nutshell, is this: The attractiveness of the Jesuit brother's vocation rests on the apostolic value of religious life on its own terms, without the benefits (or burdens) of the clerical position. As then Father General Kolvenbach put it in a 1997 interview with Charles Jackson,

Ultimately, however, the theological reasons are more important than the pragmatic ones. We will attract Jesuit brothers only if we Jesuits treasure our life together as apostolic religious and communicate its joys to Catholic laymen.

⁹⁴*Formula*, [3]; for a historical argument supporting this point, see William Harmless, S.J., "Jesuits as Priests: Crisis and Charism," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 19, no. 3 (May 1987); Harmless emphasizes the apostolic character of Jesuit priesthood, oriented primarily to ministries of the word—which includes the brothers' practice of spiritual conversation. See also O'Malley, *First Jesuits*, chaps. 3–4. I thank Kevin Burke, S.J., for the idea of the brothers' role in sustaining the identity of the Jesuit priest.

the brother's vocation "needs nothing else—nothing is lacking. It is really a *full* vocation and a *full* mission."⁹⁵ The happy Jesuit brothers I have known, young and old, bear this statement out: they find their vocation complete. As one brother explained to me why he chose to become a brother: he found that "it just fit." These men testify to the value and viability of religious life today.

However, in that same interview, Kolvenbach warned that we should not expect many brothers' vocations precisely for that reason, that is, because the attractiveness of that vocation depends so heavily on the intrinsic value of religious life, hardly a high-demand market in today's consumer- and pleasure-oriented American society. The freedom to live out that value distinguishes the vocation of the religious brother from the other lay states of life. However, for most young Catholic men, the brother's vocation still lacks the visibility of the priest's.

This is unfortunate, for the apostolic mission of the Society of Jesus needs brothers as much as ever. Given the pluralistic character of the contemporary United States and the secular tendencies in many areas of endeavor, there is certainly a need for Jesuits, priests and brothers, who can engage the world through their lay talents—in science, education, administration, areas of health care, and so on. Given the increasing professional demands in such areas of engagement, there is a need for Jesuits whose full mission has them devote all their energies to the requirements of such non-sacramental apostolates. Thus the need for brothers in the Society of Jesus continues, not only for theological reasons connected with the Jesuit charism, but also for very pragmatic reasons, just as in 1550.

Ultimately, however, the theological reasons are more important than the pragmatic ones. We will attract Jesuit brothers only if we Jesuits treasure our life together as apostolic religious and communicate its joys to Catholic laymen. The stakes are high, for nothing less than the Society's charism is at stake. The young brothers in formation today, though few, are a sign of hope for the whole Society.

⁹⁵NJBC file (see n. 69).

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Editor:

I am very grateful for Wilkie Au's most recent essay on "Ignatian Service: Gratitude and Love in Action." It is a masterpiece, very timely, challenging, and inspiring. He expresses very well the subtle, nuanced Ignatian ideal. I want to underscore two of his points that seem especially relevant at this time.

First, Ignatian mysticism of service continues to stretch and invite anyone seriously called to Ignatian spirituality. It is an ideal that is always susceptible to compromise in reducing that ideal to *doing* more and more work. Whereas mysticism of service is concerned with something much more subtle, inspiring and challenging: the *quality* of religious experience in our hearts while we are working. A quantity of more and more work is always easier than the careful concern for and cooperation with the Holy Spirit in the religious quality of our working hearts. However tempting the contemporary compromises are, Ignatius's ideal stands clear in the mysticism expressed in the very grammar of the grace of the *Contemplatio* (#233): The direct object of our service is the Divine Majesty.

Second, as Wilkie shows, the appropriate understanding and translation of Ignatius's favorite word *magis* (*mas*) can protect us from the dangerous compromise to which I have referred above. In this light, I have come to prefer the English translation for *magis* as "especially." This is a legitimate translation for the Latin word. In this understanding we are always serving in what is especially our unique call and role. This call and election, as the *Exercises* refers to it (#169-88), is revealed to each one of us in our contemplation of the Risen Jesus through the Second, Third, and Fourth Weeks. Also in the Foundation (#23), the better translation might be "which is 'especially and uniquely conducive' to the end for which we are being created."

Much gratitude to Wilkie for his loving, clear, and challenging reminder of inspired Ignatian service at a time when the impulse to more and more work insidiously surrounds us in our culture and in our Church.

George Aschenbrenner, SJ
Office of the Rector
University of Scranton
Scranton, PA, 18510-4623

Past Issues of Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits Available for Sale

(For prices, see inside back cover.)

- 1/1 Sheets, *Profile of the Contemporary Jesuit* (Sept. 1969)
- 1/2 Ganss, *Authentic Spiritual Exercises: History and Terminology* (Nov. 1969)
- 2/1 Burke, *Institution and Person* (Feb. 1970)
- 2/2 Futrell, *Ignatian Discernment* (Apr. 1970)
- 2/3 Lonergan, *Response of the Jesuit as Priest and Apostle* (Sept. 1970)
- 3/1 Wright, *Grace of Our Founder and the Grace of Our Vocation* (Feb. 1971)
- 3/2 O'Flaherty, *Some Reflections on Jesuit Commitment* (Apr. 1971)
- 3/4 Toner, *A Method for Communal Discernment of God's Will* (Sept. 1971)
- 3/5 Sheets, *Toward a Theology of the Religious Life* (Nov. 1971)
- 4/2 *Two Discussions: I. Spiritual Direction, II. Leadership and Authority* (Mar. 1972)
- 4/3 Orsy, *Some Questions about the Purpose and Scope of the General Congregation* (June 1972)
- 4/4 Ganss, Wright, O'Malley, O'Donovan, Dulles, *On Continuity and Change: A Symposium* (Oct. 1972)
- 5/1-2 O'Flaherty, *Renewal: Call and Response* (Jan.-Mar. 1973)
- 5/3 Arrupe, McNaspy, *The Place of Art in Jesuit Life* (Apr. 1973)
- 5/4 Haughey, *The Pentecostal Thing and Jesuits* (June 1973)
- 5/5 Orsy, *Toward a Theological Evaluation of Communal Discernment* (Oct. 1973)
- 6/3 Knight, *Joy and Judgment in Religious Obedience* (Apr. 1974)
- 7/1 Wright, Ganss, Orsy, *On Thinking with the Church Today* (Jan. 1975)
- 7/2 Ganss, *Christian Life Communities from the Sodalities* (Mar. 1975)
- 7/3 Connolly, *Contemporary Spiritual Direction: Scope and Principles* (June 1975)
- 7/5 Buckley, *The Confirmation of a Promise; Padberg, Continuity and Change in General Congregation XXXII* (Nov. 1975)
- 8/1 O'Neill, *Acatamiento: Ignatian Reverence* (Jan. 1976)
- 8/2-3 De la Costa, Sheridan, and others, *On Becoming Poor: A Symposium on Evangelical Poverty* (Mar.-May 1976)
- 8/4 Faricy, *Jesuit Community: Community of Prayer* (Oct. 1976)
- 9/1-2 Becker, *Changes in U.S. Jesuit Membership, 1958-75; Others, Reactions and Explanations* (Jan.-Mar. 1977)
- 9/4 Connolly, Land, *Jesuit Spiritualities and the Struggle for Social Justice* (Sept. 1977).
- 9/5 Gill, *A Jesuit's Account of Conscience* (Nov. 1977)
- 10/1 Kammer, "Burn-Out" — *Dilemma for the Jesuit Social Activist* (Jan. 1978)
- 10/4 Harvanek, *Status of Obedience in the Society of Jesus; Others, Reactions to Connolly-Land* (Sept. 1978)
- 11/1 Clancy, *Feeling Bad about Feeling Good* (Jan. 1979)
- 11/2 Maruca, *Our Personal Witness as Power to Evangelize Culture* (Mar. 1979)
- 11/3 Klein, *American Jesuits and the Liturgy* (May 1979)
- 11/5 Conwell, *The Kamikaze Factor: Choosing Jesuit Ministries* (Nov. 1979)
- 12/2 Henriot, Appleyard, Klein, *Living Together in Mission: A Symposium on Small Apostolic Communities* (Mar. 1980)
- 12/3 Conwell, *Living and Dying in the Society of Jesus* (May 1980)
- 13/1 Peter, *Alcoholism in Jesuit Life* (Jan. 1981)

- 13/3 Ganss, *Towards Understanding the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation* (May 1981)
- 13/4 Reites, *St. Ignatius of Loyola and the Jews* (Sept. 1981)
- 14/1 O'Malley, *The Jesuits, St. Ignatius, and the Counter Reformation* (Jan. 1982)
- 14/2 Dulles, *St. Ignatius and Jesuit Theological Tradition* (Mar. 1982)
- 14/4 Gray, *An Experience in Ignatian Government* (Sept. 1982)
- 14/5 Ivern, *The Future of Faith and Justice: Review of Decree Four* (Nov. 1982)
- 15/1 O'Malley, *The Fourth Vow in Its Ignatian Context* (Jan. 1983)
- 15/2 Sullivan and Faricy, *On Making the Spiritual Exercises for Renewal of Jesuit Charisms* (Mar. 1983)
- 15/3-4 Padberg, *The Society True to Itself: A Brief History of the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus* (May-Sept. 1983)
- 15/5-16/1 Tetlow, *Jesuits' Mission in Higher Education* (Nov. 1983-Jan. 1984)
- 16/2 O'Malley, *To Travel to Any Part of the World: Jerónimo Nadal and the Jesuit Vocation* (Mar. 1984)
- 16/3 O'Hanlon, *Integration of Christian Practices: A Western Christian Looks East* (May 1984)
- 16/4 Carlson, "A Faith Lived Out of Doors": *Ongoing Formation* (Sept. 1984)
- 17/1 Spohn, *St. Paul on Apostolic Celibacy and the Body of Christ* (Jan. 1985)
- 17/2 Daley, "In Ten Thousand Places": *Christian Universality and the Jesuit Mission* (Mar. 1985)
- 17/3 Tetlow, *Dialogue on the Sexual Maturing of Celibates* (May 1985)
- 17/4 Spohn, Coleman, Clarke, Henriot, *Jesuits and Peacemaking* (Sept. 1985)
- 17/5 Kinerk, *When Jesuits Pray: A Perspective on the Prayer of Apostolic Persons* (Nov. 1985)
- 18/1 Gelpi, *The Converting Jesuit* (Jan. 1986).
- 18/2 Beirne, *Compass and Catalyst: The Ministry of Administration* (Mar. 1986)
- 18/3 McCormick, *Bishops as Teachers and Jesuits as Listeners* (May 1986)
- 18/5 Tetlow, *The Transformation of Jesuit Poverty* (Nov. 1986).
- 19/1 Staudenmaier, *United States Technology and Adult Commitment* (Jan. 1987)
- 19/2 Appleyard, *Languages We Use: Talking about Religious Experience* (Mar. 1987)
- 19/5 Endean, *Who Do You Say Ignatius Is? Jesuit Fundamentalism and Beyond* (Nov. 1987)
- 20/1 Brackley, *Downward Mobility: Social Implications of St. Ignatius's Two Standards* (Jan. 1988)
- 20/2 Padberg, *How We Live Where We Live* (Mar. 1988)
- 20/3 Hayes, Padberg, Staudenmaier, *Symbols, Devotions, and Jesuits* (May 1988)
- 20/4 McGovern, *Jesuit Education and Jesuit Spirituality* (Sept. 1988)
- 20/5 Barry, *Jesuit Formation Today: An Invitation to Dialogue and Involvement* (Nov. 1988)
- 21/1 Wilson, *Where Do We Belong? United States Jesuits and Their Memberships* (Jan. 1989)
- 21/2 Demoustier, Calvez, et al., *The Disturbing Subject: The Option for the Poor* (Mar. 1989)
- 21/3 Soukup, *Jesuit Response to the Communication Revolution* (May 1989)
- 22/1 Carroll, *The Spiritual Exercises in Everyday Life* (Jan. 1990)
- 22/2 Bracken, *Jesuit Spirituality from a Process Prospective* (March 1990)
- 22/3 Shepherd, *Fire for a Weekend: An Experience of the Exercises* (May 1990)
- 22/4 O'Sullivan, *Trust Your Feelings, but Use Your Head* (Sept. 1990)
- 22/5 Coleman, *A Company of Critics: Jesuits and the Intellectual Life* (Nov. 1990)
- 23/1 Houdek, *The Road Too Often Traveled* (Jan. 1991)
- 23/3 Begheyn and Bogart, *A Bibliography on St. Ignatius's Spiritual Exercises*

(May 1991)

- 23/4 Shelton, *Reflections on the Mental Health of Jesuits* (Sept. 1991)
- 23/5 Toolan, "Nature Is a Heraclitean Fire" (Nov. 1991)
- 24/1 Houdek, *Jesuit Prayer and Jesuit Ministry: Context and Possibilities* (Jan. 1992)
- 24/2 Smolich, *Testing the Water: Jesuits Accompanying the Poor* (March 1992)
- 24/3 Hassel, *Jesus Christ Changing Yesterday, Today, and Forever* (May 1992)
- 24/4 Shelton, *Toward Healthy Jesuit Community Living* (Sept. 1992)
- 24/5 Cook, *Jesus' Parables and the Faith That Does Justice* (Nov. 1992)
- 25/3 Padberg, *Ignatius, the Popes, and Realistic Reverence* (May 1993)
- 25/4 Stahel, *Toward General Congregation 34* (Sept. 1993)
- 25/5 Baldovin, *Christian Liturgy: An Annotated Bibliography* (Nov. 1993)
- 26/2 Murphy, *The Many Ways of Justice* (March 1994)
- 26/3 Staudenmaier, *To Fall in Love with the World* (May 1994)
- 26/5 Landy, *Myths That Shape Us* (Nov. 1994)
- 27/1 Daley, "To Be More like Christ" (Jan. 1995)
- 27/2 Schmidt, *Portraits and Landscapes* (March 1995)
- 27/3 Stockhausen, *I'd Love to, but I Don't Have the Time* (May 1995)
- 27/4 Anderson, *Jesuits in Jail, Ignatius to the Present* (Sept. 1995)
- 27/5 Shelton, *Friendship in Jesuit Life* (Nov. 1995)
- 28/1 Begheyn, *Bibliography on the History of the Jesuits* (Jan. 1996)
- 28/3 Clooney, *In Ten Thousand Places, in Every Blade of Grass* (May 1996)
- 28/4 Starkloff, "As Different As Night and Day" (Sept. 1996)
- 28/5 Beckett, *Listening to Our History* (Nov. 1996)
- 29/1 Hamm, *Preaching Biblical Justice* (Jan. 1997)
- 29/2 Padberg, *The Three Forgotten Founders* (March 1997)
- 29/3 Byrne, *Jesuits and Parish Ministry* (May 1997)
- 29/4 Keenan, *Are Informations Ethical?* (Sept. 1997)
- 29/5 Ferlita, *The Road to Bethlehem—Is It Level or Winding?* (Nov. 1997)
- 30/1 Shore, *The "Vita Christi" of Ludolph of Saxony and Its Influence on the "Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius of Loyola"* (Jan. 1998)
- 30/2 Starkloff, "I'm No Theologian, but . . . (or So . . .)?" (March 1998)
- 30/3 Torrens, *The Word That Clamors* (May 1998)
- 30/4 Petrik, "Being Sent" (Sept. 1998)
- 30/5 Jackson, "One and the Same Vocation" (Nov. 1998)
- 31/1 Clifford, *Scripture and the Exercises* (Jan. 1999)
- 31/2 Toohig, *Physics Research, a Search for God* (March 1999)
- 31/3 Fagin, *Fidelity in the Church—Then and Now* (May 1999)
- 31/4 Schineller, *Pilgrim Journey of Ignatius* (Sept. 1999)
- 31/5 Fullam, *Juana, S.J.: Status of Women in the Society* (Nov. 1999)
- 32/1 Langan, *The Good of Obedience in a Culture of Autonomy* (Jan. 2000)
- 32/2 Blake, *Listen with Your Eyes* (March 2000)
- 32/3 Shelton, *When a Jesuit Counsels Others* (May 2000)
- 32/4 Barry, *Past, Present, and Future* (Sept. 2000)
- 32/5 Starkloff, *Pilgrimage Re-envisioned* (Nov. 2000)
- 33/1 Kolvenbach et al., *Faith, Justice, and American Jesuit Higher Education* (Jan. 2001)
- 33/2 Keenan, *Unexpected Consequences: Persons's Christian Directory* (March 2001)
- 33/3 Arrupe, *Trinitarian Inspiration of the Ignatian Charism* (May 2001)
- 33/4 Veale, *Saint Ignatius Asks, "Are You Sure You Know Who I Am?"* (Sept. 2001)
- 33/5 Barry and Keenan, *How Multicultural Are We?* (Nov. 2001)
- 34/1 Blake, "City of the Living God" (Jan. 2002)
- 34/2 Clooney, *A Charism for Dialog* (March 2002)

- 34/3 Rehg, *Christian Mindfulness* (May 2002)
- 34/4 Brackley, *Expanding the Shrunken Soul* (Sept. 2002)
- 34/5 Bireley, *The Jesuits and Politics in Time of War* (Nov. 2002)
- 35/1 Barry, *Jesuit Spirituality for the Whole of Life* (Jan. 2003)
- 35/2 Madden/Janssens, *The Training of Ours in the Sacred Liturgy* (March 2003)
- 35/4 Modras, *A Jesuit in the Crucible* (Sept. 2003)
- 35/5 Lucas, *Virtual Vessels, Mystical Signs* (Nov. 2003)
- 36/1 Rausch, *Christian Life Communities for Jesuit University Students?* (Spring 2004)
- 36/2 Bernauer, *The Holocaust and the Search for Forgiveness* (Summer 2004)
- 36/3 Nantais, *"Whatever!" Is Not Ignatian Indifference* (Fall 2004)
- 36/4 Lukács, *The Incarnational Dynamic of the Constitutions* (Winter 2004)
- 37/1 Smolarski, *Jesuits on the Moon* (Spring 2005)
- 37/2 McDonough, *Clenched Fist or Open Hands?* (Summer 2005)
- 37/3 Torrens, *Tuskegee Years* (Fall 2005)
- 37/4 O'Brien, *Consolation in Action* (Winter 2005)
- 38/1 Schineller, *In Their Own Words* (Spring 2006)
- 38/2 Jackson, *"Something that happened to me at Manresa"* (Summer 2006)
- 38/3 Reiser, *Locating the Grace of the Fourth Week* (Fall 2006)
- 38/4 O'Malley, *Five Missions of the Jesuit Charism* (Winter 2006)
- 39/1 McKevitt, *Italian Jesuits in Maryland* (Spring 2007)
- 39/2 Kelly, *Loved into Freedom and Service* (Summer 2007)
- 39/3 Kennedy, *Music and the Jesuit Mission* (Autumn 2007)
- 39/4 Creed, *Jesuits and the Homeless* (Winter 2007)
- 40/1 Giard, *The Jesuit College* (Spring 2008)
- 40/2 Au, *Ignatian Service* (Summer 2008)
- 40/3 Kaslyn, *Jesuit Ministry of Publishing* (Autumn 2008)
- 40/4 Rehg, *Value and Viability of the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation* (Winter 2008)

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION, EFFECTIVE MARCH 2001

➤ U.S. JESUITS:

An annual subscription is provided by the ten United States provinces for U.S. Jesuits living in the United States and U.S. Jesuits who are still members of a U.S. province but living outside the United States.

➤ ALL OTHER SUBSCRIPTIONS:

Subscriptions to STUDIES:

U.S.: one-year, \$18; two years, \$35

Canada and Mexico: one year, \$26; two years, \$50

All other destinations: one year, \$29; two years, \$55

▲ Gift Certificates Available ▲

*** All payments must be in U.S. funds. ***

➤ CHANGE-OF-ADDRESS INFORMATION:

- »» Jesuit subscribers: Your province office should send us your change of address; you need not do so.
- »» Non-Jesuit subscribers: Subscriptions and change of address information should be sent to the business office address given below. Please include former address label if possible.

➤ EDITORIAL OFFICE

Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality
Faber House
102 College Road
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3841
Tel: 617-552-0860
Fax: 617-552-0925
E-mail: fleminpb@bc.edu

➤ BUSINESS OFFICE

Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits
3601 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63108
Tel: 314-633-4622
Fax: 314-633-4623
E-mail: ijs@jesuitsources.com

➤ SINGLE ISSUES (Current or Past):

The price for single copies of current or past issues is \$3.00, plus postage and handling charges. Double issues (for example, 5/1-2, 8/2-3, 9/1-2, etc.) are \$6.00 each, plus postage and handling.

**The Institute of Jesuit Sources
The Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality
3601 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63108-3393**

Non Profit Org.
US Postage
PAID
Kansas City MO
Permit 6654

Address Service Requested

*****MIXED ADC 66340

Thomas O'Neill Serials
Boston College Library
Boston College
Chestnut Hill MA 02467

