



STUDES

IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

JESUITS AND EUCHARISTIC
CONCELEBRATION

JAMES J. CONN, S.J.

JESUITS, THE MINISTERIAL PRIESTHOOD,
AND EUCHARISTIC
CONCELEBRATION

JOHN F. BALDOVIN, S.J.

51/1 SPRING 2019

THE SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS is a publication of the Jesuit Conference of Canada and the United States.

The Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality is composed of Jesuits appointed from their provinces. The seminar identifies and studies topics pertaining to the spiritual doctrine and practice of Jesuits, especially US and Canadian Jesuits, and gathers current scholarly studies pertaining to the history and ministries of Jesuits throughout the world. It then disseminates the results through this journal.

The opinions expressed in Studies are those of the individual authors. The subjects treated in STUDIES may be of interest also to Jesuits of other regions and to other religious, clergy, and laity. All who find this journal helpful are welcome to access previous issues at: ejournals@bc.edu/jesuits.

CURRENT MEMBERS OF THE SEMINAR

Note: Parentheses designate year of entry as a seminar member.

Casey C. Beaumier, SJ, is director of the Institute for Advanced Jesuit Studies, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts. (2016)

Brian B. Frain, SJ, is Assistant Professor of Education and Director of the St. Thomas More Center for the Study of Catholic Thought and Culture at Rockhurst University in Kansas City, Missouri. (2018)

Barton T. Geger, SJ, is chair of the seminar and editor of STUDIES; he is a research scholar at the Institute for Advanced Jesuit Studies and assistant professor of the practice at the School of Theology and Ministry at Boston College. (2013)

Michael Knox, SJ, is director of the Shrine of the Jesuit Martyrs of Canada in Midland, Ontario, and lecturer at Regis College in Toronto. (2016)

Gilles Mongeau, SJ, is professor of systematic theology and coordinator of the first studies program at Regis College in Toronto. (2017)

Peter P. Nguyen, SJ, is Assistant Professor of Theology at Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska. (2018)

Hung T. Pham, SJ, teaches spirituality at the Jesuit School of Theology at Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, California. (2015)

John R. Sachs, SJ, is superior of Gonzaga Eastern Point Retreat House in Gloucester, Massachusetts, and is a Board Member and Associate Editor of *Theological Studies*. (2014)

Copyright © 2019 and published by the Jesuit Conference of Canada and the United States.

ISSN 1084-0813

JESUITS AND EUCHARISTIC CONCELEBRATION
JAMES J. CONN, SJ

JESUITS, THE MINISTERIAL PRIESTHOOD, AND
EUCHARISTIC CONCELEBRATION
JOHN F. BALDOVIN, SJ

STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

51/1 • SPRING 2019

a word from the editor. . .

“There is nothing new under the sun” (Ecclesiastes 1:9).

Of all the questions that Jesuits have debated among themselves since the close of Vatican II—including the relationship between faith and justice, how to preserve the Catholic identity of Jesuit schools, and where to mission our declining numbers of Jesuits—perhaps no subject has proven quite so neuralgic as whether Jesuit priests can and should concelebrate at Mass, especially at the daily masses celebrated in their own communities.

The reasons for and against concelebration being generally well-known, I will not review them here; Frs. Conn and Baldovin will discuss some of them in their respective contributions to this issue of *STUDIES*. But let me suggest that the question of concelebration, unlike other controversial subjects, goes to the heart of what it means to be a Jesuit. If the other questions concern *what* Jesuits should do, or for whom they should do it, then concelebration points to *who* Jesuits are. In other words, are Jesuits primarily apostolic religious, most of whom have priestly ministry as an additional qualifier? Or is the Society essentially a priestly institute, with religious life a universal but secondary characteristic?

At daily mass, Jesuits can keep their personal convictions about the other issues to themselves, so that, as a result, Jesuits of every stripe can find respite at that moment of communal worship. But when Jesuit priests choose either to concelebrate or to sit in the congregation, they seem to lay bare their convictions about Jesuit identity—and perhaps also, by implication, what they believe should be the convictions of everyone else at the liturgy. No wonder, then, that concelebration can be such a flashpoint.

However, one would err to suppose that these tensions have resulted from the Second Vatican Council’s (re)introduction of concelebration. On the contrary, they have existed almost since the beginning of institutional religious life.

In fourth-century Egypt, and continuing into the early Middle Ages in Europe, monasteries were composed largely of illit-

erate laypersons. And evidence suggests that monks in general were wary of—if not outright hostile to—having their members be ordained, and having priests join their communities. The monks wished to cultivate humility and equality as much as possible, and they worried that priests would require deferential treatment. They also believed that the monastic way of life offered the most ideal expression of the Gospel, especially when compared to the diluted and compromised witness of the broader church, in which the ordained clergy played a prominent role.¹ Of course, the monks did need ordained ministers to preside at liturgy; but when monasteries lacked a priest, they often forced ordination on one of their members.²

Given this background, one might reasonably conclude that the monks would have greeted any suggestion of concelebration—if the practice existed back then, which it did not—very negatively!

And so, the question arises: if the Society of Jesus is a religious order, and if all religious orders in some sense descend from Eastern monasticism, then should Jesuits regard themselves firstly as religious and secondly as priests? For in fact, some Jesuits have argued against daily concelebration in Jesuit houses on just these grounds.

Unfortunately, the problem is more complicated than that. In the eleventh century, priests called *canons*, who lived next to and cared for the liturgical functions of cathedrals, began to adopt an ancient rule, usually the Rule of St. Augustine, to structure their common life. As a result, a new form of religious life, the *canons regular*, developed, where the word *regular* denotes the fact that these priests lived by a rule. In

¹ St. Jerome (327–420) is famous for his caustic descriptions of the laxities of the Roman clergy. On a related point, Fr. Hugo Rahner, SJ (1900–1968) argued that the perennial value of the Rule of St. Benedict and the Rule of St. Basil lies in the fact that both founders understood their monastic communities to be at the service of, rather than in opposition to, the wider church. See Hugo Rahner, SJ, *The Spirituality of St. Ignatius Loyola: An Account of Its Historical Development*, trans. Francis John Smith, SJ (Loyola University Press, 1980), 65–78.

² See William Harmless, SJ, *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 323. Fr. Harmless notes that Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine all were ordained against their will.

this sense, canons regular were priests with religious life added, and it seems reasonable to speculate that they would have considered any question of daily concelebration with sympathetic ears.

Then, the sixteenth century witnessed the rise of *clerks regular*, which were communities of priests dedicated to sacramental and apostolic work “in the field” —which is to say, they were not associated with a specific place, like a cathedral. The clerks regular considered priesthood central to their mission, since they desired to serve the church in ways that the secular clergy had served poorly; and for that reason, the faithful often called them “reformed priests.”³

The first institute of clerks regular was the Theatines (1524), followed by the Barnabites (1533) and the Somaschi (1534). Our own First Companions were aware of these precedents when, in 1539, they deliberated the characteristics of the new Society of Jesus (1540). Still later, more communities of clerks regular developed, including the Camillians (1582), the Adorno Fathers (1588), and the Piarists (1597).

In short, if one is going to point to a specific movement in the history of religious life to guide discussion of Jesuit concelebration, then it makes all the difference in the world where one points.

As Frs. Conn and Baldovin both observe, some Jesuits approach the issue of concelebration by affirming that the Society is a pastoral priesthood as opposed to cultic priesthood. According to the first model, priests provide sacraments only as pastoral need requires; otherwise, they function as ordinary members of the community. For this reason, only one priest is needed for community liturgy, and the atmosphere of the liturgies tends to be more casual. But according to the cultic model, the Mass is a participation in the one eternal sacrifice of Christ, by means of which priests acquire merits and graces for the sake of themselves and others. From this point of view, the more masses celebrated, the greater the sanctification of the entire church . . . and since the priests experience the act of pre-

³ For an excellent introduction to clerks regular, see Mark A. Lewis, SJ, “Recovering the Apostolic Way of Life: The New Clerks Regular of the Sixteenth Century,” in *Early Modern Catholicism: Essays in Honour of Fr. John W. O’Malley, SJ*, ed. Kathleen M. Comerford and Hilmar M. Pabel (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 280–96.

siding as a principal source of mission and consolation, they often pay greater attention to questions of rubrics and solemnity.

If one chooses to abide by these categories, then it is fair to say that there is plenty of evidence to suggest that Ignatius envisioned a pastoral priesthood. For instance, he asked Jesuits not to refer to each other as *Father* or *Brother*, but rather to call one another by name.⁴ Likewise, the “Autobiography” does not indicate either when he chose to become a priest or his reasons for doing so, on which basis some have argued that he did not consider priesthood a specific emphasis of his apostolic spirituality.⁵ In a similar vein, the *Constitutions* make only fleeting references to priestly ordination as part of Jesuit formation.⁶ Furthermore, when Ignatius was superior general, he apparently was content often simply to hear Mass at the Roman College rather than to preside.⁷

On the other hand, there can be no question that Ignatius had a strong cultic sensibility. For example, when it looked in 1539 like curial officials might succeed in resisting the pope’s oral approbation of the Society, Ignatius asked priests to offer, in honor of the Holy Trinity, three thousand masses. Not thirty. Not three hundred. *Three thousand*. And because Ignatius himself asked for this, it is a fair bet that he said many of them himself. On this note, the *Constitutions* frequently refer to a theology of merit and economy of graces within the Society; and, with an emphasis unique among

⁴ *Gonçalves Mem.* 142, 372; Luís Gonçalves da Câmara, SJ, *Remembering Iñigo: Glimpses of the Life of St. Ignatius Loyola*, trans. Alexander Eaglestone and Joseph A. Munitiz, SJ (Leominster, UK and St. Louis, MO: Gracewing and the Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2004), 86, 207.

⁵ But one should keep in mind that the “Autobiography” contains little or nothing on many important aspects of Ignatius’s life, such as his pre-conversion piety; the specific content of his illumination at the Cardoner; his eventual explicit dedication to the greater glory of God; the origins of his *Romanità* (i.e., his dedication to the See of Rome); the 1539 Deliberation of the First Fathers; and, perhaps most curiously, the formal moment in November 1538 when the Companions placed themselves at the service of the pope, thereby fulfilling the terms of the conditional vow that they had made at Montmartre.

⁶ *Constitutions* 45, 112, 365, 401, hereafter *Const.*

⁷ *Gonçalves Mem.* 179; Gonçalves da Câmara, *Remembering Iñigo*, 108.

classic rules and constitutions, Ignatius requires priests to offer masses regularly for deceased companions and benefactors.⁸

I have heard some Jesuits maintain that Ignatius conceived a whole new way of being a priest. But based on the precedent set by other institutes of clerks regular, I am not sure that I agree. I also question their implication that Ignatius had found a way to reconcile the tension between the two models of priesthood. Rather, I suspect that his strong devotion to both apostolic service and ritual worship brought into bold relief a reality that has existed since the beginning of religious life and probably always will.

For my own part, I usually am happy to sit in the congregation at masses in Jesuit houses. But at times, I do have a desire to concelebrate—either out of devotion or because I am obliged to offer Mass for a specific intention—and I would like to be able to do so without worrying that others will perceive me as divisive. I suspect that many Jesuits feel the same.

Which brings us to the current issue of *STUDIES*. Our contributors, Frs. Conn and Baldovin, have been colleagues and dear friends for many years. As such, both men have expressed to the Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality their hope that readers will see in their exchange the Ignatian presupposition in action, and that this will inspire Jesuits to practice the presupposition when they themselves discuss concelebration.

In light of the complicated history of concelebration in the church, and also of the many holy companions on both sides of the issue, it seems likely that the debate will not be ended by a decisive argument, but rather by a slowly-growing consistency of practice guided by the Holy Spirit. May the Lord grant that these essays facilitate that journey by promoting an ever-greater union of minds and hearts in this least Society.

Barton T. Geger, SJ
Editor

⁸ *Const.* 309–19, 598, 638, 640. Earlier constitutions, like those of the Dominicans, had required masses for deceased members only at the time of the deaths and on specified anniversaries.

CONTENTS

JESUITS AND EUCHARISTIC CONELEBRATION

JAMES J. CONN, SJ

INTRODUCTION	1
I. A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	2
II. THE CURRENT SITUATION	8
A. Reasons for the Current Practice	9
B. Current Ecclesiastical Discipline	11
III. A NOTE ON JESUIT NORMS.....	14
IV. CONSEQUENCES OF THE PRACTICE.....	15
EPILOGUE	16

JESUITS, THE MINISTERIAL PRIESTHOOD, AND EUCHARISTIC CONCELEBRATION

JOHN F. BALDOVIN, SJ

INTRODUCTION	17
I. WHY DID VATICAN II (RE-)INTRODUCE CONCELEBRATION?	20
II. ISSUES REGARDING ECCLESIOLOGY AND ORDAINED MINISTRY.....	23
III. SPECIFIC ISSUES REGARDING THE EUCHARIST	28
1. Daily Celebration of the Eucharist	28
2. "Private Mass": vs. Concelebration	29
3. Co-Consecration	30
4. Mass Intentions and Offerings.....	32
5. Unity of the Priesthood and Unity of the Assembly.....	34
CONCLUSION	35
FR. CONN'S RESPONSE TO FR. BALDOVIN.....	36
FR. BALDOVIN'S RESPONSE TO FR. CONN.....	39

Fr. James J. Conn (MAR), a Philadelphia native, entered the Society of Jesus at Wernersville in 1966 and is currently professor of the practice of canon law at the Boston College School of Theology and Ministry. He studied theology at Woodstock College and received a doctorate in canon law from the Gregorian University, where he served in the 2000s as ordinary professor. Also a civil lawyer with a JD from Fordham, he served there as executive assistant to the president in the 1980s. In the 1990s, he was dean at St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore. His primary research area has been the relationship between Catholic educational institutions and ecclesiastical authority.

Fr. John F. Baldovin (UNE) entered the Society of Jesus at St. Andrew Hall, Syracuse, New York, in 1969. He is presently professor of historical and liturgical theology at the Boston College School of Theology and Ministry. Previously, he taught at Weston Jesuit (1999–2008), the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley (1984–1999), and Fordham University (1981–1984). He holds a PhD in Religious Studies from Yale University and an MDiv from the Weston School of Theology. He has published in liturgical history and liturgical theology, especially on the Eucharist and the ministerial priesthood.

Jesuits and Eucharistic Concelebration

James J. Conn, SJ

Following Vatican II, the delegates of GC 31 encouraged concelebration in Jesuit houses. Since then, however, the practice has become controversial. The author points out that the current predominant custom of Jesuit priests attending Mass modo laico is contrary to the norms of the church and has various negative consequences. For example, Jesuits today who wish to concelebrate sometimes have to compromise their consciences lest their communities regard them as divisive.

It is hardly a secret among Jesuits that it is a disputed question whether or when they—or, for that matter, any priests—should concelebrate at the eucharistic celebration. Full disclosure requires me to admit that my own position on the question has changed over time. Ordained in 1974, I initially followed the practice that since has become typical in our communities. Later, my studies in canon law (1980–1983) changed my opinion to the one that I will elaborate shortly. My present practice, when not presiding at a scheduled mass for the benefit of the faithful, is to concelebrate at the daily mass at St. John’s Seminary, where I teach, or with a willing confrere at home. I attend the weekly prescribed community Mass, but I refrain from concelebrating, since I prefer not to be a source of distraction in a community where no one else concelebrates, whether he might like to or not.

I first wrote these observations in the summer of 2006 as a personal exercise that I passed on to individuals seeking my opinion on the subject. I was invited by the leadership of the Jungmann Society of international Jesuit liturgists to present the paper

at their plenary meeting in June 2008 at the Abbey of Montserrat. It was subsequently published by the Jungmann group in Spanish translation but has not yet been published in English.¹ The text that follows is almost identical to the 2008 version.

I. A Historical Perspective

The rite of eucharistic concelebration was extended in the Latin Church during and after the Second Vatican Council. The practical context of the council made the extension of the rite particularly timely. Concelebration was a means of accommodating the large number of bishops and priests present for the council and eliminated the need for them to celebrate Mass individually.² It should be recalled that the daily celebration of—not attendance at—Mass by priests in the Latin Church has long been and remains the presumption and preference of the church’s spiritual tradition and discipline. Canon 904 has as its source the Vatican II Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (1965), which affirms that especially at Mass the priest acts in the person of Christ.³ The canon reads as follows:

Remembering always that in the mystery of the eucharistic sacrifice the work of redemption is exercised continually, priests are to celebrate frequently; indeed, daily celebration is recommended earnestly since, even if the faithful cannot be present, it is the act of Christ and the Church in which priests fulfill their principal function.⁴

¹ James J. Conn, SJ, “Los Jesuitas en la concelebración eucarística” in *Jesuitas, Sacerdocio y Liturgia: III Congreso de la Asociación Internacional Jungmann para Jesuitas y Liturgia. Abadía de Montserrat-Cataluña, España. Junio 23–28 de 2008* (Mexico City: Obra Nacional de la Buena Prensa, 2010), 57–76.

² Sacred Congregation of the Rites, *Ecclesiae Semper* (March 7, 1965), in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis [AAS]* 57 (1965): 410–12. The decree asserts that the theological reasons, “much more than any at a purely practical level,” are the ones that explain why concelebration in one form or other has always been accepted by the church (p. 411).

³ *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (December 7, 1965), 13, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_presbyterorum-ordinis_en.html (hereafter cited as *PO*).

⁴ Canon 904; *Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983); trans. *Code of Canon Law: Latin-English Edition*,

Conciliar teaching in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* acknowledged the theological grounding to this practically useful rite—namely, its appropriate manifestation of the unity of the priesthood (SC 57). This conciliar text and the postconciliar liturgical reform called for concelebration on certain occasions—to wit, priestly ordination and the Masses of Holy Thursday and the Easter Vigil, when individual, or so-called private, celebration of Mass is forbidden. Discretion for its more extensive application was left to local authority.

The widespread practice of concelebration in the Latin Church was probably not foreseen by the council. The pattern of eucharistic practice then as now was envisioned as that of individual priests celebrating Mass for assemblies of the faithful in parishes and other churches and oratories. Religious communities and other residences of priests—for example, seminaries and colleges—were viewed as exceptional situations in which concelebration would be practiced on a more frequent and even daily basis. Not only did concelebration eliminate the need for multiple individual celebrations, but it provided these communities with a new means of celebrating their unity in faith and grace around one table of word and sacrament.

The right to celebrate Mass individually—not privately, since all liturgy is by definition public, and not without at least one member of the faithful present (canon 906)—was guaranteed by the documents first extending concelebration and later by the Code of Canon Law (c. 902). One may reasonably presume that this conciliar provision was made to accommodate older priests or those with problems of conscience over such matters as the moral simultaneity of pronouncing the words of consecration. The celebration of Mass individually—that is, without an assembly—remains widely practiced in some quarters of the Society of Jesus. In such celebrations, liturgical norms may or may not be carefully observed. The same is probably true of the requirement that at least one of the faithful be present.⁵

New English Translation (Washington: Canon Law Society of America, 1999), 295. All citations of the code refer to the former edition, and all translations to the latter, hereafter cited as CLSA (1999), followed by the page number.

⁵ The faculty of celebrating Mass “in a case of necessity . . . without a server” is included in the 1963 *Elenchus Facultatum*, appendix seconda, n. 9. It is not clear whether

The Society welcomed the rite of concelebration at the time of the 31st General Congregation, and for about a decade thereafter widely practiced that rite in our communities, especially in houses of formation. The congregation cited the provisions of *Presbyterium Ordinis* 13 and *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 57 noted above, declaring that “Concelebration, by which the unity of the priesthood is appropriately manifested, is encouraged in our houses when allowed by the proper authority, while each priest shall always retain his right to celebrate Mass individually.”⁶ Proper authority here meant the universal and local authority of the Apostolic See, the episcopal conference, and the diocesan bishop or local ordinary.

During this same period, many other liturgical reforms were legitimately introduced, such as the gradual use of the vernacular in the celebration of Mass and the other sacraments, the simplification of many rites in the celebration of the Eucharist according to the first typical edition (1970) of the *General Instruction on the Roman Missal* (*GIRM*), several new eucharistic prayers, and the option of the faithful receiving Holy Communion in the hand and under both kinds.⁷ While competent ecclesiastical authority eventually mandated these innovations, Jesuits often had anticipated them within the more secluded context of their religious houses.

At the same time, Jesuits also introduced other unapproved practices, some of the less outrageous of which were the elimination of the lavabo, abandoning some or all of the required liturgical vesture, alternate postures for both celebrants and assembly, and using unapproved texts. The anticipation of reforms before their official approval or im-

celebrating “without a server” is the same as celebrating without at least one of the faithful present.

⁶ GC 31, d. 14, no. 10; *Jesuit Life and Mission Today: The Decrees and Accompanying Documents of the 31st–35th General Congregations of the Society of Jesus*, ed. John W. Padberg, SJ (St. Louis, MO: The Institute of Jesuit Sources [IJS], 2009), 103.

⁷ *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani*, in *Missale Romanum ex Decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II Instauratum Auctoritate Pauli PP. VI Promulgatum, Editio Typica* (Città del Vaticano, 1970), 15–92. Hereafter, editions of this document are cited in the text and notes of this essay as *GIRM*, followed, where applicable, by year of promulgation and paragraph number.

plementation and the spontaneous introduction of other innovations gradually eroded the careful if simple liturgical observance formerly common among Jesuits and compromised the consensus that the rites and texts of the liturgical books were normative.

Such general relaxation of liturgical observance created a ready context for unauthorized changes in the rite of concelebration in Jesuit communities, including the reduction or elimination of vestments, words, or gestures on the part of concelebrants. Eventually, some Jesuits appropriately refrained from this kind of minimalism in the rite of concelebration; but instead of celebrating individually, they began simply to assist *modo laico* at masses celebrated by only one member of the community.⁸ An article published by Fr. John Baldovin (UNE) in *Worship* in 1985 provides a certain scholarly justification for this practice.⁹ Reflecting on the practice of the so-called “private mass” in religious communities of priests, he writes, “Given the nature of the eucharist as a communal act symbolizing the church’s unity, it seems to me that concelebration in such circumstances is far preferable to individual celebrations with or without a server.”¹⁰ With this, I fully agree.

Alas, however, Fr. Baldovin’s praise is faint, for he goes on to assert, “Frankly, although I think that concelebration can be an effective sign of the unity of the church, there are circumstances in which priests should assist at the eucharist in the same manner as lay people and that ritual concelebration should be extremely rare.”¹¹ He bases his position on the notion that lay persons feel that the distinction between priests and assembly somehow highlights disunity in the church, and on the concept that priests sometimes need more to be ministered unto than to minister. He further asserts, “Another occasion which seems to warrant priests refraining from concelebration is the frequent or daily

⁸ Here and elsewhere in this essay, the verb *assist*, when referring to a person at Mass, means “to attend” rather than “to give support or help.” And when referring to a priest, it implies that he is not concelebrating. —Ed. note.

⁹ John Baldovin, “Concelebration: A Problem of Symbolic Roles in the Church,” *Worship* 59 (1985): 32–47.

¹⁰ Baldovin, “Concelebration,” 43.

¹¹ Baldovin, “Concelebration,” 44.

Eucharist. Here no sacramental or ecclesial purpose is served by the outward manifestation of the unity of the priesthood, especially when there may be a very small minority of unordained people present."¹² On this point we disagree. I for one have been deeply moved by the truth of the one priesthood I share with the other priests with whom I have concelebrated at a daily Eucharist. Furthermore, I suspect that the brothers and scholastics present are not inclined to dismiss that sign so easily. Unfortunately, the unavailability of concelebration may have resulted in some priests resorting to the liturgically less preferable choice of celebrating Mass individually.

Perhaps back in 1985, Fr. Baldovin's discomfort with concelebration may have been more deeply motivated by its poor implementation along the lines of his comments at the end of the article. There he raises several valid questions on such issues as voice volume, vesture, spatial arrangements, and the like. Perhaps these neuralgic points are troubling enough to an attentive liturgist that refraining from concelebration is for him the best solution.

On that note, he admits that his view is at odds with the 1972 declaration on concelebration of the then Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship.¹³ That document bases its contrary position on the well-known principle that "in liturgical celebrations each person, minister or layman, who has an office to perform, should do all of, but only, those parts which pertain to his office by the nature of the rite and the principles of liturgy" (SC 28). The declaration on concelebration applies this principle to concelebration when it says:

Because of the distinct sacrament of orders, priests exercise a function peculiar to them in the celebration of the Mass when, either individually or together with other priests, by a sacramental rite they bring about the presence of Christ's sacrifice, offer it, and through communion share in it.

¹² Baldovin, "Concelebration," 44.

¹³ Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, *In Celebratione Missae* (August 7, 1972), in *AAS* 64 (1972): 561-63.

Consistent with this, priests should celebrate or concelebrate in order to take part in the Mass more fully and in their own distinctive way; nor should they receive communion in the manner proper to the laity.¹⁴

The declaration does not articulate a new norm. It is rooted in the notion of the priest acting *in persona Christi* (PO 13), and it found early expression in the postconciliar instruction *Eucharisticum Mysterium* of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.¹⁵ This 1967 document similarly commends to priests the exercise of the order proper to them by celebrating or concelebrating “and not simply receiving communion like the laity.”¹⁶ Not only does it confirm the council’s teaching that concelebration “aptly expresses the unity of the sacrifice and the priesthood,” but it adds another dimension—namely, that concelebration “symbolizes and strengthens the fraternal bond between priests.”¹⁷ The instruction further extends the permission for the use of concelebration, especially in communities of priests. It adds the following practical provision: “Those who live in community or serve the same church should gladly welcome visiting priests to concelebrate with them.”¹⁸

While in more recent years Jesuits have eliminated other unauthorized liturgical practices in many places, it has nonetheless become the almost universal practice in Jesuit houses in the US that priests do not concelebrate but rather simply assist at daily Mass. While local or house policies may or may not permit concelebration, the practice of concelebrating at daily Mass in our houses has nearly disappeared. By way of exception, many but not all Jesuits do concelebrate at ordinations, first masses, funerals, masses of religious profession, and certain masses on special occasions celebrated in schools and universities. Also, some priests still celebrate individu-

¹⁴ Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, *In Celebratione Missae*, 561; trans. Thomas C. O'Brien, *Documents on the Liturgy 1963–1979: Conciliar, Papal, and Curial Texts* (Collegeville MN: Liturgical Press, 1982), 563.

¹⁵ Sacred Congregation of Rites, *Eucharisticum Mysterium* (May 25, 1967), in AAS 59 (1967): 539–73 (hereafter cited as *EM*).

¹⁶ *EM* 43.

¹⁷ *EM* 47.

¹⁸ *EM* 47.

ally in “private” chapels. Others, of course, celebrate Mass for the Jesuit community, for groups of students, in our own and other parish churches, for religious sisters and brothers, and so forth.

Although Fr. Baldovin does not argue this point in this *Worship* article, except perhaps indirectly by his use of the term *ritual concelebration*, there is a certain widespread belief, often mentioned but not readily documented, that any time a priest takes part in the celebration of the Eucharist, he does so as a priest and therefore, in a sense, “concelebrates.” This notion, however, is not easily reconciled with the long tradition, carried out before and since the Vatican II extension of concelebration beyond ordination masses, of priests assisting at the Eucharist in choir, which suggests a clear distinction between the roles of celebrant or concelebrants and assisting though not concelebrating clergy.

On May 23, 1957, the Holy Office published a response, approved *in forma communi* by Pope Pius XII (1876–1958), to a *dubium de valida concelebratione* that had been submitted to it.¹⁹ The question posed in the doubt was whether several priests validly concelebrate the sacrifice of the Mass if only one of them pronounces the words of consecration over the bread and wine while the others do not but, with the knowledge and consent of the celebrant, have and manifest their intention of making his words and actions their own. The response was “negative, because by the institution of Christ, he alone celebrates validly who pronounces the words of consecration.”²⁰

II. The Current Situation

To my mind, most US Jesuits would agree with the facts of the current practice of eucharistic concelebration as stated above. There is probably less agreement about the reasons for the practice, its relationship to the law of the church, or its consequences. Observations

¹⁹ Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, *Dubium de Valida Concelebratione* (May 23, 1957), in *AAS* 49 (1957): 370.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

on each of these follow. Note, however, that I base what I say about the reasons for the current practice primarily on my own experience of watching and listening to our confreres. And some of these comments are hypotheses that may need further testing.

A. Reasons for the Current Practice

1. Many Jesuits appear to imitate uncritically the practice of others. Specifically, many of our elders abandoned their former practices because, some forty years ago, the young—including superiors—set a new pace. Likewise, some younger men today observe the practice they learned in houses of formation, whether they have reflected carefully on it or not. Other younger men do not accept their elders' practice regarding the Eucharist, though some are more vocal about the matter than others.
2. It is probable that many Jesuits do not know the pertinent liturgical norms. Some of our men have extensive knowledge, but some appear to have only partial or selective knowledge. For a variety of reasons, disputes in this area are very difficult to settle; and of all arbiters, Jesuits rarely consider the opinions of canonists authoritative.
3. Some Jesuits may believe that liturgical practice is simply a matter of taste, style, and opinion. From this perspective, they might view the dominant practice of rare concelebration as simple, comfortable, and informal. These are subjective values that many Jesuits wish to cultivate in their lives, and they apply them to liturgical practice. This is a positive or neutral interpretation of behavior that the more censorious might attribute, perhaps too rashly, to sloth or irreverence.
4. Some Jesuits may have a mistaken understanding of how ecclesiastical law, including liturgical law, is properly interpreted and of how the canonical concept of custom is applied to situations regulated by liturgical law.
5. Some Jesuits tend to equate concelebration with liturgical solemnity, which they feel has its place but is not for every day. This is a line of argument that can be inferred from Fr. Baldovin's article.

6. For some Jesuits, the dominant practice reflects a notion of the priesthood that may be characterized as functional, in that it views the ministerial priesthood as a service of liturgical leadership offered to the community. From this perspective, when a priest is entrusted with “leading” or “presiding at” the Eucharist on a certain occasion, it is then that he fulfills a priestly role; otherwise, he remains a member of the assembly in the manner of the lay faithful. In this spirit, some Jesuits are uneasy with the term *priest* and prefer *minister* or *presider*.

Their critics would characterize this functional notion as neglectful of the principle that the priesthood is an ontological reality and that the ordained priest acts at Mass *in persona Christi Capitis* whether he is principal concelebrant or not. Opponents of the dominant practice also appeal to the principle cited above from the constitution on the liturgy that at the Eucharist each should do all and only what is appropriate to his or her condition in the church (SC 28). They further recall the close connection made in the encyclical *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* between the priesthood and the Eucharist, and John Paul II’s (1920–2005) repeated emphasis on the distinction between the common priesthood of all the faithful and the ministerial priesthood of the ordained.²¹

7. Some Jesuits seem to view concelebration as an exercise in clericalism whereby those who are ordained display their superiority over those who are not. In response, their opponents appeal to the principle of equality in dignity but difference in condition (canon 208). Moreover, some Jesuits refrain from concelebration because of the antipathy

²¹ John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* (April 17, 2003), 28–30, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/special_features/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_20030417_ecclesia_eucharistia_en.html. Regarding the distinction, see John Paul II, *Christifideles Laici* (December 30, 1988), 21–23, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_30121988_christifideles-laici.html; *Pastores Dabo Vobis* (March 15, 1992), 13–15, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_25031992_pastores-dabo-vobis.html; and the interdicastrial instruction approved *in forma specifica*, *Ecclesiae de Mysterio*, “On Certain Questions Regarding the Collaboration of the Non-Ordained Faithful in the Sacred Ministry of Priests” (August 15, 1997), “Theological Principles 1: The Common Priesthood of the Faithful and the Ministerial Priesthood,” http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cclergy/documents/rc_con_interdic_doc_15081997_en.html.

toward it displayed by some women in the church for whom it highlights their exclusion from holy orders, and with whom some Jesuits wish to be in solidarity. Opponents of this view point to the definitive character of the apostolic letter *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* of John Paul II.²²

B. Current Ecclesiastical Discipline

Unlike the preceding seven points, which are conjecture, the comments that follow are based on juridically-binding texts and their proper interpretation.

First, the 1983 Code of Canon Law permits rather than requires concelebration, providing as follows:

Unless the welfare of the Christian faithful requires or suggests otherwise, priests can concelebrate the Eucharist. They are completely free to celebrate the Eucharist individually, however, but not while a concelebration is taking place in the same church or oratory.²³

The source of this norm is *Mysterium Eucharisticum*, the 1967 instruction cited above. Here, the “welfare of the faithful” that limits concelebration is obviously the need of the faithful for masses to be celebrated for their pastoral advantage. In other words, priests should not, for the sake of concelebrating Mass, neglect their pastoral obligation to celebrate Mass at times and in places convenient to the faithful. This hardly presents a problem in Jesuit contexts, and even if pastoral duties required a Jesuit to celebrate Mass for the faithful, the discipline of canon 905 §1 on bination would allow him to concelebrate at a community mass on the same day.

It should be noted, however, that this norm on its own strength establishes no right to concelebrate; rather, it guarantees a priest the right to celebrate Mass individually. In view of the reason for this norm,

²² John Paul II, *Ordinatio Sacerdotalis* (May 22, 1994), http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/1994/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_19940522_ordinatio-sacerdotalis.html.

²³ Canon 902; trans. CLSA (1999), 295.

“individually” here probably means “without an assembly”; in other words, it is not within a priest’s rights to exclude concelebrants, since it is the function of the superior of a community or the rector of a church to “facilitate and encourage” concelebration.²⁴

Note here that the code establishes no right to concelebration, although other sources of law favor it. On the other hand, the third typical edition of the *GIRM* (2002) contains new material on concelebration that is relevant to this discussion. The relevant provision appears in the document’s fourth chapter, which deals with the different forms of celebrating Mass. Regarding masses presumably celebrated in religious institutes and societies of apostolic life, the *GIRM* reaffirms the faculty of priests who belong to such communities and have already celebrated Mass on a given day “for the pastoral benefit of the faithful” to binate by concelebrating the conventual or community Mass.²⁵ But this new edition of the text goes a step further than its earlier versions, stating:

For it is preferable that priests who are present at a Eucharistic Celebration, unless excused for a good reason, should as a rule exercise the office proper to their Order and hence take part as concelebrants, wearing the sacred vestments. Otherwise, they wear their proper choir dress or a surplice over a cassock.²⁶

Note that the phrase “should as a rule” implies the imposition of a duty, from which follows the corresponding right to fulfill that duty. And so, this provision not only affirms a preference for concelebration, but also suggests the right of a priest to concelebrate, at least in the context of special groups like religious communities.

By way of commentary, I suggest that this new norm responds to a mistaken ideology and abusive practice whereby concelebration is perceived as a sign of clericalism and as somehow offensive to the non-ordained members of a clerical religious institute, to

²⁴ *EM* 47.

²⁵ *GIRM* (2002), 114; trans. International Commission on English in the Liturgy [ICEL], *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, Liturgical Documentary Series 2 (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2003), 54. See also canon 905 §1.

²⁶ *GIRM* (2002), 114; trans. ICEL, 54.

laypersons generally, or to women specifically. By contrast, the norm simply applies the principle of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 28 cited above—namely, that each person is to carry out all and only those parts of the liturgy that are proper to him.

The 2004 Instruction *Redemptionis Sacramentum* provides a still broader norm—that is, one not limited to concelebration in religious communities—and adds a final proscription:

Holy Mass and other liturgical celebrations, which are acts of Christ and of the people of God hierarchically constituted, are ordered in such a way that the sacred ministers and the lay faithful manifestly take part in them each according to his own condition. It is preferable therefore that “Priests who are present at a Eucharistic Celebration, unless excused for a good reason, should as a rule exercise the office proper to their Order and thus take part as concelebrants, wearing the sacred vestments. Otherwise, they wear their proper choir dress or a surplice over a cassock.” It is not fitting, except in rare and exceptional cases and with reasonable cause, for them to participate at Mass, as regards to externals, in the manner of the lay faithful.²⁷

This clarification seems to reinforce the notion of a right to concelebration consequent to the duty that this norm imposes. One should keep in mind, however, that the needs of the faithful for Mass, the norms regarding bination, and other practical considerations may limit concelebration in particular circumstances. These considerations may include, among other things, time, vessels, vesture, common language, and the configuration of the worship space. Very clearly, however, this norm precludes the restriction of concelebration arising from an ideological antipathy toward it, and identifies as its foundation the principle that the church’s hierarchical constitution is reflected in its liturgical action.

Furthermore, the 2002 *GIRM*, to the degree that it establishes a right to concelebrate, trumps the code’s silence on the matter. And

²⁷ Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Redemptionis Sacramentum* (March 25, 2004), 128, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20040423_redemptionis-sacramentum_en.html. The internal quotation is from *GIRM* (2002), 114.

Redemptionis Sacramentum, while an instruction and therefore of lesser juridical moment than the *GIRM*, is nonetheless a source of law (*ius*) and, following canon 34, normative, unless it contradicts an ecclesiastical law (*lex*). Moreover, *Redemptionis Sacramentum* and its proscription of priests participating at Mass *modo laico* in any but rare and exceptional cases has the effect of reprobating and extinguishing a non-legal custom contrary to the law (canons 23–26), as some may wish to categorize the dominant practice in many Jesuit communities.

III. A Note on Jesuit Norms

Daily Mass has long been the norm for all Jesuits. As noted above, GC 31 affirmed the universal norm of *Presbyterorum Ordinis* encouraging daily eucharistic celebration by priests. It further encouraged concelebration when the law permitted it, and by the time of GC 32, concelebration was more widespread in both the church and the Society. Accordingly, the congregation provided that: “all of our members should consider daily celebration of the Eucharist as the center of their religious and apostolic life.”²⁸ It adds that “Concelebrations are encouraged, especially on days when the community can more easily gather together.”²⁹ The *Complementary Norms* repeat these words, except that “Concelebrations” is replaced by “Communitarian celebrations.”³⁰ Perhaps that change in terminology was intended to include in a clearer fashion non-ordained members; regardless, the universal law still would apply to members who are priests.³¹

²⁸ GC 32, d. 11, no. 35; *Jesuit Life and Mission Today*, ed. Padberg, 348.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Complementary Norm 227, 2; The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms: A Complete English Translation of the Official Latin Texts*, ed. John W. Padberg, SJ (St. Louis, MO: IJS, 1996), 259.

³¹ In Ignatius’s time, as the *Constitutions* indicate, the practice was different: “The frequentation of the sacraments should be highly recommended; and Holy Communion or the celebration of Mass should not be postponed beyond eight days without reasons legitimate in the opinion of the superior.” See *Constitutions* 584; ed. Padberg, 254.

IV. Consequences of the Practice

What are or may be the consequences of Jesuits in the US and perhaps elsewhere neglecting the rite of concelebration? Here are some suggestions:

1. Numerous bishops and diocesan clergy view Jesuits who violate norms of liturgical discipline as giving scandal and undermining ecclesiastical discipline more broadly. In short, they perceive them as not thinking with the church, which endangers our reputation and the effectiveness of our ministries.
2. In violating this *lex orandi* ("rule of prayer"), Jesuits run the risk of eroding the *lex credendi* ("rule of belief")—in this case, the authentic church doctrine on the nature of the priesthood.
3. Policies in Jesuit houses that prohibit concelebration—or even customary dispositions, upheld by superiors, against concelebrations—create problems of conscience for observant Jesuits. From this perspective, at least permitting liturgical discipline to be observed would better serve unity in religious communities. Then, violations happen as a function of freewill and personal choice rather than as a function of a general imposition of policy.
4. The prohibition of concelebration makes our retreat centers unattractive and unfriendly to many diocesan priests who properly desire to celebrate Mass daily while on retreat.
5. The view of the priesthood and the antipathy toward concelebration that this current practice promotes discourage men whom a Jesuit vocation might otherwise attract. I make this observation based on anecdotal evidence from conversations with men aspiring to the priesthood and consecrated life over the course of my twenty-seven years in the ministry of priestly formation.
6. The Society runs the risk of promoting or committing grave injustice by accepting stipends from the faithful for a Jesuit's mere assistance at Mass or for his marginal concelebration. For this reason, Jesuits who are priests should review the norms that govern this matter.

Epilogue

When I began my academic and professional formation as a canonist in 1980, I probably did so with eyes half shut, thinking that I could remain in the mainstream of Jesuit life and work, even in the increasingly secular context of university ministry. I soon learned that teaching diocesan seminarians in Baltimore, then future canon lawyers at the Gregorian, and, most recently, younger Jesuits and lay students in Boston, was to be my sphere of ministry, along with many kinds of *ad hoc* service at various levels of ecclesial life.

I learned too that, at least in the United States, I would have very few Jesuit companions in my field. While I have noted with delight that a good number of my Jesuit students have found their few required credits in canon law to be quite useful in their early years of ministry, I have no illusions that, in Jesuit circles in years to come, my discipline is likely to be anything but marginal. However, our recent congregations have affirmed that we Jesuits are supposed to be working at the margins — which is where other Jesuits know to find us canonists when they need us.

Finally, I have lived happily as a Jesuit for over fifty-two years, and I look forward to more of the same. Even if I find myself in the minority on a variety of controversial issues, I always have treasured the respect of my brother Jesuits. For this reason, I hope that what I have written here will not imperil that friendship but rather provoke further study, reflection, and good conversation.



Jesuits, The Ministerial Priesthood, and Eucharistic Concelebration

John F. Baldovin, SJ

Post-conciliar developments on the meaning of the ministerial priesthood and its relationship to the priesthood of all the baptized make concelebration less than ideal. The norms of the church often do not keep pace with such developments. Furthermore, the church needs to re-examine the theology behind other practices, such as the offering of Mass intentions, that encourage concelebration.

In an essay entitled “Concelebration: A Problem of Symbolic Roles in the Church,” published over thirty years ago, I argued that daily concelebration by priests was less preferable than simple participation in the Eucharist.¹ Why? Because the post-Vatican II reformed liturgy requires us to re-think how priests are related to the common or baptismal priesthood of the faithful, in line with a renewed understanding of the communal nature of the liturgy. While I stand by that basic thesis, I realize that it must be argued with much more finesse and complexity than I could do at that time.

At the outset, I need to be clear. The subject of this essay is not the practice of concelebration considered without qualification, but rather the practice of concelebrating daily and in a formal way—which is to say, properly vested and saying the eucharistic prayer in a low voice along with the principal celebrant. In a concelebration as the official documentation of the Catholic Church envisions it, the church is clearly

¹ John F. Baldovin, “Concelebration: A Problem of Symbolic Roles in the Church,” *Worship* 59 (1985): 32–47.

arrayed in its hierarchical form. I certainly would argue that there are occasions on which manifesting the church's hierarchical arrangement is most appropriate—for example, at ordinations, weddings, and funerals—but I do not believe that such a practice is the same as daily concelebration; I leave the profession of vows here as an open question.

Although the Society of Jesus is a clerical order, many of us, me included, would consider manifesting our identity as Jesuits—ordained and non-ordained alike—on a vow day a more powerful witness to our Jesuit brotherhood than distinguishing our ecclesial roles by concelebrating at Mass. This would follow the practice of Franciscans, both ordained and not, whom I have seen processing together as brothers on their vow days. And I also maintain that there are good reasons why many Jesuits and members of other religious orders refrain from daily concelebration.

In any case, this issue of daily concelebration has become a neuralgic and at times divisive one in our Jesuit communities. The question I want to ask is: why is it that so many Jesuits opt for attendance at daily eucharistic celebrations as opposed to concelebrating? To answer this question, I think that we need to reflect first on the profound change and renewal that has taken place in our theology and practice of liturgy in the past fifty years, second on developments in the theology of the Eucharist, and then on how both influence our identity and practice as priests. For this reason, I will be dealing in this essay with some rather sensitive and complex issues, including the nature of the eucharistic sacrifice and the practice of Mass intentions and stipends. As such, I will attempt to look beyond the church's official prescriptions, for I believe that many Jesuits and other religious are operating at least implicitly out of a contemporary theology that raises important questions regarding our official practice.

To be clear, according to the current rules, priests may not, except "in rare and exceptional cases," participate in the Eucharist *modo laico*—that is, in distinguishing vestments.² Thus, they have

² *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* (2002) 114, <http://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/the-mass/general-instruction-of-the-roman-missal/girm-chapter-4.cfm> (hereafter cited in this essay as GIRM): "For it is preferable that Priests who are present

three choices: concelebration, the individual celebration of Mass, and assisting *in choro*—that is, vested in cassock and surplice and taking a place in the sanctuary.³ Thus, official church teaching clearly expects priests to participate in the Eucharist according to their “order” in the church. In short, both canon law and liturgical law, the latter as presented in the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, urge priests to celebrate the Eucharist daily if possible.⁴

With this in mind, the question arises as to whether Jesuits and other religious who do not follow these prescriptions can defend their practice. It seems to me that there are a number of prior and more fundamental issues that come to bear on this question: the relationship between the ministerial and common priesthood, especially in the celebration of the sacraments; the nature of the Mass as a sacrifice, as well as what that sacrifice effects; and the meaning of Mass intentions and stipends. Of course, these are profound questions; but I would maintain that even if I cannot do them justice here, we cannot avoid them if we want to understand what is at stake when priests refrain from concelebration.

And so, after a brief recap of the history of concelebration and of the reasoning that led the fathers at Vatican II to introduce presbyteral concelebration into the church’s practice, I will discuss some of the most pertinent issues from ecclesiology, the theology of the priesthood, and eucharistic theology relating to the question of daily concelebration.

at a celebration of the Eucharist, unless excused for a just reason, should usually exercise the function proper to their Order and hence take part as concelebrants, wearing sacred vestments. Otherwise, they wear their proper choir dress or a surplice over a cassock.” See also Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacrament, *Redemptionis Sacramentum* (March 25, 2004), 128, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20040423_redemptionis-sacramentum_en.html, which adds: “It is not fitting, except in rare and exceptional cases and with reasonable cause, for them to participate at Mass, as regards to externals, in the manner of the lay faithful.”

³ Here and elsewhere in this essay, the verb *assist*, when referring to a person at Mass, means “to attend” rather than “to give support or help.” And when referring to a priest, it implies that he is not concelebrating. —Ed. note.

⁴ Canons 904, 912; *GIRM* 114. Section three, below, deals with the recommendation for daily celebration by priests.

I. Why Did Vatican II (Re-)Introduce Concelebration?

Please note that the title of this section reads “(re-)introduce,” since prior to Vatican II, concelebration—in the sense of verbal co-consecration—was unusual in the church’s eucharistic practice. This is certainly true for the first seven centuries, in which we have evidence—for example, in the third-century *Apostolic Tradition*—of only bishops and presbyters concelebrating, in the sense of extending their hands during the eucharistic prayer. We also have evidence of bishops ceding parts of the prayer to a visiting bishop or sharing it among presbyters.⁵ From the eighth century on, however, there is evidence that presbyters and bishops concelebrated verbally with the pope on certain feast days.

Still, by the thirteenth century, concelebration was practiced as co-consecration only at the ordination of priests and by a newly-ordained bishop with the one who ordained him. But even then, the practice raised some questions. For instance, St. Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) asks how it is that several priests can participate in one eucharistic consecration. The question is whether one of the concelebrants can consecrate by finishing the formula “this is my body” before the others.⁶ He responds, on the basis of the church’s practice at priestly ordination—what today we would call the *lex orandi* or “rule of prayer”—and the authority of Pope Innocent III (1160–1216), that the ordaining bishop and the newly-ordained priests all should direct their intention to the same moment of consecration.⁷ Nevertheless, in the twentieth century, permission was sometimes given for “synchronized” masses at which one priest would celebrate at the main altar and other priests would celebrate separately but in a synchronized fashion at side altars.⁸

⁵ For a survey of this evidence, see Jean C. McGowan, *Concelebration: Sign of the Unity of the Church* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), 23–53; and Archdale King, *Concelebration in the Christian Church* (London: Mowbray, 1966), 65–68.

⁶ Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* [ST] 3, q. 82, a. 2. Thomas’s teacher, Albert the Great (1193–1280), himself opposed concelebration on the grounds that one of the concelebrants might confect the Eucharist before the principal celebrant. On this point, see Pierre Journel, *The Rite of Concelebration of the Mass and of Communion under Both Species* (New York: Desclee De Brouwer, 1967), 98.

⁷ ST 3, q. 82, a. 2, resp.

⁸ See King, *Concelebration*, 60.

There was a vigorous theological debate around the issue of concelebration during the 1940s and 1950s, much of it centering on an article by Karl Rahner (1904–1984) dealing with the relationship between many masses and the one sacrifice.⁹ Rahner’s proposal went to the heart of the matter: given the fact that every mass is of infinite value as the representation of Christ’s redemptive sacrifice, how is the effectiveness of a particular mass to be applied?¹⁰ In brief, his solution was that the effectiveness of the Mass depends on the faith and devotion of those who offer it, lay and ordained alike. By Rahner’s logic, a priest celebrating privately could be offering with more faith and devotion than he would by concelebrating. This is an issue with which I deal below, where I draw on the implications of Rahner’s argument as a whole.

For the time being, note that, in a speech entitled *Magnificate Dominum Mecum*, Pius XII vigorously condemned Rahner’s position. According to the pope, one hundred masses celebrated individually by one hundred priests is not the same as a mass at which one hundred priests assist: if they merely assist, then they are “considered to be on the same plane as the lay-members of the faithful.”¹¹ Rahner responded by distinguishing among four types of concelebration, wherein:

1. the concelebrating priests do not intend to exercise their priestly power and so function only ceremonially;
2. only the principal celebrant says the consecratory words, such that the concelebrating priests exercise their priestly function by offering the Mass but are not co-consecrators;

⁹ Karl Rahner, “Die vielen Messen und das eine Opfer: Ein Untersuchung über die rechte Norm der Messhäufigkeit,” in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 71 (Freiburg: Herder and Herder, 1949), 257–317. This essay was expanded and translated into English as Karl Rahner and Angelus Häussling, *The Celebration of the Eucharist* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968).

¹⁰ See Council of Trent, session 22, *Decree on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, chapter 2; Denzinger–Hünemann, *Enchiridion Symbolorum: A Compendium of Creeds, Definitions and Declarations of the Catholic Church* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012), 1548. Note too that the effects of the Mass are often referred to as its “fruits,” following the usage of Duns Scotus; on this point, see Rahner and Häussling, *The Celebration of the Eucharist*, 61–87.

¹¹ Pope Pius XII, *Magnificate Dominum Mecum* (November 2, 1954), in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 46 (1954), 666–77, at 669; cited in McGowan, *Concelebration*, 85.

3. the principal celebrant alone pronounces the words, but in the name of the other concelebrants who are in moral union with him; and
4. the concelebrants all pronounce the words with the principal celebrant, each intending to confect the sacrament and so exercising his priestly power.¹²

Vigorous theological discussion continued all the way to the Second Vatican Council, where during the first session the debate over concelebration was mirrored in a speech by Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani (1870–1979) lamenting that concelebrated masses meant fewer masses.¹³ In the end, the liturgy document, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, reads as follows: “Concelebration, whereby the unity of the priesthood is appropriately manifested, has remained in use to this day in the church both in the east and in the west.”¹⁴ It goes on to give the following examples: Holy Thursday at both the Chrism Mass and the Mass of the Lord’s Supper; masses during priests’ conferences and synods; the blessing of an abbot; and, at the bishop’s discretion, the “conventual” Mass of a religious community or the principal masses in churches. The constitution also adds that priests retain their right to celebrate Mass individually and mandates a new rite for concelebration.

Finally, a Vatican instruction issued in 1965 decided the primary theological questions around co-consecration and the ability of a priest to apply a stipend to a concelebrated mass.¹⁵ This teaching required concelebrating priests to say *sotto voce* the part of the eucharistic prayer from the epiclesis until the end of the anamnesis and decreed that those priests could apply a stipended intention once a day, including at a concelebrated mass. I will revisit these issues in part III, below.

¹² Karl Rahner, “Dogmatische Bemerkungen über die Frage der Konzelebration,” in *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 6 (1955), 81–106; McGowan, 77–107.

¹³ Alfredo Ottaviani, *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani Secundi*, session 1, 20–21. For a description of the debate by Mathijs Laberights, see Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph Komonchak, *The History of Vatican II*, vol. 2 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000), 129–31.

¹⁴ *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (December 4, 1963), 57–58, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html (hereafter cited as SC).

¹⁵ For a full commentary, see Jounel, *The Rite of Concelebration*, passim.

II. Issues Regarding Ecclesiology and Ordained Ministry

Profound theological issues underly the question of concelebration. These issues affect, at least implicitly, the practice of not concelebrating that has become common among Jesuits.

Several of these issues relate to ecclesiology in general and specifically to ordained ministry. First, the seventeen documents of Vatican II, four of which are constitutions, do not all bear the same weight. Furthermore, they do not always present a unified vision—for example, the vision of full, conscious, and active liturgical participation that characterized both the constitution on the liturgy (1963) and the constitution on the church (1964) seems to fade from the picture by the time that the council's last document, the Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests (*Presbyterorum Ordinis*), was issued in 1965.

As the historian Massimo Faggioli has pointed out, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* promoted a radical rethinking about the Eucharist as the act of the whole church, including the head and members. The document also formed the basis for a new vision of church that begins with liturgy—the *lex orandi* or rule of prayer—rather than juridically with the church's hierarchical structure. The communion ecclesiology of the constitution on the church then follows from the eucharistic ecclesiology of the liturgy constitution, which proposed a radically new liturgically-based vision of the church.¹⁶ Radically new, that is, with regard to the second millennium of the church's history; but not with regard to the church of the first millennium.¹⁷ For instance, the council fathers clearly affirmed the essentially communal nature of the liturgy as a major factor in this reclaimed vision of the liturgy.

Among the general norms for reforming the liturgy that *Sacrosanctum Concilium* outlines, we find the following:

¹⁶ On the importance of the liturgy constitution for the hermeneutics of Vatican II, see Massimo Faggioli, *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 13–18.

¹⁷ Often referred to as *ressourcement*, or “going back to the sources”; see Faggioli, *True Reform*, 19–58.

Liturgical services are not private functions, but are celebrations of the Church, which is the “sacrament of unity,” namely, the holy people united and ordered under their bishops.

Therefore liturgical services pertain to the whole body of the Church; they manifest it and have effects upon it; but they concern the individual members of the Church in different ways, according to their differing rank, office, and actual participation.

It is to be stressed that whenever rites, according to their specific nature, make provision for communal celebration involving the presence and active participation of the faithful, this way of celebrating them is to be preferred, so far as possible, to a celebration that is individual and quasi-private.

This applies with especial force to the celebration of Mass and the administration of the sacraments, even though every Mass has of itself a public and social nature.

In liturgical celebrations each person, minister or layman, who has an office to perform, should do all of, but only, those parts which pertain to his office by the nature of the rite and the principles of liturgy. (SC 26–28)

One could read the last paragraph as arguing that priests *must* always assist at Mass only as priests. On the other hand, we do not expect all deacons present at a celebration of the Eucharist to serve in their capacity as deacons. For this reason, it seems that we should read the passage more as discouraging priests from doing those things that are appropriate to others—for example, offering the prayer of the faithful—rather than as promoting concelebration, as well as forbidding lay persons from taking on roles assigned to deacons and priests.

In any case, this communal vision of worship from the liturgy document is echoed in chapter 2 of the dogmatic constitution on the church (*Lumen Gentium*), which reads:

Taking part in the Eucharistic sacrifice, which is the fount and apex of the whole Christian life, they offer the Divine Victim to God, *and offer themselves along with It*. Thus both by reason of the offering and through Holy Communion

all take part in this liturgical service, not indeed, all in the same way but each in that way which is proper to himself. Strengthened in Holy Communion by the Body of Christ, they then manifest in a concrete way that unity of the people of God which is suitably signified and wondrously brought about by this most august sacrament.¹⁸

How one interprets this paragraph has far-reaching implications. In some ways the post-conciliar history of the Catholic Church can be characterized by a division between, on the one hand, those stressing the communality of the offering of the Eucharist; and, on the other hand, those who emphasize the phrase “each in the way which is proper to himself” by differentiating sharply between the role of the priest and that of the rest of the assembly. In my opinion, the desire to highlight the distinctiveness of the priest’s role came in reaction to the large number of departures from the priesthood during the 1960s and 1970s. Many today would support that emphasis because of the dearth of vocations to the priesthood. Finally, there can be little debate that there is a clear differentiation of roles in the liturgy and that the priest is indispensable; the question comes with how these roles relate to one another.

Regarding priests (presbyters), the dogmatic constitution on the church goes on to associate their function directly with that of Christ:

They exercise their sacred function especially in the Eucharistic worship or the celebration of the Mass by which acting in the person of Christ and proclaiming His mystery they unite the prayers of the faithful with the sacrifice of their Head and renew and apply in the sacrifice of the Mass until the coming of the Lord the only sacrifice of the New Testament namely that of Christ offering Himself once for all a spotless Victim to the Father. (*LG* 28)

Then, in chapter 2, “On the People of God,” the document makes an important distinction between the common priesthood that all the

¹⁸ *Lumen Gentium* (November 21, 1964), 11, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html (hereafter cited as *LG*), my italics.

faithful enjoy by virtue of their baptism, and the ministerial priesthood that some have by virtue of holy orders:

Though they differ from one another in essence and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood are nonetheless interrelated: each of them in its own special way is a participation in the one priesthood of Christ. The ministerial priest, by the sacred power he enjoys, teaches and rules the priestly people; acting in the person of Christ, he makes present the Eucharistic sacrifice, and offers it to God in the name of all the people. But the faithful, in virtue of their royal priesthood, join in the offering of the Eucharist. They likewise exercise that priesthood in receiving the sacraments, in prayer and thanksgiving, in the witness of a holy life, and by self-denial and active charity. (LG 10)

Here, the document is emphasizing the unity between the baptismal and ministerial forms of Christ's one priesthood. In doing so here and elsewhere in the text, the council affirms the idea of the ministerial priest acting "in the person of Christ" (*in persona Christi*)—a concept since refined and clarified in terms of the priest acting "in the person of Christ the Head" of the church (*in persona Christi Capitis*).¹⁹

As subsequent theological debates have illustrated, this use of *in persona Christi* begs for more theological reflection than conciliar documents can articulate. For instance, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* explains that "the ministerial priesthood is at the service of the common priesthood."²⁰ In this sense, we can say that the common priesthood has a certain primacy over the ordained priesthood. Regardless, surely no one would argue that the ordained ministry exists for itself.²¹

¹⁹ As, for example, in *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (December 7, 1965), 2, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_presbyterorum-ordinis_en.html (hereafter cited as *PO*).

²⁰ *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1547, http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccs_archive/catechism/p2s2c3a6.htm.

²¹ This issue is handled with some delicacy by John Paul II in his post-synodal apostolic exhortation on the formation of priests, where he insists on the relational nature of the ministerial priesthood and at the same time its character as ontological configuration to the person of Christ. See John Paul II, *Pastores*

Once again, I think that a serious postconciliar division exists between those who emphasize the power that priests receive at their ordination and those who argue that the primary manifestation of Christ's priesthood is that of the baptized who are called to join Christ in offering the world back to the Father. In my opinion, the more we can do to help the people of God to appreciate their priestly service of the Gospel, the better. For this reason, although no one should question the necessity of the ministerial priesthood or its essential difference from that of the common priesthood, it is appropriate that priests express their solidarity with the faithful in addition to carrying out their ministerial duties.²² This relates directly to the issue of concelebration, in that ordinary Catholics have had such difficulty appreciating the importance of their baptismal priesthood.

Returning to concelebration, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* explains the practice in terms of manifesting the unity of the priesthood. Now, following the line that I have been developing, I would argue that the nature of the assembly as offering the eucharistic sacrifice should take precedence over the role of priests. To phrase this as a question, do priests act in the person of Christ insofar as they act in the person of the church; or do they act in the person of the church insofar as they act in the person of Christ?²³ For my part, I prefer the first formulation. In any case, differing attitudes and practices about con-

Dabo Vobis (March 15, 1992), 16–18, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_25031992_pastores-dabo-vobis.html. See also Gerald O'Collins, SJ, and Michael Keenan Jones, *Jesus our Priest: A Christian Approach to the Priesthood of Christ* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 279–84.

²² I am avoiding the unnecessary opposition so often made between a functional and an ontological understanding of the ministerial priesthood, since a balanced view requires both. It is interesting to note, however, that the council's decree placed the functional aspect first, as in the title itself, "On the Ministry and Life of Priests."

²³ See Edward J. Kilmartin, SJ, "The Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Towards the Third Millennium," *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 405–57; Robert J. Daly, SJ, "Sacrifice Unveiled or Sacrifice Revisited: Trinitarian and Liturgical Perspectives," *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 24–42. Kilmartin frequently refers to his own critique of the "average modern Catholic theology of the Eucharist." See the excellent synthesis of Kilmartin's thought on the priesthood and the Eucharist in Edward Hahnenberg, "The Ministerial Priesthood and Liturgical Anamnesis in the Thought of Edward J. Kilmartin, SJ," *Theological Studies* 66 (2005): 253–78.

eboration clearly reflect the differing ecclesiologies that have emerged from Vatican II and from theological debates about the ministerial priesthood in the decades following the council.

III. Specific Issues Regarding the Eucharist

My experience teaching theology has convinced me that all theological topics relate to one another, and the relationship between ecclesiology and the sacraments, especially the Eucharist and baptism, offers a case in point. Ultimately, the question can be summarized as, “of which God do we speak?”²⁴

On this note, the following issues regarding eucharistic theology are relevant to our discussion: (1) the encouragement of priests to celebrate the Eucharist frequently if not daily; (2) the question of “private mass”; (3) the idea of co-consecration, which in turn relates to (4) how the priest offers the eucharistic sacrifice, and how that offering relates to Mass intentions and stipends; and finally (5) the Mass as a manifestation of the unity of the priesthood. While I do not hope to do these issues justice here, I will suggest what each has to do with concelebration.

1. Daily Celebration of the Eucharist

It is often repeated that the Eucharist is at the center of the priest’s life. I should hope so—not because he is a priest, but because he is a Christian. Indeed, canon law urges priests to celebrate the Eucharist frequently, since “in the mystery of the Eucharistic sacrifice the work of redemption is exercised continually”—but it does not oblige them to do so.²⁵ Now, does this mean that, as Pius XII asserted, the more masses, the better? Not necessarily. A better interpretation would consider the pas-

²⁴ Louis-Marie Chauvet brilliantly demonstrates this point when he insists that we take the cross and Resurrection of Christ as our theological starting points. See Chauvet, *The Sacraments: The Word of God at the Mercy of the Body* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2001), 158–69.

²⁵ Canon 904.

toral good of the people, recognizing that priests who refrain from celebrating the Eucharist out of their own predilection and without regard for the needs of the faithful are surely negligent in their duties. On this point, Jesuits should note that the 32nd General Congregation mandated daily participation in the Eucharist for all.²⁶

2. "Private Mass" vs. Concelebration

Is there such a thing as a private mass? Strictly speaking, every mass, even when celebrated without the assistance of at least one person, is an act of Christ and the whole church. While we cannot deny this, if we consider the meaning of the eucharistic celebration as a whole, we must recognize that a private mass is a far cry from what the Eucharist is intended to be. On this point, consider only St. Paul's treatment of the Eucharist in First Corinthians 11. In short, the Eucharist is a sacrificial banquet, and there is a great difference between dining alone and with others. For this reason, canon law states that "A priest may not celebrate the Eucharistic Sacrifice without the participation of at least one of the faithful, unless there is a good and reasonable cause for doing so."²⁷

Here we find another area in which the insights and values of the constitution on the liturgy conflict with an older sacramental theology. Celebrating alone—or even with a few people—represents a very tenuous theology. For this reason, even allowing for circumstances where a solitary mass may be permitted, regular celebration of masses with few people present constitutes an abuse. I for one find the persistence of this practice in Jesuit communities troubling, since this practice is not in the spirit of the post-Vatican II renewal of the liturgy.

²⁶ *Complementary Norm 227, 2; The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms: A Complete English Translation of the Official Latin Texts*, ed. John W. Padberg, SJ (St. Louis, MO: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996), 259. See also the letter of Fr. General Peter Hans Kolvenbach (1928–2016) to All Major Superiors, "The Eucharist," February 15, 2006.

²⁷ Canon 906; see also *GIRM* 254.

3. Co-Consecration

In his 1949 essay and the book he published later with Angelus Häussling, OSB, Karl Rahner took up the issue of the multiplication of masses. In the book, he addresses the issues of private masses and concelebration versus assistance at Mass. Although he was willing to admit that, in terms of the priest's private prayer, a mass celebrated alone might result in with more "faith and devotion"—an important phrase for him—than one celebrated in the presence of others, there are other issues at stake, including the essentially communal nature of the liturgy.²⁸ He also pointed out that in some instances, the church restricts the multiplication of masses—for example, on Holy Thursday. This fine insight ought to be applied much more broadly.

Furthermore, Rahner argued against the idea that only verbal co-consecration constitutes concelebration.²⁹ Without going into detail here, let it suffice to note that concelebration consisting simply of priests extending their hands over the offerings seems to have been church practice for the first seven centuries.³⁰ He goes on to argue that the theory, which Duns Scotus (1266–1308) developed in the fourteenth century, of the fruits of the Mass has no theological foundation. From this, Rahner argued further that a priest might simply assist at Mass with greater faith and devotion than if he were concelebrating.³¹

How, then, did the church decide to insist on verbal consecration as opposed to simple gestures or even to vested participation at the altar? It is not easy to say. As noted above, until the eighth century verbal co-consecration does not seem to have been the practice in the West, and it has never been the practice in the Christian East.³²

²⁸ Rahner and Häussling, *The Celebration of the Eucharist*, 91–96.

²⁹ Rahner and Häussling, *The Celebration of the Eucharist*, 109.

³⁰ See McGowan, *Concelebration*, 24–30; and King, *Concelebration*, 18–25.

³¹ Rahner and Häussling, *The Celebration of the Eucharist*, 109–14.

³² See King, *Concelebration*, 102–15. In any case, there has long been a debate in the Christian East regarding a "moment of consecration." Many Eastern theologians consider the epiclesis or invocation of the Holy Spirit to be the moment when the transformation happens.

And, thus, there seems to be no clear theological reason why concelebration requires verbal co-consecration.

From one perspective, co-consecration insures that priests satisfy their obligation from accepting Mass stipends. On the other hand, only one mass—one sacrifice—is being celebrated. From this, it seems to follow that priests might assist at Mass *modo laico* and still offer an intention, just as any Jesuit—lay or ordained—is bound to do.³³ Of course, a priest always remains a priest; but he need not manifest this identity at every mass. Yet precisely this rationale seems to operate in the ordinary practice of many religious communities.

Moreover, the notion of co-consecration involving the saying of certain formulae (e.g., epiclesis, institution narrative, and anamnesis) needs to be re-thought in light of a growing consensus among theologians that the eucharistic prayer as a whole is consecratory. Church teaching has in fact acknowledged as much in declaring valid the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, which is a eucharistic prayer of the Assyrian Church or Church of the East, although it contains no explicit institution narrative.³⁴

On this same note, some Jesuits ignore the directions given for concelebration that require priests to join *sotto voce* in the prayers from the epiclesis until the end of the anamnesis and second epiclesis (e.g., in Eucharistic Prayer III, up to and including the words “one Body, one Spirit in Christ”). The problem is that simply reciting the words of institution takes them out of their context within the prayer and runs the risk of reducing them to a magical formula.

³³ See the *Manual for the Juridical Practice of the Society of Jesus* (Rome: Curia of the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, 1997), 303–07.

³⁴ Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, “Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East” (July 20, 2001), http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20011025_chiesa-caldea-assira_en.html. For an analysis of this question, see Robert F. Taft, “Mass Without the Consecration? The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East Promulgated 26 October 2001,” *Worship* 77 (2003): 482–509.

I hasten to add, however, that our current rubrics give the impression that only the institution narrative really matters.³⁵

4. Mass Intentions and Offerings

Since at least the third century, the Eucharist has been offered with particular intentions in mind. In fact, it has been argued that the success of Christianity has related in part to how Christians honored their dead, especially in the cemeteries.³⁶ But in the early church, this offering did not detract from the offering made by any and all of the faithful. M. Francis Mannion has argued that the migration of Christianity north of the Alps introduced a new sense of economy into the Eucharist, whereby sacred actions became reified and a restrictive notion of offering came into play.³⁷

In this context, the offering went from being inclusive to exclusive with regard to the intention of the donor, and a money value was attributed to it. Of course, the church has never taught that one can buy or pay for a sacrament. Indeed, all such offerings are made as free-will donations for the support of the church in general and especially for the priest. While in theory this makes sense, in practice it is difficult for people not to imagine that they are paying for a mass to be said. Even the common though unofficial use of the word *stipend* connotes a payment. Here, the Protestant Reformers were responding to real abuses.

And so, while remembering individuals at the Eucharist has been a constant practice in the church, this offering of intentions was not restrictive until the Middle Ages, when Christianity adapted to a new social and cultural milieu. This is not to say that a parish community should not announce an intention at any given mass; but we

³⁵ In passing, note that the rubrics make the extension of both hands at the epiclesis mandatory, whereas the gesture of pointing to the gifts during the words of institution is optional.

³⁶ See Ramsay MacMullen, *The Second Church: Popular Christianity, AD 200–400* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009).

³⁷ See M. Francis Mannion, "Stipends and Eucharistic Praxis," *Worship* 57 (1983): 194–214.

need to consider how best to articulate this. It seems to me that there is a big difference between saying "I am offering this mass for N.," and "today we are remembering in a special way N." In other words, we must never lose sight of the fact that we are not offering the Mass for anything other than for the glory of God and the salvation of the world.³⁸ Which is to say that the offering of a mass, whether by a layperson or by a priest, regardless of whether a monetary offering has been made, cannot be thought of in terms of a transaction. Rather, our constant and healthy Christian instinct has been that to have a certain intention in mind is a salutary way of remembering the person before God. Theologically, we cannot say more.

In addition, the reintroduction of the universal prayer or general intercessions to the eucharistic liturgy should raise questions about limiting the intentions for a mass. For example, if Mrs. Smith is in attendance and praying for the repose of her late husband, I fail to see any difference in the value of a particular Mass offering, except that the priest may voice the intention aloud on behalf of the church. From this perspective, while a priest has a moral and canonical obligation to remember at a mass an intention for which a monetary offering has been received for that mass, this does not mean that the priest's intention has any more value than the intention of anyone else at the celebration.³⁹ All we can safely say when a priest has offered a mass for a donor's intention is that he has offered that mass for that intention.

All the same, under current church discipline, if I have received a monetary offering for a mass, or if my superiors have asked me to apply that intention to a given mass, then I have an obligation either to preside at or to concelebrate that mass. For Jesuits, the *Complementary Norms* explicate these rules.⁴⁰

³⁸ As the French order of Mass puts so well in its response to the invitation, "pray, brothers and sisters": "for the glory of God and the salvation of the world" (*Pour la gloire de Dieu et le salut du monde*).

³⁹ See canons 945–58, especially canons 947, 949; John Huels, "Stipends in the New Code of Canon Law," *Worship* 57 (1983): 215–24.

⁴⁰ CN 184; ed. Padberg, 243. See too the *Manual for the Juridical Practice of the Society of Jesus*, 165–67.

Of course, the whole issue of stipends is complex. On one level, it relates to the welfare of priests and of religious orders—an issue to consider carefully, but no excuse for misleading people as to what they are “getting” when they make a monetary offering for an intention. Finally, at the very least we should not regard the effects of the Eucharist as a pie that can be cut into so many pieces. Instead, Catholic doctrine teaches that the sacrifice of Christ is of infinite value; but, as Rahner argued, how we relate to that value is a matter of our faith and devotion.

5. Unity of the Priesthood and Unity of the Assembly

The rationale that both Vatican II and the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* give for (re)introducing eucharistic concelebration is the manifestation of the unity of the priesthood. Certainly, this unity is a positive value, apparent in such occasions as celebrations of a diocesan presbyterate with its bishop. But the unexpressed motivation for this policy was the elimination of private masses.⁴¹ Note, however, that private masses have not been eliminated altogether, perhaps from a resistance to or ignorance of the theological issues discussed above. Furthermore, I have no doubt that concelebration has been a positive advance over the offering of private masses. Still, I feel the need to ask whether individual priests have a *right* to concelebrate, especially given that the diocesan bishop is to regulate concelebration, from which it follows that permission to concelebrate can be restricted.

On the other hand, it seems to me that the issues that I have treated in this article—for example, the communal nature of the liturgy, the relationship between liturgy and ecclesiology, the sacramental activity of the priest and his identity, daily celebration, private masses, and Mass intentions—can help us to appreciate how the practice of so many Jesuits and so many Jesuit communities has developed over the past fifty years. As examples of how practice and

⁴¹ Goffredo Boselli, “Concelebración eucarística y ministerio de los presbiteros,” in *Jesuitas, Sacerdocio y Liturgia: III Congreso de la Asociación Internacional Jungmann para Jesuitas y Liturgia. Abadía de Montserrat-Cataluña, España. Junio 23–28 de 2008* (Mexico City: Obra Nacional de la Buena Prensa, 2010), 77–94.

official directives developed after Vatican II, I would point to the celebration of Mass *versus populum*, the giving of communion to the faithful under both kinds, and the celebration of the sacraments entirely in the vernacular. And by the same token, I would argue that, in order to appreciate more fully the celebration of the Eucharist as a communal act of the people of God in Christ, it would be better to refrain from regular—which is to say, daily—concelebration.

Conclusion

To be clear, I freely admit that canon 902 of the Code of Canon Law permits priests to concelebrate except in cases where they should celebrate a particular mass for the good of the faithful. Now, whether it is *advisable* for priests to concelebrate at a daily community mass is another question. Granted, daily concelebration is, in fact, the practice of many good Jesuits and other priests. However, I hope that this essay will help my brother Jesuits to see the deeper issues here, for which reason I affirm that, for the most part, it is better not to concelebrate on a daily basis.

Again, I understand that many of the theological issues that I have raised are controversial; but I do not think that we can afford to avoid discussing them. The Society has always held the celebration of the Eucharist to be central to its life and well-being, and we know well the devotion with which St. Ignatius himself celebrated Mass. But he was a man of his time, celebrating according to the best practices and theology of his day.⁴² And we should do likewise.

Finally, I do not see the point of either forbidding or requiring priests to concelebrate. Because daily concelebration is a significant aspect of priestly ministry and identity for many Jesuits, they should, in the absence of some compelling pastoral reason, be allowed to do so. On the other hand, I hope that Jesuits will ask themselves whether these reasons are generally persuasive. As always, dialogue on these

⁴² See Robert F. Taft, SJ, "Jesuit Liturgy—An Oxymoron?" *Worship* 84 (2010): 38–70.

issues helps; and we should be talking to one another rather than hovering in silos. To quote the old Latin adage, *In necessariis, unitas; in dubiis, libertas; sed in omnibus, caritas*: in essential matters, unity; in unessential matters, freedom; but in all things, love.

Fr. Conn's Response to Fr. Baldovin

The single-most gratifying experience of my eleven years serving at the School of Theology and Ministry at Boston College was twice team-teaching the Rites Practicum with my long-term friend Fr. John Baldovin. Perhaps because of our well-known disagreement on the question of concelebration, our students were pleasantly surprised to see how consistently he and I were on the same page as regards our understanding and interpretation of the church's sacred rites, especially the celebration of the Eucharist. In other contexts, as well, Fr. Baldovin has great respect for the discipline of canon law and often consults me on matters of mutual interest, as I do him. He has been an exemplary and valued colleague.

After reading several times his contribution to this issue of *STUDIES*, I am confirmed in my belief that canon law and theology are different though intersecting disciplines. As I learned nearly fifty years ago from my legendary canon law professor at Woodstock College, the late Fr. John Reed (1913–1979) canon law is only as good as the theology that grounds it. And so, in my many years of teaching canon law at various levels and places, I have always tried to help my students understand how canonical norms protect and foster theological—and especially ecclesiological—values. That is not always easy, perhaps because those values are more fluid than the norms.

Now, I agree with many of the points that Fr. Baldovin raises in his piece. Perhaps the most important of these is the interplay between the universal priesthood of all the baptized and the ministerial priesthood of the ordained, and that the latter is at the service of the former. I also agree that not all the faithful fully appreciate their priestly dignity and responsibility. I further agree that it is incum-

bent on the church's ordained ministers to help their fellow believers grow in their rightful role in the eucharistic assembly.

But I fail to see how priests adopting the role of the lay faithful at Mass achieves this objective. Rather, I believe that solidarity among the people of God at the Eucharist is fostered by each of the members carrying out his or her own role, as the liturgy document asks (SC 28). For this reason, I do not find compelling Fr. Baldovin's argument that there is not a special role for more than one or two deacons at Mass, since the rite of Mass specifically provides a role for all priests—namely, concelebration.

On this point, it would be interesting for Jesuits and other religious to ask themselves and to share with each other the reasons why they choose to participate at Mass as they do. Is daily Mass part of their ordinary spiritual life? What are the reasons why some choose or desire to concelebrate, while others do not? Then, are these answers proper to understandings of the charism of different institutes? And what does the Jesuit charism have to contribute to such reflection?

I would answer that I desire to share in the Eucharist both as an ordained priest, and according to the norms that the church has established. I concede that canon law's use of the jussive subjunctive in calling for priests' frequent celebration and strongly commending daily celebration is less than the imposition of a strict legal obligation (c. 904). But the sources of the canon do not at all propose participating at Mass in the manner of the lay faithful as a regular option for priests. I would add to my answer that I do not want to draw attention to myself at Mass but rather to do in the least ostentatious way permissible what the church does and requires.

As I said in my own contribution, I acknowledge that there is not an absolute right for a priest to concelebrate, and I would not impose my own desire in a situation where, with or without good reason, concelebration is not welcome. So burdensome is the practice of demanding letters of good standing, which far exceed the simple requirement of canon 903, that it undoes the presumptive right or obligation to concelebrate that a priest may feel.

Fr. Baldovin and I agree on three more points. First, even if the notion of the “special fruit” attached to the intention of a priest who celebrates or concelebrates may not be theologically strong, it is a matter of strict justice that when someone has accepted an offering for a priest to apply a mass to a specific intention, that priest has the obligation to celebrate or concelebrate that mass for that intention. The law of the Society could, I suppose, mitigate the manner whereby the monthly required intentions and suffrages for our deceased members are satisfied. However, I, for one, would be saddened at the loss of an old and noble practice.

A second point of convergence is our shared antipathy for the individual Mass—that is, for masses celebrated alone or with at least one other. The theology of the Eucharist expressed in various conciliar documents favors communal celebration of the Eucharist, even though canon law guarantees a right to individual celebration (c. 902). With this in mind, from my perspective, disfavor for individual celebration ought to favor an individual Jesuit's option to concelebrate in a communal setting.

Fr. Baldovin puts the third point of agreement this way: “I do not see the point of either forbidding or requiring priests to concelebrate.”¹ I agree; but the reader might detect in this statement a tone of half-heartedness, and one that is not likely to go away soon among those who share Fr. Baldovin's perspective. Granted, Fr. Baldovin is persuaded in his opposition to daily concelebration by theological reasons—notably, his inclination to favor the commonality of the universal and ministerial priesthoods—and he is willing to act on his theological position. But for my part, I am at peace with the coexistence of the commonality and divergence of the two priesthoods and am persuaded to follow the norms that the church has established in the Code of Canon Law and in the liturgical books, unless and until a competent authority changes them.

Finally, I do not believe we Jesuits as members of a religious community have adequately considered or discussed this matter

¹ See p. 35, above.

among ourselves, and I applaud the Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality for its willingness to engage it and to do so in a fraternal spirit. In the meantime, our practice should be characterized by mutual respect, perhaps with special care for those who hold the minority view, lest they feel marginalized or even foolish in their convictions and choices. *In omnibus, caritas*, indeed!

Fr. Baldovin's Response to Fr. Conn

I am happy to respond to Fr. Jim Conn's very well-written essay on Jesuits and concelebration. It's important to note at the outset that this conversation has been going on between us for a number of years and that we remain good friends. In fact, as Fr. Conn mentions in his response to my own essay, we very happily team-taught a course on liturgical presiding for two years. Despite our differences—which are significant—we regard one another highly, and I think that's a good example of what being "friends in the Lord" means.

I freely grant Fr. Conn's main thesis that the church's directives expect priests to celebrate/preside at the Eucharist frequently and preferably daily. I also grant that, according to the directives, if priests do not preside or concelebrate, then they should attend dressed in cassock and surplice.

However, the fact that most of us Jesuits do not even own a cassock or a surplice indicates that our approach to the priesthood and to the liturgical/sacramental life of the church differs from what the documents clearly expect. The burden of my article is to ask why this difference and to give some theological and pastoral reflection to that question. My premise is that, in its teaching about the ministerial priesthood, the church has not been consistent with Vatican II's revolutionary understanding of the full, conscious, and active participation required of all the faithful. I have no doubt that many Jesuits will disagree with this assessment; but I am certainly not alone in making it. Understanding the ministry and life of presbyters—to use the title and vocabulary of the council's document on the priesthood—remains a neuralgic issue

in the church, especially with so many questions being raised presently, in the wake of the sex abuse crisis and its mishandling.

For my part, I contend that, at an existential level, many if not most Jesuits neither concelebrate nor assist at Mass in choir dress, because they are at least implicitly in agreement with the vision of full, conscious, and active participation that I mentioned above. Furthermore, in my experience, most Jesuits attend or celebrate daily Mass primarily as an act of devotion; and I suggest that it might be helpful for us to move forward in our understanding of the Eucharist as more than this.

To be clear, I do not want to downplay the value of devotion; but again, much more is going on at the Eucharist, which is the celebration of the Paschal Mystery: the passion, death, and Resurrection of the Lord. That celebration has profound implications for the world itself and for the way in which all of us—Jesuit and lay alike—live our lives. As the prayer over the offerings for the Second Sunday in Ordinary Time and for the Holy Thursday Mass of the Lord's Supper puts it so strikingly, "Grant us, O Lord, we pray, that we may participate worthily in these mysteries, for *whenever the memorial of this sacrifice is celebrated the work of our redemption is accomplished*" (my italics). It takes me about fifteen weeks to flesh that out in my course on eucharistic theology. Which is to say that one major issue is to contextualize our own personal devotion within the broader context of the Eucharist considered as a whole.

Here, I think it's useful to take care how we regard St. Ignatius's obvious devotion at his daily private mass. For example, note the distinction that Jesuit scholar Robert Taft makes between what pertains to Ignatius and what is Ignatian.¹ As Fr. Taft points out, the attitude toward the liturgy in Ignatius's time was vastly different from the attitude today, which is far more conscious of the communitarian and evangelical orientation of our worship. In other words, to be Ignatian is not to be an Ignatian fundamentalist. And far from it, since he was such an exemplary man of his times.

¹ Robert Taft, "Jesuit Liturgy—An Oxymoron?" *Worship* 84 (2010): 38–70, at 42–49.

This brings me to a second observation, which for Jesuits in general and especially for those who are ordained priests is even more significant, and this involves the question of Mass intentions. As every attentive Jesuit knows, the Society expects all Jesuits, ordained or not, to offer Mass each month for a variety of intentions, as well as to offer Mass for our brothers who have died. But I contend that we need to re-evaluate the manner in which we fulfill this expectation. Granted, as I mention in my essay, there exists a venerable tradition, stretching back at least to the second century, of Christians praying for the dead. And so, to "offer Mass" presumably means that we would lift up, at a particular liturgy, a specific intention for which someone may have made a monetary offering. But I do want to raise the question, with which no one as far as I know has dealt dogmatically, of whether the priest *qua* priest is doing anything more than what the church is doing and what individuals are doing when they pray for someone or something at the Eucharist.

Lastly, since Fr. Conn raises the specter of giving scandal to diocesan priests and bishops, I wonder if we are not so much provoking scandal as raising challenging questions for a church that continues to grow in its understanding of the relation of ministerial priests to the rest of the baptized.

In any case, these are the deeper questions of theology, spirituality, and piety that in my opinion underlie the practice of many good Jesuits as regards concelebration. I hope that Fr. Conn and I both have been able to further the conversation.



Past Issues of STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

- 1/1 John R. Sheets, *A Profile of the Contemporary Jesuit: His Challenges and Opportunities* (Sep 1969).
- 1/2 George E. Ganss, *The Authentic Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: Some Facts of History and Terminology Basic to Their Functional Efficacy Today* (Nov 1969).
- 2/1 William J. Burke, *Institution and Person* (Feb 1970).
- 2/2 John Carroll Futrell, *Ignatian Discernment* (Apr 1970).
- 2/3 Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *The Response of the Jesuit, as Priest and Apostle, in the Modern World* (Sep 1970).
- 3/1 John H. Wright, *The Grace of Our Founder and the Grace of Our Vocation* (Feb 1971).
- 3/2 Vincent J. O'Flaherty, *Some Reflections on Jesuit Commitment* (Apr 1971).
- 3/3 Thomas E. Clarke, *Jesuit Commitment—Fraternal Covenant?*; John C. Haughey, *Another Perspective on Religious Commitment* (Jun 1971).
- 3/4 Jules J. Toner, *A Method for Communal Discernment of God's Will* (Sep 1971).
- 3/5 John R. Sheets, *Toward a Theology of the Religious Life: A Sketch, with Particular Reference to the Society of Jesus* (Nov 1971).
- 4/1 David B. Knight, *Saint Ignatius' Ideal of Poverty* (Jan 1972).
- 4/2 John R. Sheets, William W. Meissner, William J. Burke, Thomas E. Clarke, and John H. Wright, *Two Discussions: I. On Spiritual Direction [and] II. On Leadership and Authority* (Mar 1972).
- 4/3 Ladislav Orsy, *Some Questions about the Purpose and Scope of the General Congregation* (Jun 1972).
- 4/4 George E. Ganss, John H. Wright, John W. O'Malley, Leo J. O'Donovan, and Avery Dulles, *On Continuity and Change: A Symposium* (Oct 1972).
- 4/5 John Carroll Futrell, *Communal Discernment: Reflections on Experience* (Nov 1972).
- 5/1–5/2 Vincent J. O'Flaherty, *Renewal: Call and Response* (Jan and Mar 1973).
- 5/3 Pedro Arrupe, "Art and the Spirit of the Society of Jesus"; Clement J. McNaspy, "Art in Jesuit Life," in *The Place of Art in Jesuit Life* (Apr 1973).
- 5/4 John C. Haughey, *The Pentecostal Thing and Jesuits* (Jun 1973).
- 5/5 Ladislav Orsy, *Toward a Theological Evaluation of Communal Discernment* (Oct 1973).
- 6/1–6/2 John W. Padberg, *The General Congregations of the Society of Jesus: A Brief Survey of Their History* (Jan and Mar 1974).
- 6/3 David B. Knight, *Joy and Judgment in Religious Obedience* (Apr 1974).
- 6/4 Jules J. Toner, *The Deliberation That Started the Jesuits: A Commentario on the Deliberatio primorum Patrum, Newly Translated, with a Historical Introduction* (Jun 1974).
- 6/5 Robert L. Schmitt, *The Christ-Experience and Relationship Fostered in the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola* (Oct 1974).
- 7/1 John H. Wright, George E. Ganss, and Ladislav Orsy, *On Thinking with the Church Today* (Jan 1975).
- 7/2 George E. Ganss, *The Christian Life Communities as Sprung from the Sodalities of Our Lady*; Miss José Gsell and Sister Françoise Vandermeersch, *A Specimen Copy of Communications from the International Service in Ignatian Spirituality, Rome* (Mar 1975).

- 7/3 William J. Connolly, *Contemporary Spiritual Direction—Scope and Principles: An Introductory Essay* (Jun 1975).
- 7/4 Thomas E. Clarke, *Ignatian Spirituality and Societal Consciousness*; Ladislav Orsy, *Faith and Justice: Some Reflections* (Sep 1975).
- 7/5 Michael J. Buckley, *The Confirmation of a Promise: A Letter to George Ganss*; John W. Padberg, *Continuity and Change in General Congregation XXXII* (Nov 1975).
- 8/1 Charles E. O'Neill, *Acatamieto: Ignatian Reverence in History and in Contemporary Culture* (Jan 1976).
- 8/2–8/3 Horacio de la Costa, "A More Authentic Poverty"; Edward F. Sheridan, "The Decree on Poverty," in *On Becoming Poor: A Symposium on Evangelical Poverty*, with discussions by Michael J. Buckley, William J. Connolly, David L. Fleming, George E. Ganss, Robert F. Harvanek, Daniel F. X. Meenan, Charles E. O'Neill, and Ladislav Orsy (Mar and May 1976).
- 8/4 Robert L. Faricy, *Jesuit Community: Community of Prayer* (Oct 1976).
- 8/5 Michael J. Buckley, *Jesuit Priesthood: Its Meaning and Commitments* (Dec 1976).
- 9/1–9/2 Joseph M. Becker, "Section I: The Statistics and a Tentative Analysis"; Ladislav Orsy, Robert F. Harvanek, James J. Gill, David L. Fleming, and William J. Connolly, "Section II: Other Reactions and Explanations from Different Backgrounds," in *Changes in U.S. Jesuit Membership, 1958–1975: A Symposium* (Jan and Mar 1977).
- 9/3 Robert F. Harvanek, *The Reluctance to Admit Sin* (May 1977).
- 9/4 Bill Connolly, "A Letter on the Problematic, To Phil Land," and "A Reply to Phil Land: Afterthoughts"; Phil Land, "A Reply about the Problematic," in *Jesuit Spiritualities and the Struggle for Social Justice* (Sep 1977).
- 9/5 James J. Gill, *A Jesuit's Account of Conscience—For Personal and Organizational Effectiveness* (Nov 1977).
- 10/1 Alfred C. Kammer, "Burn-Out": *Contemporary Dilemma for the Jesuit Social Activist*; Richard L. Smith, Francisco Ornelas, and Noel Barré, *Other Viewpoints* (Jan 1978).
- 10/2–10/3 William A. Barry, Madeline Birmingham, William J. Connolly, Robert J. Fahey, Virginia Sullivan Finn, and James J. Gill, *Affectivity and Sexuality: Their Relationship to the Spiritual and Apostolic Life of Jesuits—Comments on Three Experiences* (Mar and May 1978).
- 10/4 Robert F. Harvanek, *The Status of Obedience in the Society of Jesus*; Philip S. Land, *Reactions to the Connolly-Land Letters on Faith and Justice: A Digest* (Sep 1978).
- 10/5 John W. Padberg, *Personal Experience and the Spiritual Exercises: The Example of Saint Ignatius* (Nov 1978).
- 11/1 Thomas H. Clancy, *Feeling Bad about Feeling Good* (Jan 1979).
- 11/2 Dominic Maruca, *Our Personal Witness as a Power toward Evangelizing Our Culture* (Mar 1979).
- 11/3 J. Leo Klein, *American Jesuits and the Liturgy* (May 1979).
- 11/4 Michael J. Buckley, *Mission in Companionship: Of Jesuit Community and Communion* (Sep 1979).
- 11/5 Joseph F. Conwell, *The Kamikaze Factor: Choosing Jesuit Ministries* (Nov 1979).
- 12/1 Thomas H. Clancy, ed., *Veteran Witnesses: Their Experience of Jesuit Life* [reflections of fifteen Jesuits] (Jan 1980).

- 12/2 Peter J. Henriot, Joseph A. Appleyard, and J. Leo Klein, *Living Together in Mission: A Symposium on Small Apostolic Communities* (Mar 1980).
- 12/3 Joseph F. Conwell, *Living and Dying in the Society of Jesus or Endeavoring to Imitate Angelic Purity* (May 1980).
- 12/4–12/5 J. Peter Schineller, *The Newer Approaches to Christology and Their Use in the Spiritual Exercises* (Sep and Nov 1980).
- 13/1 Simon Peter [pseudonym], *Alcoholism and Jesuit Life: An Individual and Community Illness* (Jan 1981).
- 13/2 Paul Beghey, *A Bibliography on St. Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises: A Working Tool for American Students* (Mar 1981).
- 13/3 George E. Ganss, *Toward Understanding the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation, Especially as Described in the Papal and Jesuit Documents* (May 1981).
- 13/4 James W. Reites, *St. Ignatius of Loyola and the Jews* (Sep 1981).
- 13/5 David J. O'Brien, *The Jesuits and Catholic Higher Education* (Nov 1981).
- 14/1 John W. O'Malley, *The Jesuits, St. Ignatius, and the Counter Reformation: Some Recent Studies and Their Implications for Today* (Jan 1982).
- 14/2 Avery Dulles, *Saint Ignatius and the Jesuit Theological Tradition* (Mar 1982).
- 14/3 Paul V. Robb, *Conversion as a Human Experience* (May 1982).
- 14/4 Howard J. Gray, *An Experience in Ignatian Government: Letters to a New Rector* (Sep 1982).
- 14/5 Francisco Ivern, *The Future of Faith and Justice: A Critical Review of Decree Four* (Nov 1982).
- 15/1 John W. O'Malley, *The Fourth Vow in Its Ignatian Context: A Historical Study* (Jan 1983).
- 15/2 Francis A. Sullivan and Robert L. Faricy, *On Making the Spiritual Exercises for the Renewal of Jesuit Charisms* (Mar 1983).
- 15/3–15/4 John W. Padberg, *The Society True to Itself: A Brief History of the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus (December 2, 1974–March 7, 1975)* (May and Sep 1983).
- 15/5–16/1 Joseph A. Tetlow, *The Jesuits' Mission in Higher Education: Perspectives & Contexts* (Nov 1983 and Jan 1984).
- 16/2 John W. O'Malley, *To Travel to Any Part of the World: Jerónimo Nadal and the Jesuit Vocation* (Mar 1984).
- 16/3 Daniel J. O'Hanlon, *Integration of Christian Practices: A Western Christian Looks East* (May 1984).
- 16/4 Gregory I. Carlson, "A Faith Lived Out of Doors": *Ongoing Formation of Jesuits Today* (Sep 1984).
- 16/5 E. Edward Kinerk, *Eliciting Great Desires: Their place in the Spirituality of the Society of Jesus* (Nov 1984).
- 17/1 William C. Spohn, *St. Paul on Apostolic Celibacy and the Body of Christ* (Jan 1985).
- 17/2 Brian E. Daley, "In Ten Thousand Places": *Christian Universality and the Jesuit Mission* (Mar 1985).
- 17/3 Joseph A. Tetlow, *A Dialogue on the Sexual Maturing of Celibates* (May 1985).
- 17/4 William C. Spohn, John A. Coleman, Thomas E. Clarke, and Peter J. Henriot, *Jesuits and Peacemaking: A Symposium* (Sep 1985).
- 17/5 E. Edward Kinerk, *When Jesuits Pray: A Perspective on the Prayer of Apostolic Persons* (Nov 1985).
- 18/1 Donald L. Gelpi, *The Converting Jesuit* (Jan 1986).

- 18/2 Charles J. Beirne, *Compass and Catalyst: An Essay on the Ministry of Administration* (Mar 1986).
- 18/3 Richard A. McCormick, *Bishops as Teachers and Jesuits as Listeners* (May 1986).
- 18/4 Brian O. McDermott, *With Him, In Him: Graces of the Spiritual Exercises* (Sep 1986).
- 18/5 Joseph A. Tetlow, *The Transformation of Jesuit Poverty* (Nov 1986).
- 19/1 John M. Staudenmaier, *United States Technology and Adult Commitment* (Jan 1987).
- 19/2 J. A. Appleyard, *The Languages We Use: Talking about Religious Experience* (Mar 1987).
- 19/3 J. William Harmless and Donald L. Gelpi, *Priesthood Today and the Jesuit Vocation* (May 1987).
- 19/4 Roger Haight, *Foundational Issues in Jesuit Spirituality* (Sep 1987).
- 19/5 Philip Endean, *Who Do You Say Ignatius Is? Jesuit Fundamentalism and Beyond* (Nov 1987).
- 20/1 Dean Brackley, *Downward Mobility: Social Implications of St Ignatius's Two Standards* (Jan 1988).
- 20/2 John W. Padberg, *How We Live Where We Live* (Mar 1988).
- 20/3 James M. Hayes, John W. Padberg, and John M. Staudenmaier, *Symbols, Devotions, and Jesuits* (May 1988).
- 20/4 Arthur F. McGovern, *Jesuit Education and Jesuit Spirituality* (Sep 1988).
- 20/5 William A. Barry, *Jesuit Formation Today: An Invitation to Dialogue and Involvement* (Nov 1988).
- 21/1 George B. Wilson, *Where Do We Belong? United States Jesuits and Their Memberships* (Jan 1989).
- 21/2 Adrien Demoustier, "The First Companions and the Poor"; Jean-Yves Calvez, "The Preferential Option for the Poor: Where Does It Come From For Us?", in *The Disturbing Subject: The Option for the Poor*, trans. Edward F. Sheridan; includes short reflections by Dan Weber, James K. Voiss, Michael L. Cook, Jack Morris, James E. Royce, Phil Boroughs, J. D. Whitney, Kevin Connell, and Chuck Schmitz (Mar 1989).
- 21/3 Paul A. Soukup, *Jesuit Response to the Communication Revolution* (May 1989).
- 21/4 Joseph A. Tetlow, *The Fundamentum: Creation in the Principle and Foundation* (Sep 1989).
- 21/5 Past and Present Seminar Members, *Jesuits Praying: Personal Reflections* (Nov 1989).
- 22/1 L. Patrick Carroll, *The Spiritual Exercises in Everyday Life: A Practical Implementation* (Jan 1990).
- 22/2 Joseph A. Bracken, *Jesuit Spirituality from a Process Prospective* (Mar 1990).
- 22/3 John R. Shepherd with Paul A. Soukup, *Fire for a Weekend: An Experience of the Spiritual Exercises* (May 1990).
- 22/4 Michael J. O'Sullivan, *Trust Your Feelings, but Use Your Head: Discernment and the Psychology of Decision Making* (Sep 1990).
- 22/5 John A. Coleman, *A Company of Critics: Jesuits and the Intellectual Life* (Nov 1990).
- 23/1 Frank J. Houdek, *The Road Too Often Traveled: Formation—"Developing the Apostolic Body of the Society"* (Jan 1991).
- 23/2 James J. DiGiacomo, *Ministering to the Young* (Mar 1991).

- 23/3 Paul Begheyn and Kenneth Bogart, *A Bibliography on St. Ignatius's Spiritual Exercises* (May 1991).
- 23/4 Charles M. Shelton, *Reflections on the Mental Health of Jesuits* (Sep 1991).
- 23/5 David S. Toolan, "Nature Is a Heraclitean Fire": *Reflections on Cosmology in an Ecological Age* (Nov 1991).
- 24/1 Frank J. Houdek, *Jesuit Prayer and Jesuit Ministry: Context and Possibilities* (Jan 1992).
- 24/2 Thomas H. Smolich, *Testing the Water: Jesuits Accompanying the Poor* (Mar 1992).
- 24/3 David J. Hassel, *Jesus Christ Changing Yesterday, Today, and Forever* (May 1992).
- 24/4 Charles M. Shelton, *Toward Healthy Jesuit Community Living: Some Psychological Reflections* (Sep 1992).
- 24/5 Michael L. Cook, *Jesus' Parables and the Faith That Does Justice* (Nov 1992).
- 25/1 Thomas H. Clancy, *Saint Ignatius as Fund-Raiser* (Jan 1993).
- 25/2 John R. Donahue, *What Does the Lord Require?: A Bibliographical Essay on the Bible and Social Justice* (Mar 1993).
- 25/3 John W. Padberg, *Ignatius, the Popes, and Realistic Reverence* (May 1993).
- 25/4 Thomas H. Stahel, *Toward General Congregation 34: A History "from Below" of GC 31, GC 32, and GC 33* (Sep 1993).
- 25/5 John F. Baldwin, *Christian Liturgy: An Annotated Bibliography for Jesuits* (Nov 1993).
- 26/1 Joseph A. Tetlow, *The Most Postmodern Prayer: American Jesuit Identity and the Examen of Conscience, 1920–1990* (Jan 1994).
- 26/2 Séamus Murphy, *The Many Ways of Justice* (Mar 1994).
- 26/3 John M. Staudenmaier, *To Fall in Love with the World: Individualism and Self-Transcendence in American Life* (May 1994).
- 26/4 John B. Foley, *Stepping into the River: Reflections on the Vows* (Sep 1994).
- 26/5 Thomas M. Landy, *Myths That Shape Us: Jesuit Beliefs about the Value of Institutions* (Nov 1994).
- 27/1 Brian E. Daley, "To Be More like Christ": *The Background and Implications of "Three Kinds of Humility"* (Jan 1995).
- 27/2 Edward W. Schmidt, *Portraits and Landscapes: Scenes from Our Common Life* (Mar 1995).
- 27/3 Gerard L. Stockhausen, "I'd Love to, but I Don't Have the Time": *Jesuits and Leisure* (May 1995).
- 27/4 George M. Anderson, *Jesuits in Jail, Ignatius to the Present* (Sep 1995).
- 27/5 Charles M. Shelton, *Friendship in Jesuit Life: The Joys, the Struggles, the Possibilities* (Nov 1995).
- 28/1 Paul Begheyn, *Bibliography on the History of the Jesuits: Publications in English, 1900–1993* (Jan 1996).
- 28/2 Joseph Veale, *Saint Ignatius Speaks about "Ignatian Prayer"* (Mar 1996).
- 28/3 Francis X. Clooney, *In Ten Thousand Places, in Every Blade of Grass: Un-eventful but True Confessions about Finding God in India, and Here Too* (May 1996).
- 28/4 Carl F. Starkloff, *As Different as Night and Day: Ignatius's Presupposition and Our Way of Conversing across Cultures* (Sep 1996).
- 28/5 Edward F. Beckett, *Listening to Our History: Inculturation and Jesuit Slaveholding* (Nov 1996).

- 29/1 Dennis Hamm, *Preaching Biblical Justice: To Nurture the Faith That Does It* (Jan 1997).
- 29/2 John W. Padberg, *The Three Forgotten Founders of the Society of Jesus: Paschase Bröet (1500–1652), Jean Codure (1508–1541), Claude Jay (1504–1552)* (Mar 1997).
- 29/3 Peter D. Byrne, *Jesuits and Parish Ministry* (May 1997).
- 29/4 James F. Keenan, *Are Informationes Ethical?* (Sep 1997).
- 29/5 Ernest C. Ferlita, *The Road to Bethlehem—Is it Level or Winding?: The Use of the Imagination in the Spiritual Exercises* (Nov 1997).
- 30/1 Paul Shore, *The “Vita Christi” of Ludolph of Saxony and Its Influence on the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius of Loyola* (Jan 1998).
- 30/2 Carl F. Starkloff, *“I’m No Theologian, but . . . (or so . . .)?”: The Role of Theology in the Life and Ministry of Jesuits* (Mar 1998).
- 30/3 James S. Torrens, *The Word That Clamors: Jesuit Poetry That Reflects the Spiritual Exercises* (May 1998).
- 30/4 Clement J. Petrik, *Being Sent: A Personal Reflection on Jesuit Governance in Changing Times* (Sep 1998).
- 30/5 Charles J. Jackson, *One and the Same Vocation: The Jesuit Brother, 1957 to the Present—A Critical Analysis* (Nov 1998).
- 31/1 Richard J. Clifford, *Scripture and the Exercises: Moving from the Gospels and Psalms to Exodus and Proverbs* (Jan 1999).
- 31/2 Timothy E. Toohig, *Physics Research: A Search for God* (Mar 1999).
- 31/3 Gerald M. Fagin, *Fidelity in the Church—Then and Now* (May 1999).
- 31/4 J. Peter Schineller, *The Pilgrim Journey of Ignatius: From Soldier to Laborer in the Lord’s Vineyard and Its Implications for Apostolic Lay Spirituality* (Sep 1999).
- 31/5 Lisa Fullam, *Juana, SJ: The Past (and Future) Status of Women in the Society of Jesus* (Nov 1999).
- 32/1 John P. Langan, *The Good of Obedience in a Culture of Autonomy* (Jan 2000).
- 32/2 Richard A. Blake, *Listen with Your Eyes: Interpreting Images in the Spiritual Exercises* (Mar 2000) [misnumbered on the front cover as “31/2.”].
- 32/3 Charles M. Shelton, *When a Jesuit Counsels Others: Some Practical Guidelines* (May 2000).
- 32/4 William A. Barry, *Past, Present, and Future: A Jubilarian’s Reflections on Jesuit Spirituality* (Sep 2000).
- 32/5 Carl F. Starkloff, *Pilgrimage Re-envisioned: Mission and Culture in the Last Five General Congregations* (Nov 2000).
- 33/1 Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, “The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice in American Jesuit Higher Education,” in *Faith, Justice, and American Jesuit Higher Education: Readings from the Formula of the Institute, the Constitutions, the Complementary Norms, GC 32, Pedro Arrupe, and GC 34*; and an address by Peter-Hans Kolvenbach (Jan 2001).
- 33/2 James F. Keenan, *Unexpected Consequences: A Jesuit and Puritan Book, Robert Persons’s Christian Directory, and Its Relevance for Jesuit Spirituality Today* (Mar 2001).
- 33/3 Pedro Arrupe, *The Trinitarian Inspiration of the Ignatian Charism* (May 2001).
- 33/4 Joseph Veale, *Saint Ignatius Asks, “Are You Sure You Know Who I Am?”* (Sep 2001).

- 33/5 William A. Barry and James F. Keenan, eds., *How Multicultural Are We? Six Stories*, by Claudio M. Burgaleta, Gregory C. Chisholm, Eduardo C. Fernandez, Gerdenio M. Manuel, J-Glenn Murray, and Hung T. Pham (Nov 2001).
- 34/1 Richard A. Blake, *City of the Living God: The Urban Roots of the Spiritual Exercises* (Jan 2002).
- 34/2 Francis X. Clooney, *A Charism for Dialogue: Advice from the Early Jesuit Missionaries in Our World of Religious Pluralism* (Mar 2002).
- 34/3 William Reh, *Christian Mindfulness: A Path to Finding God in All Things* (May 2002).
- 34/4 Dean Brackley, *Expanding the Shrunken Soul: False Humility, Ressentiment, and Magnanimity* (Sep 2002).
- 34/5 Robert Bireley, *The Jesuits and Politics in Time of War: A Self-Appraisal* (Nov 2002).
- 35/1 William A. Barry, *Jesuit Spirituality for the Whole of Life* (Jan 2003).
- 35/2 V. Rev. John Baptist Janssens, *Instruction and Ordinance Concerning the Training of Ours in the Sacred Liturgy*, with introduction by Lawrence J. Madden (Mar 2003).
- 35/3 Douglas Marcouiller, *Archbishop with an Attitude: Oscar Romero's Sentir con la Iglesia* (May 2003).
- 35/4 Ronald Modras, *A Jesuit in the Crucible: Friedrich Spee and the Witchcraft Hysteria in Seventeenth-Century Germany* (Sep 2003).
- 35/5 Thomas M. Lucas, *Virtual Vessels, Mystical Signs: Contemplating Mary's Images in the Jesuit Tradition* (Nov 2003).
- 36/1 Thomas P. Rausch, *Christian Life Communities for Jesuit University Students?* (Spring 2004).
- 36/2 James Bernauer, *The Holocaust and the Search for Forgiveness: An Invitation to the Society of Jesus?* (Summer 2004).
- 36/3 David E. Nantais, "Whatever!" Is Not Ignatian Indifference: *Jesuits and the Ministry to Young Adults* (Fall 2004).
- 36/4 János Lukács, *The Incarnational Dynamic of the Constitutions* (Winter 2004).
- 37/1 Dennis C. Smolarski, *Jesuits on the Moon: Seeking God in All Things . . . Even Mathematics!* (Spring 2005).
- 37/2 Peter McDonough, *Clenched Fist or Open Hands? Five Jesuit Perspectives on Pluralism* (Summer 2005).
- 37/3 James S. Torrens, *Tuskegee Years: What Father Arrupe Got Me Into* (Fall 2005).
- 37/4 Kevin O'Brien, *Consolation in Action: The Jesuit Refugee Service and the Ministry of Accompaniment* (Winter 2005).
- 38/1 Peter Schineller, *In Their Own Words: Ignatius, Xavier, Favre and Our Way of Proceeding* (Spring 2006).
- 38/2 Charles J. Jackson, *Something That Happened to Me at Manresa: The Mystical Origin of the Ignatian Charism* (Summer 2006).
- 38/3 William Reiser, *Locating the Grace of the Fourth Week: A Theological Inquiry* (Fall 2006).
- 38/4 John W. O'Malley, *Five Missions of the Jesuit Charism: Content and Method* (Winter 2006).
- 39/1 Gerald L. McKeivitt, *Italian Jesuits in Maryland: A Clash of Theological Cultures* (Spring 2007).

- 39/2 Patrick M. Kelly, *Loved into Freedom and Service: Lay Experiences of the Exercises in Daily Life* (Summer 2007).
- 39/3 T. Frank Kennedy, *Music and the Jesuit Mission in the New World* (Autumn 2007).
- 39/4 William E. Creed, *Jesuits and the Homeless: Companions on Life's Journey* (Winter 2007).
- 40/1 Luce Giard, *The Jesuit College: A Center for Knowledge, Art and Faith 1548–1773* (Spring 2008).
- 40/2 Wilkie Au, *Ignatian Service: Gratitude and Love in Action* (Summer 2008).
- 40/3 Robert J. Kaslyn, *The Jesuit Ministry of Publishing: Overview of Guidelines and Praxis* (Autumn 2008).
- 40/4 William Reh, *The Value and Viability of the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation: An American Perspective* (Winter 2008).
- 41/1 Markus Friedrich, *Governance in the Society of Jesus, 1540–1773: Its Methods, Critics, and Legacy Today* (Spring 2009).
- 41/2 Gerdenio Sonny Manuel, *Living Chastity: Psychosexual Well-Being in Jesuit Life* (Summer 2009).
- 41/3 Jeremy Clarke, *Our Lady of China: Marian Devotion and the Jesuits* (Autumn 2009).
- 41/4 Francis X. Hezel, *A Life at the Edge of the World* (Winter 2009).
- 42/1 Michael C. McCarthy, Thomas Massaro, Thomas Worcester, and Michael A. Zampelli, *Four Stories of the Kolvenbach Generation* (Spring 2010).
- 42/2 Roger Haight, *Expanding the Spiritual Exercises* (Summer 2010).
- 42/3 Thomas M. Cohen, *Jesuits and New Christians: The Contested Legacy of St. Ignatius* (Autumn 2010).
- 42/4 R. Bentley Anderson, Numa J. Rousseve Jr.: *Creole, Catholic, and Jesuit* (Winter 2010).
- 43/1 Milton Walsh, *"To Always Be Thinking Somehow about Jesus": The Prologue of Ludolph's Vita Christi* (Spring 2011).
- 43/2 Michael C. McCarthy, *"Let Me Love More Passionately": Religious Celibacy in a Secular Age* (Summer 2011).
- 43/3 Gerald L. McKeivitt, *The Gifts of Aging: Jesuit Elders in Their Own Words* (Autumn 2011).
- 43/4 John Gavin, *"True Charity Begins Where Justice Ends": The Life and Teachings of St. Alberto Hurtado* (Winter 2011).
- 44/1 Michael D. Barber, *Desolation and the Struggle for Justice* (Spring 2012).
- 44/2 Barton T. Geger, *The First First Companions: The Continuing Impact of the Men Who Left Ignatius* (Summer 2012).
- 44/3 Emanuele Colombo, *"Even among Turks": Tirso González de Santalla (1624–1705) and Islam* (Autumn 2012).
- 44/4 Thomas D. Stegman, *"Run That You May Obtain the Prize": Using St. Paul as a Resource for the Spiritual Exercises* (Winter 2012).
- 45/1 Hilmar M. Pabel, *Fear and Consolation: Peter Canisius and the Spirituality of Dying and Death* (Spring 2013).
- 45/2 Robert E. Scully, *The Suppression of the Society of Jesus: A Perfect Storm in the Age of the "Enlightenment"* (Summer 2013).
- 45/3 Jorge Mario Bergoglio, *Writings on Jesuit Spirituality I*, trans. Philip Endean (Autumn 2013).
- 45/4 Jorge Mario Bergoglio, *Writings on Jesuit Spirituality II*, trans. Philip Endean (Winter 2013).

- 46/1 Anthony J. Kuzniewski, *“Our American Champions”*: The First American Generation of American Jesuit Leaders after the Restoration of the Society (Spring 2014).
- 46/2 Hung T. Pham, *Composing a Sacred Space: A Lesson from the Catechismus of Alexandre de Rhodes* (Summer 2014).
- 46/3 Barton T. Geger, *Hidden Theology in the “Autobiography” of St. Ignatius* (Autumn 2014).
- 46/4 Nicholas Austin, *Mind and Heart: Towards an Ignatian Spirituality of Study* (Winter 2014).
- 47/1 John W. O’Malley, *Jesuit Schools and the Humanities Yesterday and Today* (Spring 2015).
- 47/2 Paul [L.] Mariani, *The Mystery and the Majesty of It: Jesuit Spirituality in the Poetry of Gerald Manley Hopkins* (Summer 2015).
- 47/3 Mark Lewis, *Unfinished Business: The Spiritual Coadjutor in the Society of Jesus Today* (Autumn 2015).
- 47/4 Francis X. Hezel, *Let the Spirit Speak: Learning to Pray* (Winter 2015).
- 48/1 Joseph A. Tetlow, *The Preached Weekend Retreat: A Relic or a Future?* (Spring 2016).
- 48/2 Hung T. Pham and Eduardo C. Fernández, *Pilgrims in Community at the Frontiers: A Contemplation on Jesuit Mission Today* (Summer 2016).
- 48/3 E. Edward Kinerk, *Personal Encounters with Jesus Christ* (Autumn 2016).
- 48/4 Barton T. Geger, *Bending the Knee to Baal? St. Ignatius on Jesuit Vocation Promotion* (Winter 2016).
- 49/1 William C. Woody, *“So We Are Ambassadors for Christ”*: The Jesuit Ministry of Reconciliation (Spring 2017).
- 49/2 Henry J. Shea, *The Beloved Disciple and the Spiritual Exercises* (Summer 2017).
- 49/3 Members of General Congregation 36, *The Moment of GC 36 for Its Members* (Autumn 2017).
- 49/4 Richard J. Baumann, *Our Jesuit Constitutions: Cooperation as Union* (Winter 2017).
- 50/1 Barton T. Geger, *Ten Things That St. Ignatius Never Said or Did* (Spring 2018).
- 50/2 Ted Penton, *Spiritual Care for the Poor: An Ignatian Response to Pope Francis’s Challenge* (Summer 2018).
- 50/3 William McCormick, *“A Continual Sacrifice to the Glory of God”*: Ignatian Magnanimity as Cooperation with the Divine (Autumn 2018).
- 50/4 Brian O. McDermott, *Spiritual Consolation and Its Role in the Second Time of Election* (Winter 2018).
- 51/1 James J. Conn, *Jesuits and Eucharistic Concelebration*; John F. Baldwin, *Jesuits, the Ministerial Priesthood, and Eucharistic Concelebration* (Spring 2019).

Subscription Information Effective January 2018

All subscriptions are handled by the business office of STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS. Please do not contact the office of the Jesuit Conference of Canada and the United States.

The contact information for the business office is as follows:

Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits Modern Litho 5111 Southwest Avenue St. Louis, MO 63110	Tel: 314-781-6505 Fax: 314-781-0551 Contact: Mark McCabe Admin Asst. Georgette Grman
--	---

The Jesuit Conference provides a free annual subscription to all U.S. and Canadian Jesuits. All other subscribers should place orders by contacting the business office or by sending an email to mmccabe@modernlitho.com.

U.S. and Canadian Jesuits should NOT contact the business office about changes of address; the Jesuit Conference regularly updates the business office on these changes. If U.S. Jesuits are not receiving issues, they should contact their respective provinces to ensure that the latter have their correct addresses. However, all paid subscribers should notify the business office directly of address changes or send an email to mmccabe@modernlitho.com.

Subscription Fees

Within the U.S. One year = \$22. Two years = \$40.

Within Canada and Mexico. One year = \$30. Two years = \$52.

All Other Locations. One year = \$34. Two years = \$60.

Makes checks payable to: *Jesuit Conference – Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality.*

Payments required at time of ordering, and must be in U.S. currency only.

Annual subscriptions run from Jan. 1 to Jan 1. All renewals are needed by Jan. 15.

Back Issues

A complete archive of previous issues is accessible on-line through the Boston College Library:
<http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/jesuit>

More recent issues are also available through the website of the Jesuit Conference:
<http://jesuit.org/publications?C=journals&#publications>

Hard copies of some back issues are available. Contact the general editor at
JCUSTudies@jesuits.org. Copies are \$6.00 each plus postage.

“Letters to the Editor,” and all other questions or comments regarding the content of STUDIES or the submission of essays, should be sent to the general editor at:

Fr. Barton Geger, SJ, General Editor Institute of Advanced Jesuit Studies 140 Commonwealth Avenue Chestnut Hill, MA 02467	Office: 617-552-9097 Fax: 617-552-0811 E-mail: JCUSTudies@jesuits.org
--	---

Jesuit Conference, Inc.
1016 16th St. NW Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5727

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
MODERN LITHO