

WOODSTOCK

LETTERS

SUMMER 1966

VOLUME 95 NUMBER 3

INTRODUCTION

In recent months, **WOODSTOCK LETTERS** has been receiving more and more manuscripts for publication; and it is interesting how many of them deal with themes and ideas emphasized by Father General Arrupe in the talks he gave here and in other American houses during his tour: a rediscovery of the original spirit of St. Ignatius by studying the Society's sources; a restudy of both the length and quality of our prayer; the adaptation of our training so that we can truly speak with the secular world.

We hope that "A New Age for the Brothers," by **Antonio Cabezas, S.J.**, of the Antilles Province, will encourage replies from the brothers themselves for the Readers' Forum. **William P. Bruton, S.J.**, is entering his second year of philosophy in the Loyola House of Studies in Manila. His analysis of the new breed in a sociological context should help strengthen that rapport between the various generations and groups which our Company now desperately needs.

The study of Pauline prayer by **Stanislas Lyonnet, S.J.**, was translated by **Edward Malatesta, S.J.**, of the Pontifical Biblical Institute. Fr. Malatesta has also contributed his consideration of prayer in St. John as part of our continuing discussion of prayer and its relation to our apostolates.

Justin Kelly, S.J., of the Detroit Province, served on the Woodstock student committee for curriculum revision. The article on the Jesuit high school system by **Robert R. Newton, S.J.**, is a follow-up on both our Spring issue which concentrated on an evaluation of our high school apostolate and on Mr. Newton's own Winter article on high school renewal—which was very well received.

Among our reviewers is **James E. Coleran, S.J.**, former Provincial of New England.

CONTENTS

SUMMER, 1966

INTRODUCTION

- 269 A NEW AGE FOR THE BROTHERS • *Antonio Cabezas, S.J.*
- 288 THE JESUIT SCHOLASTIC IN THE LIGHT OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
• *William P. Bruton, S.J.*
- 305 THE PRAYER OF THE APOSTLE: A PAULINE VIEW • *Stanislas
Lyonnet, S.J.*
- 312 THE PRAYER OF JESUS AND HIS APOSTLES • *Edward Mala-
testa, S.J.*
- 325 DELIBERATION OF OUR FIRST FATHERS
- 334 TERRA FIRMA, a poem • *Thomas Kretz, S.J.*
- 335 INTER-FACULTY PROGRAM INQUIRY REPORT
- 357 TOWARD A NEW THEOLOGY • *Justin Kelly, S.J.*
- 372 THE JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL "SYSTEM" • *Robert R. Newton, S.J.*

REPORTS

- 380 The Changing Church and the Changing Structure of
American Society • *Louis Lambert, S.J.*

READERS' FORUM

- 384 Borgia and Prayer • *Rafael Carbonell, S.J.*

REVIEWS

- 386 Karl Rahner • *James E. Coleran, S.J.*
- 391 A Guide to Rahner • *John J. Mawhinney, S.J.*
- 394 Life and Conscience • *Eugene J. Linehan, S.J.*

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

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

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

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

STAFF

Published by the faculty and students of Woodstock College. Editor: Thomas J. O'Donnell, S.J./Managing Editor: Raymond A. Schroth, S.J./Associate Editors: Robert C. Collins, S.J., James P. Jurich, S.J., P. Kenneth Kania, S.J./Book Editor: Kenneth J. DeLuca, S.J./Assistant Editors: R. Emmett Curran, S.J., Robert E. Hamm, S.J., Michael C. Reilly, S.J./Business Manager: Paul L. Horgan, S.J./Subscription Manager: Edward F. Salmon, S.J.

A NEW AGE FOR THE BROTHERS

*the brothers are not destined
for the service of the fathers,
but for the service of the Society*

ANTONIO CABEZAS, S.J.

EVER SINCE YVES CONGAR'S BOOK *Jalons pour une Théologie du Laïcat* first appeared in 1953, the star of the layman has risen. The Church now strives to bring the Kingdom of God to the secular city in the witness and faith of the laity, and at the same time live the *eschaton*, as if somehow the last days were already here. In this struggle the layman has boldly stepped into the forefront of the *aggiornamento*. Yet the core of this vanguard, the lay religious, is absent from the Church's thrust forward. The fresh breeze Pope John let in five years ago has scarcely been felt by them; few even consider them as part of the new look. However, as Hans Urs von Balthasar has said, "If only the formula 'lay apostolate' can resolve today's crisis, and if this apostolate 'to be full' demands there also be the witness of a life according to the evangelical counsels, then only a synthesis of lay and religious life can meet the exigencies of our time."¹

¹ Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Laïcat et plein apostolat* (Liège and Paris, 1949), p. 32.

Since we have lay brothers in our Society, we can ask ourselves in all honesty: Are our brothers participating in the *aggiornamento*? Can we at least say that we are aware of this new age and the multiple possibilities it holds out to them in the apostolate? This paper will attempt to trace the historical roots of the lay brothers' vocation and the recent efforts of the generals to engage them more fully in today's world. We will first investigate the historical background of their present status; otherwise, our own mentality will fail to cope with the real problem—whose solution the current General Congregation has said requires no mere "accidental changes."²

With regard to the brothers we share the same shortsightedness as other religious orders. Fr. Jerome Marschal, C.SS.R., pointed out in Rome at the General Congress of States of Perfection in 1950: "The lay religious—the elite of the Lord's laity—has not participated in the progress of the lay people in the Church."³ During the last thirty years the Society has written into its spirit and documents profound changes in favor of the brothers, but the practical applications of the new directions have failed. "Too many of our fathers treat brothers as servants, and not as true brothers and fellow-workers in the Lord," the late Fr. Janssens said in his letter of August 31, 1964. "After the last General Congregation, I sent out an instruction on the formation and work of the brothers: I am afraid the brothers know little of it."⁴ The first session of the current General Congregation also has envisioned substantial changes in the training of the brothers, but the heart of the matter still is our mentality. For this reason we will discuss first some historical facts about the brothers to show how our present attitude arose.

² *Nuntius Congregationis Generalis XXXI*, n. 16 (July 15, 1965), p. 7. See James P. Jurich, S.J., ed., "The 31st General Congregation: The First Session," WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1966) 61.

³ *Congressus Generalis de Statibus Perfectionis: Acta et Documenta* (Rome, 1950), III, 193 ff. The idea of the lay religious as the most important part of the laity is clearly proved in this congress. The volume contains thorough studies under the headings: *Fratres Coadjutores: Functio, Collectio, Selectio, Institutio religiosa et technica*.

⁴ *Acta Romana Societatis Iesu* (henceforth abbreviated *ActRSJ*) 14 (1964) 553-54.

I: ST. IGNATIUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BROTHERS

In the Middle Ages Christendom was a religious society in which civil states, religious hierarchy, art, culture, and science were under the patronage of the Church. The Christian man of medieval days lived in a religious context in which his every action was enveloped somehow by Christianity. When the Society of Jesus appeared in the sixteenth century, the humanism of the age had already erected a giant partition between the human and the religious. The Renaissance split society into two distinct spheres, the religious and the cultural. From that time on, the new modes of life drew man out of the Christian climate he knew. The Church sought a positive solution in Christian humanism. She entered every quarter of art, culture, and science, encouraging the clergy to the task of assimilating the new forms and sanctifying them. To be a priest now meant to be learned; the priestly apostolate became the scientific apostolate.

The moment a candidate entered the religious life, his aspiration was to be a priest. The state of the lay brother was reserved for the illiterate and simple-minded. It was unthinkable that a lay religious should possess qualities and education that equipped him for a wide range of apostolic works. The new member entering a religious order, therefore, naturally ambitioned to acquire enough knowledge to be a priest. Yet this ambition was frowned upon and denounced as pride. A lay brother was to humble himself in lowly, domestic concerns. Numerous examples of this outlook toward the lay brother abound in the literature of the time. Fr. Salmeron once threatened a brother from Cataranzaro with eternal fire and a thousand temporal punishments because he wanted to study to be a priest.⁵ In contrast, a Bro. Zamorza won the admiration of all because he entered the Society as a deacon and "was never ordained a priest, thanks to the constant humility, strength and charity which he exercised in the domestic and external tasks of the brothers."⁶ Once in a while,

⁵ Bartolomé Alcázar, *Chrono-Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Provincia de Toledo* (Madrid, 1710) p. 116.

⁶ *Epistolae P. Alphonsi Salmeronis* (in the series "Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu," henceforth abbreviated MHSJ) II, 437-38.

permission was granted to a brother to be a priest, but this led to further problems. With the assertion of titles of seniority and services, it became impossible to make exceptions.

Nor did the Reformation alleviate the brothers' plight. The Lutheran revolt had undermined respect for priests, but the Church in reaction overcompensated in its reverence for them. Now not only intellectually were the brothers looked upon as inferior but also religiously. In this atmosphere we can imagine how much apprehension St. Ignatius felt when he first instituted brothers. The first thing he did was to give them a juridical equality with priests which they did not enjoy in other orders. This partially explains why so many flocked to the Society in its early years; in it they saw an ideal. Yet, even St. Ignatius does not always seem consistent nor free of the prejudices of his day. Sometimes he displays a clear vision of the greatness of the brothers' vocation, and at other times he appears contradictory. For the man who bestowed juridical equality on the brothers was the same one who did not seem to appreciate the difference between a servant and a brother: "the salary of a servant is balanced by the clothes of a brother."⁷ It is a legitimate interpretation that Ignatius limited the number of brothers for the purpose of helping just the priests. In analyzing the mind of our founder in instituting the brothers we can never forget this dual tension within himself: first, his charismatic understanding of the religious life; secondly, the bias of his times.

It is evident that St. Ignatius was not at first even thinking of having brothers. In the beginning we can picture the first fathers tending the door, cooking, and cleaning, with all the accompanying inconveniences for men deeply committed to active, spiritual ministries. In 1539 one reason the fathers voted for a superior and to be under obedience was precisely this: without a superior nobody would do this kind of work regularly.⁸ This difficulty with domestic chores made them consider the need of fellow-workers to lend "assistance." Six years after the foundation of the Society, therefore, Ignatius asked the Pope to have spiritual and temporal coadjutors.

⁷ *S. Ignatii Epistolae et Instructiones* (henceforth abbreviated *EppIgn*; in *MHSJ*) VI, 30.

⁸ *Constitutiones et Regulae Societatis Iesu* (henceforth abbreviated *ConsMHSJ*), I (*Monumenta Constitutionum praevia*) p. 6.

In the brief *Exponi nobis* of June 5, 1546, Paul III approved this innovation in the new order.

In his day, however, it was difficult for Ignatius to think of the brothers in any other way but as cook, storekeeper, buyer, porter, infirmarian, and other roles of this nature. "Assistance" meant one thing, domestic chores. Apostolate was synonymous with priesthood. The few brothers whom Ignatius and other early generals employed as secretaries were simply exceptions and not really typical. The famous case of Bro. Juan de Alba will help illustrate the tenor of the times and the mind of Ignatius.

Young Juan de Alba, as the story is told by Fr. Luis Gonçalves da Câmara, was first admitted to the Society in 1545 and shortly thereafter sent to work in the barn.⁹ He was a restless person whose spirit St. Ignatius had momentarily temporized with a retreat. But still he learned how to read and write on his own while tending cows. Not satisfied with this, he gave his own interpretation of Isaiah the prophet—and this at a time when the Inquisition was peculiarly sensitive to heretics. The last straw came when Juan began planting in the minds of his fellow brothers the notion that the fathers were the only real members of the Society. Needless to say, young Juan soon departed from the Society, and it was then Ignatius wrote into the first common rules Rule 14 forbidding a brother from learning any more than he knew when he entered.

Nevertheless, he explicitly stated in the *Examen* that the brothers could be employed in more major roles [114], and he also approved their use as ministers and subministers. But if Ignatius had left any door open for the promotion of brothers, others in subsequent centuries by their neglect let it slam shut.

II: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE BROTHERS IN THE SOCIETY

We shall now review the times from St. Ignatius up to Fr. Ledochowski. The innovation of the lay brothers was in the beginning a source of a large number of vocations. We know that Ignatius was very pleased by the entry into the Society of the famous architect Lorenzo Tristano. That vocation alone, our founder thought,

⁹ *Scripta de Sancto Ignatio* (MHSJ) I, 664, 715, 718, 738.

was worthy of the troubles experienced in establishing the College of Ferrara. Later Lorenzo's brother also entered the Society and was the architectural adviser to three Generals: Laynez, Borgia and Mercurian. Notwithstanding these successful events, there were from the very beginning misunderstandings between brothers and fathers. Among the first official father-brother difficulties related in early documents is the famous case of the Spanish provincial fathers who, as Fr. Gil González Dávila pointed out, had "infused knowledge of architecture." They were unwilling to accept the suggestions of any brother for buildings. This was true even in the case of the suggestions of the well-balanced José Valeriani, one of the most outstanding brothers in the history of the Society, whom Fr. Mercurian gave permission to be ordained to the priesthood in order to compensate for the many sufferings which he experienced from Spanish provincials.

The first years

Despite these circumstances, we can say that brothers were well respected during the first years of our Society. The occurrence of a brother as subminister was frequent, for it seemed unfortunate to them for a priest to be fulfilling such a temporal job. In such cases, permission was easily granted to learn reading and the necessary mathematics. From one letter of St. Ignatius it seems that some brothers were even ministers. In the letter Ignatius wrote that "the minister, although he be a layman, can give penances to the priests."¹⁰ In all the manuals of the history of the Society there can be found humorous examples of brothers giving fathers public reprehensions in the refectory. Even Fr. Polanco, at a time when he was acting in the name of Ignatius, and the Father Minister, along with others, received a *capelo in piccola* (public reprehension while they ate in a little chair) from the cook because they did not inform him they wanted to eat with the boarding students.

The point here is that a brother was considered a living cell within the whole body of the Society. This can again be seen from the fact that Ignatius used them as consultors although in the Society brothers have neither active nor passive voice. There are some cases

¹⁰ *EppIgn*, VI, 268. Nowadays we have the case of the Antilles Province, in which at least three brothers are ministers and house consultors.

in which St. Ignatius indirectly gave the brothers active and passive voice. In 1554, for example, Ignatius was sick and wished to appoint a Vicar General. He gathered all the priests to elect a Vicar General, and he indirectly did the same thing with the brothers. They elected four priests who were to represent them in the election. Fr. Nadal was elected Vicar General.¹¹ A similar method was employed in the famous case of Bro. Juan de Alba. Ignatius did not wish to expel him without first learning the opinion of the brothers. Although there was a clear case against Bro. Juan, the opinion of the brothers was sought.

Another illustration of the kind of life the brothers had appears in the fact that the provision in the *Constitutions* that the fathers assist the brothers in their offices was actually put into practice. The names of the priests, beginning with the superior, were posted in public in such a way that it was not optional to go to the sink to wash dishes. It was a duty of life in the Society.¹² This obligation was so serious that if a priest could not go during the week because of classes, his name appeared on the list at the end of the week and on holidays.

The mind of St. Ignatius was not to have separation of classes; he clearly ordered that the brothers walk with the fathers during recreation time and, if possible, recreation was to be outside the house.¹³ He generally recommended scholastics and fathers to mix with the brothers: "cum coadjutoribus habeant consuetudinem in recreationibus." For that reason he recommended that the recreation room be large enough for everyone in the house. The same spirit of integration appears clearly in the seating arrangement in the dining room. The professed were first, secondly the other priests, and then without any order the scholastics and brothers; this last group was presided over by the minister, who could be a brother. It is possible that the custom of the brothers being in the last place originated in the promulgation of the now obsolete Rule 6 written by the 6th General Congregation in 1608.

At that time the unrest among the brothers was growing, and the role of the brother in the Society was taking a very secondary

¹¹ *EppIgn*, II, 42-43.

¹² *Epistolae P. Hieronymi Nadal* (MHSJ), IV, 604.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 264.

place. The restrictions of St. Ignatius were now being followed in practice; the religious vocation of the brothers was confined to the exercise of passive virtues, the favor granted to them of living in the Society.

By way of illustration I would like to give a brief synthesis of a commentary on the rules of the Society given by the well-known Julius Nigronius in Milan, 1613. It is significant that this commentary was republished in Cracow in 1917.¹⁴

At that time Rule 14 of the common rules was: "No one of those who are admitted for domestic affairs may learn how to read or how to write, and if he has any learning, let him not study further nor may anyone teach him without permission from Father General, but it will be sufficient for them to serve Christ our Lord with holy simplicity and humility." This was the famous rule abrogated by the 30th General Congregation in 1957. In spite of the good will which a reader may have, it is difficult to interpret benevolently the explanation of Julius Nigronius on the subject. First he praised the brother's vocation "since this name was the name St. Paul gave Timothy, Clement, Mark, Luke, and others," also "because they have the same job as St. Joseph." The conclusion to this part is to encourage the master of novices to teach brothers to "serve with strength the other members in the affairs of Martha."

The second part of this chapter attempts to prove, with the help of many syllogisms, the necessity of having this rule for the brothers. In a preface written in excellent Latin, Nigronius says that he will set forth "two kinds of arguments; one kind will show that this rule is in accord with right reason, the other will be for the spiritual father if a brother has temptations against the rule." From this kind of preface and the majesty with which he treats the matter, we can judge that a major quarrel on the subject was taking place at that time. Briefly his logic proceeds as follows. If a brother studies, who will be able to cook, to buy food, to sew the clothes, to serve table regularly, and to perform other tasks that are incompatible with the profound thought involved in studies? The second reason is simply that this is the custom in all other religious orders. Nigronius offers many parallel examples. Among the most humorous is that of the

¹⁴ Julius Nigronius (Giulio Negrone), S.J., *Regulae Communes Societatis Iesu* (Cracow, 1913-17), pp. 619-57. All quotations are from this edition.

Camaldolese: "They give permission to their prelate to permit a lay brother who knows how to read to recite the Office of the Blessed Virgin, but only inside the cells, in order to avoid scandal, admiration, and danger of pride."

The weakness of the arguments is hidden in the magnificent Latin and the fantastic profusion of words and examples. The answer today is very easy. If a brother is to help the Society, the more he knows, the better he will help her. From this we can see that the prejudices of the age did not allow men to see that obvious truth.

But the bulk of the argumentation comes when he speaks about the rules which a spiritual father ought to know in order to help tempted brothers. "Eagerness for studying," Nigronius says, "is either a hidden apostasy or pride or vain curiosity." The reason is quite simple and the syllogism clear: "You wish to study either to become a priest or to remain as a brother. If you wish to become a priest, it is a hidden apostasy since you will have to leave the Society to do that. But if you wish to continue as brother, then it is manifest pride in order to get the admiration and the praises of everyone. And if you do not wish your studies to be known by others but only by yourself, then it is a damnable curiosity."

Besides that, the adviser is told that to learn is something intolerable for those who are not accustomed to it because of their birth, poor education, and lack of recent experience of it. Also "learning is not necessary for their salvation (*media ad salutem necessaria*)," and to say the contrary is a clear heresy. The restriction of this rule is smoothed over by the practice of the Society by which the brothers can go to recreation with the fathers. The reason Nigronius gives for this custom is that in this way Scripture (Job 1:14) is fulfilled: *Boves arabant et asinae pascebantur juxta eos*, which is interpreted, he says, by the doctors of the Church to mean "While the oxen are grazing with the asses, the slow being in the same herd with the wise, they feed upon their intelligences (*Simul se asinae cum bobus reficiunt quia prudentibus coniuncti tardiores eorum intelligentia pascuntur*)."

The brothers' biretta

Let us now consider one of the strangest problems in the Society: the dispute over the biretta. There is in Rome a large volume entitled *De pileo fratrum coadjutorum* which I could not consult

directly, having to rely on Fr. Antonio Astráin's highly polemical history.¹⁵

Were it not for the humiliation the brothers suffered, this incident would be one of the most picturesque pages in the history of the Society. In it were involved the brothers, eight general congregations, four popes, countless provincials, one pontifical brief, and an attempt to recur to the King of Spain, Philip III. If the outcome had not been so pitiful, it would have seemed a comedy with buffoons, villains and heroes.

It is evident that Ignatius did not intend a special habit for the priests or for the brothers. There is, nevertheless, a letter addressed to Fr. Nicolás Lanoy, Rector of the College of Vienna on January 15, 1555, in which Ignatius points out that "it would not be reasonable to grant the brothers the biretta of the priests."¹⁶ Notwithstanding this mentality, the fact is that the brothers in Spain and Portugal began to wear the biretta in the same style as the priests. It seems that this custom did not win the approval of some older fathers because they saw the value of their own authority depreciated before externs.

The 3rd General Congregation, in 1573, left the problem in the hands of Father General Mercurian, who wished to remove the custom gradually. But in the Province of Castile spirits were so restless over this matter that it was necessary to send a visitor in 1577. Seventeen fathers were asked about the matter and five replied in favor of the biretta for the brothers. Twelve were opposed. The affirmative reasons given were basically to avoid greater evils. Yet Fr. Medrano says that "it is good to have the same biretta worn by both brothers and priests in the streets since otherwise for the brother to go with a hat and the priest with a biretta would be to plow with ox and ass, which is not proper."

Fr. Aquaviva was very prudent and did not wish to touch the problem since at that time he was preoccupied with the most difficult intellectual controversy that the Society has ever had: the dispute *de auxiliis*. But in the 7th General Congregation, in 1615, the assembled fathers reviewed the subject; after a debate of seven

¹⁵ Antonio Astráin, S.J., *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España*, V (Madrid, 1916), 284-300.

¹⁶ *EppIgn*, VIII, 281.

days, they enacted Decree 24, by which the use of the biretta was forbidden to the brothers. The decree nevertheless was mitigated by an addition: the older brothers were permitted to wear the biretta, but the new candidates had to sign a document in which they consented not to wear it.

As soon as the decree was heard, the brothers' reactions were so strong that they planned an appeal to the king of Spain, Philip III. Fr. Vitelleschi, knowing the restlessness of the brothers, consulted the fathers of Spain and Italy concerning the problem. Almost all the letters we have show the fear the fathers had of the brothers' reaction. They were afraid that many would leave the Society, as once happened when the brothers were obliged to cut inches off the hem of the habit. The situation reached its climax when the brothers sent a memorial to the Pope, Paul V, in 1618. Both the Pope and the General agreed on the suspension of the application of Decree 24. It is not necessary to say that the suspension was seen as a victory for the brothers. The fathers, however, were greatly alarmed. This appears in the documents: "Many times it happens," Fr. Paul Comitoli wrote on January 13, 1618, "that the faithful, seeing the brothers so well tailored, have more reverence for them than for us. The externs are scandalized when they look at the birettas on the head of the cook and the bricklayer. . . . I know no other source for their pleasure in the biretta than their pride and contumacy. We have had reformative decrees for professed fathers, spiritual coadjutors and scholastics, and all of us bowed the head. Yet the lowest one, wishing to legislate, lifts his head against the whole Society and the General Congregation."

So jealous were some brothers that in 1625 they sent a memorial to Pope Urban VIII in which they asked him to give a brief in order to assure the biretta to them. The Pope, together with Father General Vitelleschi, did not think a brief opportune and decided to leave things as they were. However, after the death of Fr. Vitelleschi, the 8th General Congregation was convoked on November 21, 1645. Again eleven provinces sent *postulata* on the subject of the biretta. First, all the information which Fr. Lencycky (Lancicius) had gathered was presented to the fathers of the Congregation, and then a delegation went to Pope Innocent X. He gave them complete freedom in the deliberations and promised to give a brief in order

to back the decision of the Congregation if it desired to finish the affair.

In spite of these securities the fathers were so terrified by fear of future reprisals that for the first time in the history of the Society they resorted to secret written discussions to insure that the brothers would not know who were the fathers opposed to their wearing the biretta. In conclusion, fifty-nine out of eighty-five voted for the suppression of the brothers' biretta. The Pope, as promised, gave a brief and backed with an excommunication the decree of the Congregation. In this way a definitive end was given to the problem officially called *de pileo fratrum coadjutorum*. Although legally the matter was settled, the manner by which the affair ended was considered by the fathers a triumph and by the brothers a humiliation. The fact is that from then on the number of brothers steadily decreased. The equality which St. Ignatius gave the brothers remained in law but disappeared in practice.

In this regard the following events are significant:

- 1558—1st General Congregation calls attention to the fact of the large number of brothers in the Society.
- 1625—7th General Congregation establishes the proportion of brothers to other members of the Society as one to four in the colleges and one to three in the professed houses.
- 1645—8th General Congregation encourages the employment of servants in order to fulfill the decree of the last General Congregation.
- 1915—27th General Congregation takes away the decree since it is useless.

The decrease in the percentage of brothers within the whole Society can be seen in the following table:¹⁷

| | | | |
|--------------|-----|-------|----------------------------|
| 16th century | 31% | 1900 | 24% |
| 17th century | 30% | 1963 | 16% |
| 18th century | 25% | 1964 | 13.7% |
| 19th century | 27% | (1964 | 8.3% in the United States) |

¹⁷ *Memorabilia Societatis Iesu*, 6 (1938) 586; *Supplementum Catalogorum S.I.*, 1964, 1965.

III: THE NATURE AND FOUNDATION OF THE BROTHERS' VOCATION

From the very start Ignatius wanted equality for all members of his Society. The name brother itself is a sign of an inner reality. In the older religious orders of this period there was a wide division between *laici*, *conversi* or *oblati*, and the priests. So great was the gap between lay and priest that to say lay was to say illiterate. Lay religious were even excluded from the liturgical exercises which were almost the essence of religious life during those days. It was no wonder then that Ignatius adopted the name brother which St. Francis had given to his followers. It symbolized the cosmic brotherhood that was so deeply ingrained in the heart of Francis. Interestingly enough, soon after Ignatius, the older religious orders accepted the term brother for their lay members.

But the foremost contribution of Ignatius was to remove the juridical distinction between brothers and priests, that is, between spiritual and temporal coadjutors. Both grades, we must remember, were introduced for similar if not the same reasons. Moreover, juridical lines between spiritual and temporal coadjutors were so thin that there was hardly any distinction, as is clear from the comments Polanco made on the text of Paul III. It is not surprising, therefore, that in drawing up the preparatory schema of the *Constitutions* Polanco discusses whether spiritual coadjutors must necessarily be priests since it is permitted that lay coadjutors fulfill some spiritual ministries such as teaching. Conversely, in a marginal note, he remarks that there is provision for some brothers to engage in spiritual ministries and for some priests to engage in temporal ones.¹⁸

We reach now the most difficult area of the problem: What did Ignatius intend when he instituted brothers in the Society? During the first session of the current General Congregation not all were able to agree. Some maintained that he established the brothers merely to aid the Society in external and domestic works. To assign them to other ministries was to go beyond his original intention, or would constitute only exceptions for very special situations. Others at the Congregation believed that a distinction should be made

¹⁸ *ConsMHSJ*, I, 171; see also *ibid.*, 338.

between the brother's vocation in itself and the brother's vocation as conditioned by historical circumstances of Ignatius' time.¹⁹

In instituting the brothers Ignatius set down three main objectives: juridical equality; religious in the full sense [114]; and a commitment "to assist the Society in those things in which the others cannot engage without detriment to the greater good" [148]. The successors of Ignatius failed to implement fully the first two aims and took the meanest and narrowest interpretation of the third. Traditional prejudices prevented them from capitalizing on the initial impetus and flexibility with which Ignatius had endowed the institution of the brothers. A noted authority on religious life, Fr. Bonduelle, O.P., has made this observation: "The equality between priests and non-priests, principally between spiritual and temporal coadjutors, has always been asserted by the Society of Jesus, but in practice its realization has been minimal." In another place he also says: "The Jesuits actually have within their communities a higher and more subtle barrier to surmount than the juridical. Psychologically and socially it infiltrates their lives in a thousand little ways. It is the mute battle between men whose life demands education and culture and men whose life does not. Consequently, the Jesuits have never really closed the gap between *conversi* and monks, between clerics and lay of the old mendicant orders."²⁰

In fact, in one other respect the division has widened in our own order. Formerly, the lay religious of the old monasteries had at least some spiritual apostolate; from time to time they went out begging from door to door and edifying their fellow-workers by their conversation and counsel. Our own Society enjoined a similar practice on its lay members. But for us, apostolate has become today the exclusive possession of the priest, the brothers participating only indirectly. However, it must be said that the practice of spiritual conversation sometimes reached lofty heights within our own communities, especially in the case of St. Alphonsus Rodriguez, who personally directed St. Peter Claver, and also, more recently, in Bro. Garrate, who was in greater spiritual demand than the most famous of the fathers of Deusto University.

¹⁹ *Nuntius Cong. Gen.* XXXI, n. 16, p. 8. See Jurich, *op. cit.*, 62.

²⁰ Fr. Bonduelle, O.P., "Développement et évolution des vocations hors cléricature," *Vocations sacerdotales et religieuses* 218 (1963).

IV: THE RENEWAL

It would be naive to blame the present situation altogether on the past. The advancement of laymen within the Church, the rise of education, a growing respect for the person, a sense of justice and equality are all factors that should sharpen and focus our attention on the situation today.

Fr. Ledochowski

In this section I would like to discuss the fresh approach the last two Fathers General have taken to advance the brothers. As far back as 1820, the 20th General Congregation had stated that the coadjutors could be appointed to teach boys reading and writing, and painting and drawing as well; and from their own rules we see clearly that the provincial may grant them permission to increase the knowledge of letters they had on their entrance into the Society.²¹ Yet the real renewal did not begin until 1936, when Fr. Ledochowski wrote a letter addressed to the provincials of the American Assistancy. He called attention to the small number of brothers and the low esteem some fathers had for this calling: "But I am informed that there are to be found among you those who presume to discourage candidates from embracing this mode of life, moved by this consideration only: that it is unworthy of a promising young man. I would advise you, if you know of anyone who holds this opinion and acts upon it, to admonish him seriously on the falsity and danger of his opinion and urge him to correct it."²²

Later in 1942, Fr. Ledochowski addressed the whole Society in another letter, stressing the equality of the brothers' grade: "To the will of our Father they are not merely assistants in domestic affairs but at the same time members of one and the same body of the

²¹ 20th General Congregation, Decree 22. This custom was followed in Spain and Latin America from the very beginning. Many famous brothers spent fifty years as high school teachers. Today Bro. Tirso Espeso, S.J., who taught a future president of the Republic of Cuba, Prio Socarrás, Premier Fidel Castro, and a bishop, Msgr. Perez Serantes, is still teaching in the Dominican Republic. Bro. Espeso was decorated by the Spanish government with the *Cruz de Isabel la Católica* medal after he completed fifty years of active teaching in Cuba, Santo Domingo, and Puerto Rico.

²² *Selected Writings of Father Ledochowski* (Chicago, 1945), p. 143.

Society, who have before their eyes the same end as all the rest, hope for the same reward in its entirety, and so are partakers in all the good works which God will vouchsafe to accomplish through the whole Society for His service and praise."²³

In the same letter he strongly recommends the brothers be given more academic background since "it makes their toil easier, their souls more cheerful, their application to individual tasks more careful, and induces not a little to calmness of spirit and firmness in our vocation; quite as frequently, too, it helps attract vocations."²⁴

Fr. Janssens

In 1948, Fr. Janssens wrote on this theme. The war had ended; new ideas of reconstruction, equality, and social justice were being fanned all around the world. And the astonishing thing was that in the Society two classes still remained, rich and poor, educated and uneducated. This occasioned one of the sharpest letters a general has even written to the whole Society:

Therefore, the idea (which some people call "communistic") that all men are equal to one another, that manual labor should be considered no less noble than intellectual pursuits, and that an ordinary workman deserves the same personal esteem as a master craftsman—this belief should, in my opinion, be called Christian and evangelical.

While demanding from the brothers the reverence which is due to the priestly state, we should be careful not to demand that esteem which, according to a worldly way of thinking, is due to a wealthy person. It is thoroughly improper that there be among us a distinction between fathers and brothers similar to the one between what are usually called "social classes." We have only one "social class," that of the sons of the same Society.

It also happens that the share of the Society's work pertaining to the brothers is incorrectly described by some. For one hears that "the brothers are destined for the service of the fathers." This saying, from its literal meaning, is bound to convey a false idea. For the brothers are not destined for the service of the fathers, but for the service of the Society, just exactly as the fathers themselves are. . . .

If the recreation rooms and living rooms destined for the brothers are extraordinarily unpleasant and quite dirty, while more pleasant and cleaner rooms are provided for the fathers, if careful refinement marks our conversation with the fathers, but we address the brothers in that way which is sometimes wrongly called "paternal"—a way that smacks of the familiarity with

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

which we address boys or uneducated servants, . . . if by tacit permission fathers take for themselves certain advantages or superfluous relaxations, which we rightly refuse to the brothers; if these and similar practices are common among us, the Apostle Paul will have been proved correct in saying that we are "mere men," and, to imitate the frankness of the Apostle James, we are "respecters of persons"; rightly then are the brothers offended, rightly are the young people of this time alienated from us, for they have deeply instilled in them a sense of the human dignity which God has bestowed on each of His sons in equal measure.²⁵

In 1957, the 30th General Congregation finally reformed the rules of the brothers and erased their 15th rule because "the Institute of the Society has no desire to see the brothers lacking in knowledge and education; its only wish was to keep them free from inordinate human ambition."²⁶

Again in 1958 Fr. Janssens directed the whole Society to the renewal of the brothers based on a more scientific program with special houses for training. Superiors not only were urged to give more opportunities to the brothers but were forbidden to admit illiterates. "If those who are illiterate should present themselves, they are not to be admitted on the spot. Let them rather, in one of our houses and under a prudent director, be trained for a year or two in those elements of learning which our vocation demands. All things being equal, the better educated will be the better religious."²⁷

Yet as late as 1964, just before his death, Fr. Janssens expressed extreme dismay and regret that in some places the new decrees and orientation were never known to the brothers.²⁸

V: THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE

The current General Congregation promises a substantial institutional change for the brothers. This updating will certainly have to take into account the times we live in, the new theology and the vocation of the lay religious. We know that the French fathers have already submitted liberal proposals in this regard; for elite Catholics in their own country are now seeking admission to the Society, but

²⁵ *ActRSJ* 11 (1948) 523-24.

²⁶ *ActRSJ* 13 (1957) 310.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 440.

²⁸ *ActRSJ* 14 (1964) 554.

without the intention of being priests. At present the Society has no room for them. But while the ranks of this kind of candidate fill up more each day, vocations to the priesthood continue to fall off. We must recognize where the inner vitality of the Church is expressing itself today.

A renovation of the institution is now more urgent than ever before for the brothers. First, however, we must come to a clear understanding of what a brother's vocation is in the Society. The Congregation has already ordered an inquiry on the subject. The most immediate relationship of brothers to priests is obviously that both are religious. However, religious life started independently of the priesthood. St. Francis of Assisi did not want to be a priest nor was St. Benedict ever one. The Dominicans, in fact, in their monastic life, only later assigned a primary role to the priesthood. Just the reverse happened in the Society: first came the priests, then the *Constitutions*, then the brothers.

In the last few centuries the charism of the priesthood has superseded that of the religious life. Previously the priesthood, in contemplative orders particularly, enjoyed no great social or liturgical prominence and was merely a personal gift. Today there are attempts in the monastic orders to ordain only the priests necessary for the liturgical life of the community.

With this in mind we can clarify our concept of the brothers' vocation. They were instituted in order to facilitate the priestly ministry of the fathers. In other words, to them belongs per se the lay activity of our works.

The Society of Jesus is pre-eminently a clerical order, and the priestly mission, strictly speaking, is defined by the charism of the ministry of the sacrament and the word; yet per accidens the priesthood does not preclude the possibility of a second activity. But this activity only by way of exception should absorb the principal charism of the priesthood.²⁹

²⁹ The works of De Lubac and Balthasar are classic on this subject. See also: P. Helbo, S.J., "La formation du frère et sa place dans la communauté," *Le Frère Coadjuteur*, October, 1960; J. M. Larose, O.M.I., "Situation actuelle des frères en France," *Vocations sacerdotales et religieuses*, April, 1962; H. McCormack (pseud.), "The Act of Christ in the Mass," *Worship* 37 (1963) 630-39.

To the brothers, therefore, rightly belong per se all the business affairs of our Society. It is too difficult for a father to keep before him the ideal of his priesthood while most of his life is spent signing checks or managing property. Only special circumstances should require it: for instance, the absence of qualified personnel, old age, sickness, or other reasonable causes.

The offices of treasurer, minister, and other administrative posts, and even the teaching of secular subjects are essentially lay roles. Normally speaking, why should not this type of job belong to the brothers? Although present circumstances will not permit a rapid changeover in our staff, we should review the purpose of our priestly vocation, the mission of our brothers, and the needs and exigencies of the new Church. This done, we will be able to accept the direction of the General Congregation: "Accidental changes will not be enough. A deep renewal, both of the institution and of the way of thinking among the priests, must take place."³⁰

³⁰ *Nuntius Cong. Gen. XXXI*, n. 16, p. 7. See Jurich, *op. cit.*, 61.

THE JESUIT SCHOLASTIC IN THE LIGHT OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

"It is too early to say whence the New Breed has come; we will have to wait until they can explain themselves."

Andrew M. Greeley

WILLIAM P. BRUTON, S.J.

IT SEEMS TO BE ONE OF THE INESCAPABLE FACTS of life that it is always a bit difficult for different generations to understand one another. There is a difficult time in any family when the younger members are just on the point of maturity and still a bit unaccustomed to their new roles. Misunderstandings arise, and friction as well; in some cases, even a lasting bitterness may develop. One would expect the same in any group of people with varying ages, particularly a group like the Society of Jesus, where the superior acts as a father and with a father's authority towards those under him.

A different situation

Some misunderstanding is natural, is expected even, but the situation today seems to have gotten a bit out of hand. The young Jesuit today is a problem and a mystery to his elders in a way that is somehow different from that of past ages, in a way that his elders never were when they were young. One might even go so far as to say that the Jesuit scholastic is a mystery even to himself. He feels that something, somewhere, should be changed, but neither he nor anyone else can say what is right.

The intention of this article is to examine the forces which are causing the tensions noted just now. The situation being what it is, no possible source of light should be disregarded. Certainly, we should not ignore social psychology, which seeks to help men develop a better understanding of themselves and to construct tools which will permit the formulation of more reliable explanations of human behavior.¹ The root contention, then, of this article is that an adequate knowledge of the principles of social psychology, coupled with reflection on current events, will enable us to understand the phenomenon of the new breed of Jesuits.

The insights of this article would probably be most easily explained and comprehended if we divide them in the following fashion: first, a brief description of some of the terms of social psychology which are essential to our purpose; then, a description of the salient features of the scholastic of today and the explanation for those features which social psychology provides. Our analysis will show that, while the situation of the young Jesuit is a natural one, it is not quite a pleasant one. And so, in the final section we will try to see what, if anything, may be done to remedy the situation.

Terms

This section of the paper will be mainly an exposition of some of the terms used in social psychology. Mention was made earlier of tools that would permit the formulation of more reliable explanations; in no uncertain way, the terms and the insights they embody *are* the tools which will be used. The authority for these particular terms, and, in general, for all the elements of social psychology in this article is the book *Society and Personality* by Tamotsu Shibutani.

The first term that will be discussed is the word "meaning." For the social psychologist, meaning is a relatively stable orientation on the part of some individual or group toward some aspect of his (their) environment; there is a consistent organization in the behavior whenever contact is made with some object or class of objects: "Meanings can be identified more fruitfully by what people *do* with objects . . . Seen in this light, it is not strange that the same object can mean different things to different people. . . . A cross has a very special meaning for Christians; but there are many parts of the world where

¹ Tamotsu Shibutani, *Society and Personality* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961), pp. 4-5.

it would be meaningless, for there are no organized ways of acting towards it. The significance of any object, then, arises from the manner in which it is used."²

Somewhat related to the different meanings that each man has is his "definition of the situation"—the way each individual interprets what is going on: "W. I. Thomas pointed out long ago that what each man does depends upon his *definition of the situation*. He was emphasizing the fact that behavior is ordinarily not a response to environmental stimulation, but constitutes a succession of adjustments to interpretations of what is going on. A man orients himself to the context in which he finds himself, ascertains his interests, and then proceeds as best he can to cope with the circumstances."³ This goes a long way toward explaining why the actions of people from one culture are often misinterpreted by the people from another. The two groups define the situation in dissimilar ways, each of which appears unreasonable to the other. It seems appropriate to note here that "group activities of all kinds are greatly facilitated when the different participants develop a *common* definition of the situation."⁴

The question of group action was raised in our last considerations, and the very question itself is an interesting and a fruitful one for the social psychologist. For he asks the basic question, "How is it possible?" "The most general hypothesis concerning joint enterprises in diverse contexts centers on the concept of *consensus*. The extent to which independently motivated men are able to coordinate their respective activities depends upon the degree of consensus that exists among them. Consensus refers to some kind of mutual understanding, a sharing of perspectives. It is however, neither absolute nor static. . . . Before there can be mutual adjustment, however, each participant must know enough about the others to be able to anticipate, within reasonable limits, what they are likely to do."⁵ We should not lose sight of this last idea, for it is crucial to an understanding of the article as a whole—each participant must have an adequate and accurate notion of the attitudes of all the other participants of the group enterprise.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 97–98.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

Group norms

“Group norms,” those things about which there is consensus, may be explicitly defined, but most often they are not:

Men interact constantly on the basis of unwritten rules, and frequently a sense of what is appropriate is only intuitively felt. There are some norms so deeply ingrained that people have difficulty in recognizing them when they are explicitly stated.

Indeed, the better established the norms are, the less likely it is that people will be aware of them. When there is a high degree of consensus, the assumptions are shared to such an extent that no one would even think of raising questions. What is important then about any group is what is taken for granted, what is silently and unconsciously presupposed.⁶

If these group norms are for the most part “unconsciously presupposed,” how does one recognize them? “Most norms are so much a part of our lives that we do not become conscious of them until there is some violation or misunderstanding. . . . The sources of resentment and indignation can be particularly revealing of what participants had been taking for granted.”⁷ Perhaps the most interesting point of all with reference to group norms is that in some cases norms develop which vary from the officially stated ideals; “In some situations formally announced objectives are reduced to little more than slogans.”⁸

Let us stand off for a moment from our work of definition and make the obvious comment that each Jesuit is a person and that the Society of Jesus is a group of men participating in a common enterprise. We have little reason to think that each Jesuit does not have his own definition of the situation, and that there are no such things as group norms or consensus within the Society.

Group norms have been treated, but what exactly is a group? “A group can be identified by its recurrent patterns of cooperative action. As long as the participants continue to comply with one another’s expectations, the action pattern persists. Since each person is capable of independent action, group structures can continue only as long as the participants are willing to honor their obligations. The collective pattern collapses when a sufficient proportion of individ-

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

uals, especially those who play the key roles, defect. Even social sanctions are effective only when they enjoy consensus."⁹ Such words as the foregoing counsel against any mean estimation of the importance of consensus.

So far, individuals and societies or larger groups have been considered. But considered merely in themselves they give an incomplete picture of human society. For everywhere, people live in "primary groups." A primary group is an association of people who know one another on an individual basis. All primary groups are small, and they are usually sustained over a long period of time. The primary group exerts a very strong influence over the attitudes and choices of its members. As a matter of fact, this influence is such that many of the decisions men make appear senseless to observers who do not know them intimately.¹⁰

Significant other

In the discussion of primary groups, the term, "significant other," is used. Once more, let us be precise. Each person comes to know a limited number of people as unique individuals. The responses of such people are of crucial importance for the construction and reinforcement of one's conception of himself. Those whom he depends upon for such support may be designated as his significant others. Each person is highly responsive to the demands of such persons because he cannot afford to lose their support; whenever there is a possibility of their not responding in the desired manner he becomes filled with anxiety. All persons who are intimately known are significant others, but a high degree of intimacy is not necessary. A teacher or a priest, for example, may be very influential, even though little is known of his private life. The views attributed to such individuals often set the standards of conduct by which a person lives.¹¹

Consideration of the significant other opens up some very interesting avenues of thought. For example, it is rather interesting and a little frightening to speculate about what would happen to an individual who had significant others who made contradictory demands. Such people do exist in society today; social psychology calls them "marginal men."

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 581.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 404, 410, 430-31.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 339, 421.

There are people who occupy ambiguous positions and embody within their careers the inconsistencies of the pluralistic society in which we live. They are called upon to play roles which consist of contradictory claims and obligations, and they face difficulties in one situation after another. . . . The dilemma confronting a person in a marginal position is that, no matter what he does, someone will be displeased. . . . Interpersonal relations are sometimes altered drastically from the bitterness aroused by such choices. The person has trouble in coming to terms with himself, finding it difficult to maintain an adequate level of self-esteem. Because he identifies so closely with significant others, he can readily appreciate their sorrow. He tries to defend and justify his action, but he is stricken with guilt.¹²

The marginal man closes off our discussions in psychology. We turn now from the order of scientific explanation to the reality of modern life.

The young Jesuit

In this section, we will try to give an accurate picture of the young Jesuit, and then we will propose an explanation for some of his more puzzling traits, an explanation based on social psychology. In the interests of clarity, we will state our position now. The proof of this assertion will be the burden of the second section of the article. It seems that the basic problem of the modern Jesuit scholastic is this: he is a marginal man and has the problems attendant on trying to satisfy the conflicting demands of significant others. Not only that, his position is made more difficult by the extreme changes which the world is going through and which have caused a breakdown of consensus in the whole Society. This weakening of consensus has its own effects, and it has affected all Jesuits, young and old. The most serious effect may well be the weakening of community spirit.

Let us begin now with our description of the young Jesuit of today. There has been much talk, of course, about the new breed of Jesuit scholastics, but it is a bit more difficult to get a clear idea of what the animal looks like. In this paper, for the most part, we shall rely on the article of Fr. Edward Sponga which appeared in *Woodstock Letters*. In his article, Father Sponga attempted to read the hopes and fears, the achievements and failures of today's Jesuit, and to generalize the data into a de facto image.¹³

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 575-578.

¹³ Edward J. Sponga, S.J., "An Ignatian Synthesis," *Woodstock Letters*, 92 (1963), p. 335.

The young Jesuit of today is one who is afraid that his work is becoming irrelevant, who fears the loss of personal identity, who refuses black-and-white, cut-and-dried solutions but who thinks in black-and-white terms, who intensely desires personal success and fulfilment, who deeply values personal initiative and responsibility, who is sometimes frightened by what he sees in older Jesuits, who sometimes feels that all his efforts are condemned to frustration, and one who, above all, desires to encounter Christ.¹⁴

The new breed

The picture drawn by Fr. Sponga should serve as the basic image which comes to our mind whenever we think of the Jesuit scholastic. In all likelihood, no one would disagree with the points he makes; however one or two small things might be added. For one thing, today's Jesuit has to know why. Andrew Greeley pointed this out in his now famous article on the "New Breed": "They must know the reason why. They do not refuse to obey, but before they obey they want to sit down and discuss the reasons for orders; they are confused when those in authority feel threatened by this desire for discussion. As a Jesuit College administrator remarked: 'For four hundred years we have been in the apostolate of Christian education, and now we suddenly find that our seminarians are demanding that we justify this apostolate.'"¹⁵ Coupled with this itch for questioning, there seems to be the strange inability to say just what the trouble is. Father General, during the first session of the General Congregation, commented to that effect concerning the *postulata* of the young members of the Society. Greeley also noticed this peculiarity.¹⁶ Thus, our picture of the Jesuit scholastic is completed.

We now begin the burdensome task of trying to explain this phenomenon. The underlying reason, and one which most people will probably admit, is that we are living in a changing world. Donald R. Champion, in an article for *America* trying to explain why the new breed arose, made the point that we have to go back four hundred years to find a parallel for the events that are happening today.¹⁷

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 336-338.

¹⁵ Andrew M. Greeley, "A New Breed," *America*, 110 (May 23, 1964), pp. 706-707.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 708.

¹⁷ Donald R. Champion, S.J., "New World, New Church," *America*, 110 (May 23, 1964), p. 710.

He also said that the economic, social, and cultural changes which take place in the next forty years may well equal in significance the sum total of the last four hundred. As if all that weren't enough, we now have Vatican II to think about. Seen in the context of a rapidly changing world, the Jesuit we have pictured makes a bit more sense, for he "is definitely a man caught between two worlds. Every Christian, of course, is, but the Jesuit more acutely because of his strong commitment to *do* something about both worlds."¹⁸ These last words might seem to imply that feeling the pressures of a changing world is strictly a religious phenomenon. Such is not quite the case, as we learn from Shibutani: "The popularity of social psychology may be increasing because so many people in modern mass societies are plagued by personal problems. In any rapidly changing society, there are apparently fewer people who feel fulfilled. Many are tense, irritable and restless, dissatisfied no matter what they do. They experience amorphous impulses. Their behavior becomes erratic; they try to do one thing after another without being sure of just what it is that they want to do. With no particular goal in sight, sometimes life itself seems pointless."¹⁹

This picture of man, of any man caught in a changing society, would seem to have a surprising amount in common with the modern Jesuit, as described above. The restlessness, the dissatisfaction, the amorphous impulses are all present in the new breed of Jesuit scholastic, are in fact expressed in that questioning spirit which cannot say just what it is that is wrong.

Father Sponga described the Jesuit as a man caught between two worlds. That is a non-scientific description of a marginal man, and it is only too aptly applied to the Jesuit. That he is caught between at least two worlds can be shown rather easily. For example, difficulties may arise for the man who has friends outside the Society, friends who attend a Jesuit college. It is not easy to explain poverty as it is practised in the Society of Jesus to those with a rather unrefined and simple understanding of the word. It is even conceivable that the young Jesuit may be tempted to regard this as an instance of something mentioned in the first part of this paper—the situation where group norms have developed which are at variance with officially

¹⁸ Sponga, *op. cit.*, p. 338.

¹⁹ Shibutani, *op. cit.*, p. 567.

stated ideals. He might not be able to formulate his feelings in such words of course, but situations like that do happen because of his marginal status.

And so, the Jesuit of today must continually adjust to different attitudes, to different meanings in his personal dealings with significant others both inside and outside of the Society. And as if the fruit of confusion from his personal dealings were not enough, he is also faced with the mass media. Fr. Robert Johann's comment is enlightening in this regard: "The prodigious increase in communications confronts the individual in his formative years with such a range of competing world views and traditions that automatic acceptance of any one of them is no longer possible. Right from the start, the individual experiences the need to decide for himself the meaning and scope of his life."²⁰

Redefining the image

So far, we have affirmed the fact of social change, and we have considered the Jesuit scholastic, as influenced by this changing world. Though we have used terms from social psychology to describe what is going on, strictly speaking we have not used the theories of the behavioral sciences to account for what is going on. This we will do, starting right now, and we turn to sociology and social psychology which share a rather uneasy border: "One of the most valuable theories in Sociology is the view of Thomas and Znaniecki that *social disorganization is a product of social change*. They pointed out that most of the phenomena condemned by those who are well established occur when there is a decreasing influence of group norms upon the conduct of individuals. Social change, the transformation of social structures, is not likely to occur without a temporary breakdown of consensus."²¹

We may say then that what seems to have happened in the Society of Jesus is that there has been a temporary breakdown of consensus because of social change. Fr. Sponga touched on this same phenomenon when he said that the purposes and goals and ways and

²⁰ Robert O. Johann, S.J., "Philosopher's Notebook," *America*, 110 (May 2, 1964), p. 606.

²¹ Shibutani, *op. cit.*, pp. 568-69, citing William I. Thomas & Florian Znaniecki, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), Vol. II, pp. 1117-1264, 1647-1827.

means have changed so much that there is an imperative need to redefine the image of the Jesuit today.²² Though he did not say so, the reason why we must redefine our image is that not all agree on the present one. This insight, this assertion, is the central theme of this article; it explains all else.

This means that today different persons and different groups of persons have their own different definitions of the situation. In some cases, the difference of definition between the older men and younger men is so great as to breed suspicion on both sides. It is here suggested that this difference in definition is the reason for the younger man's characteristic fear, noted earlier, for the older men, who "apparently lost their way and settled finally for something less than a full religious life."²³

Social disorganization

It was said just now that social change involves social disorganization; we should get as clear a notion as possible of the disorganization resulting from the weakening of consensus:

When life conditions are fairly stable, men continue to act in an habitual manner. . . . But in crisis situations, a number of people find it difficult to continue living under their old obligations. Understandings that had once been shared are called into question. Social change almost invariably involves some breakdown in social control. . . . When life conditions change, new needs arise, and a collective effort is made to adjust to the situation. New procedures are suggested and tried, and some old meanings are abandoned. It is not often that all of the people involved will do this simultaneously, although new collective patterns are sometimes instituted by common consent. There is usually a period of transition marked by disagreement over the appropriate modes of conduct. This is a period of misunderstandings; people who act in good faith find themselves rebuffed. Concerted action breaks down. Moral conduct results in coordination only in a stable setting. When consensus breaks down, individuals who continue to live in accordance with old principles are often ridiculed; sometimes, they are viciously condemned, especially by those who feel guilty about violating the norms they once had accepted.²⁴

The above passage obviously opens many doors to reflection; very much could be said by way of commentary. However, let us restrict ourselves to three short comments. We saw earlier that young Jesuits

²² Sponga, *op. cit.*, p. 333.

²³ Sponga, *op. cit.*, p. 337.

²⁴ Shibutani, *op. cit.*, p. 569.

are questioning everything, the value of the educational apostolate, for example. We see now that this is part of the collective effort to adjust to the new situation. New procedures are being suggested. (One thinks of the Bible vigils.) It is possible that during such a time of transition some old meanings, i.e., attitudes towards some traditional works of the Society, may be changed so radically as to be unrecognizable.

It is more than unfortunate that misunderstandings should spring up among men who are dedicated to the same goal. But sometimes superiors with the best of intentions have found themselves rebuffed, perhaps even bitterly hurt. One can only deplore something like that, wish that it didn't happen, and pray that further bitterness and misunderstanding not be the result. However, incidents of such a nature do have a small, bitter-sweet fruit; they show that good intentions are not enough. For good intentions to be effective, there is need of firsthand knowledge, mutual understanding, and, above all, consensus about the Jesuit way of life.

"Individuals who continue to live in accord with old principles are often ridiculed." When such a point is reached, social disorganization is on the point of becoming social disintegration. Of course, it is possible for this to happen in the Society, but one finds oneself hoping that it doesn't happen, or at least that it happens very rarely.

Authenticity and formalism

Our catalogue of the consequences of a breakdown of consensus, though formidable, is by no means complete: "In a changing society, the perspectives of the people are undergoing transformation, but to minimize conflict many of them may for a time continue to act overtly as if they were supporting the traditional values. . . . Ritualism and sanctioned evasion of norms are frequently found in periods of transition."²⁵ This passage brings us to a point very difficult to handle in a balanced way. As was noted earlier, one tendency of young Jesuits, indeed of all young people, is the tendency to formulate problems, to define a situation in black-and-white, either-or terms. This is particularly harmful when one is dealing with social reality and with life as man lives it. If a man continues to act overtly

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 570.

as if he were supporting traditional values, litanies for example, he is not acting authentically. However, authenticity is not the supreme value, and there are times when one must act unauthentically for a greater good. This unauthenticity is *not* the same thing as ritualism or being a Pharisee, which may be considered as concern for the mere external observance with a complete disregard of content. Granted that the difference is hard to see and to detect, nevertheless, it is there. Ritualism is an unmixed evil; unauthenticity is necessary in human life. As to why it is necessary, the Spanish philosopher, José Ortega y Gasset, had an excellent observation: "It is precisely its unauthenticity that enables a social agent to fulfill its collective purpose of holding sway for individuals with or without the explicit adherence of any definite person . . . If a social function ultimately depended on definite individuals, it would easily vanish away, as these can and in fact sometimes do fail it. But a society maintains its binding beliefs with a blindness not altogether harmful."²⁶

It should be clear how easy it is for a young person to equate non-authenticity with ritualism, and so perhaps we see now the reason for the fear of ritualism which was observed in today's Jesuit. Unfortunately, it is also clear how easy it is for a man to pass off sheer formalism as a necessary element of community life. It is hoped that enough has been said to show how any black-and-white description of the problems of Jesuit life is doomed to failure. We return now to our catalogue of the results of social change.

We have noted the operation in the young members of the Society of a strong desire for personal fulfillment. And after that, we made the assertion that they were marginal men, torn by the conflicting demands of significant others. It is the contention of this paper that most, if not all, Jesuit scholastics are really trying to reconcile these different claims. However, the temptation is strong, indeed, it is sometimes overwhelming, just to forget about the whole business. The temptation is to abandon the old meanings, the old attitudes, and not to renew them. Let the group go its own way, the individual will go his. This, too, could be predicted from social psychology: "When group norms are not clear, conflicting, or not taken seriously, individualism becomes widespread. . . . When others do not live up

²⁶ José Ortega y Gasset, "Prologue to a History of Philosophy," *Concord and Liberty*, trans. by Helene Weyl (New York: W. W. Norton, 1963), p. 108.

to their obligations, each begins to wonder if there is any point in doing his part, especially where it demands sacrifice. In the absence of clearly defined career lines, life becomes more uncertain, and expediency [the sole standard of judgment is what is or is not expedient for this particular individual] becomes a key consideration."²⁷

The first trait mentioned by Sponga in his article was the desire to encounter Christ in all things. It is here proposed that such a reaction might well be expected from men of God whose world is uncertain and confusing and who are severely tempted to make themselves the only consideration.

There is one final description of social disorganization which, when considered in relation to the Society today, is, perhaps, apt enough to be a bit frightening: "When life conditions change, old groups dissolve and new ones are formed. Difficulties in attaining reasonable gratifications lead to alienation from old meanings and an increasing sensibility to new possibilities. Those defending the traditional ways view the innovations with alarm, but others see the old patterns as barriers to the quest of reasonable aspirations, barriers perpetuated by selfish old men who want to exercise authority that is no longer legitimate."²⁸ Some of the things mentioned in this quotation have been treated earlier. If they are repeated now, it is only for the sake of clarity and to avoid misunderstanding. The last sentence of the passage calls for a great deal of qualification. The author hopes that he will not be presented as calling Jesuit superiors old men selfishly clinging to illegitimate authority.

Alarm is unnecessary

Do the older men view the new breed of Jesuit scholastic with alarm? Some of them probably do. It is hoped that this article may do a little to show that such alarm is unnecessary. Do the younger men regard their superiors as selfish old men who want to exercise authority that is no longer legitimate? No, of course not. However, they do have the urge to think this sometimes, and sometimes they may even say it. How are we to understand this? Well, ask a happily married man if he wants to murder his wife. He doesn't. But that

²⁷ Shibutani, *op. cit.*, pp. 570-71.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 569.

doesn't mean that he hasn't felt the urge to strangle her or bang her over the head once in a while. This is often more or less the case with the scholastic and his superior, and, no doubt, vice versa.

Thus far we have seen that the tremendous social change going on now has forced the young Jesuit to ask about almost everything, "Is it relevant?" Because he has a different definition of the situation from many other Jesuits, he is afraid of what he sees in their lives. He feels inadequate and insecure because he cannot satisfy the demands of each of the significant others in his life. The breakdown of consensus brings unauthenticity and individualism in its wake; hence he fears formalism and is slightly tinged with individualism. He values freedom and responsibility because, in a world where no two people seem to agree, he feels that you have to depend on your own right arm to do what is right. Of course, this makes for confusion, but, as was said before, "Moral conduct results in coordination only in a stable setting." Above all, there is the desire for a personal encounter with Christ, for he is seen as the one, firm, unchanging rock in a sea of change.

And so, we see how the social change and the resultant disorganization in society have affected the younger members of the Society of Jesus. But the older members are affected, too. For they are affected indirectly in that they are worried about the change in the type of young Jesuit. However, one could ask why it is that it is the younger Jesuits who are most affected by the changes of today. Why don't the older men react in the same way? Well, first of all, one should not say that it is only the young men who have young ideas, or ideas in keeping with the times. Cardinal Bea should convince anyone of that, as should the General Congregation. However, this is not always the case. There are some men who do not see what all the fuss is about. These older men simply do not see why superiors should have such trouble in getting their subjects to obey the reasonable demands of legitimate authority.

One possible explanation for this is that men such as these live in a relatively closed primary group. Their group of significant others consists of Jesuits who are roughly the same age and of the same perspective as they are. A group such as this lives in a world as firm and orderly as the Ptolemaic spheres. Again, social psychology gives us the reason for this—the primary group automatically filters out

disturbing elements; what cannot be filtered out is neutralized.²⁹ The man with one perspective regards that as the only perspective possible and cannot understand the man with more than one.

Thus ends our excursion into modern Jesuit life. We have attempted to find some order in it through the use of social psychology. It is hoped that we have been justified in our attempt by the results. It does seem fruitful to consider the Jesuit scholastic of today as a marginal man, whose problems are complicated by the breakdown of consensus in a changing world. This breakdown has led to a certain individualism and to friction between different elements in the Society. The Society of Jesus must and will overcome these difficulties; the first step in that process is an adequate knowledge of its own condition.

Faith in one another

We are faced with the problem of lack of consensus and the resultant fracture of the community and community spirit. Social psychology has helped us in the analysis of this problem; it is suggested that we may find there, too, some clues about what should be done and, perhaps even more important, what should not be done. In this regard, there is one hypothesis (and merely a hypothesis) which deserves the careful attention of all:

The hypothesis for the persistence of collective enterprises under duress that has attracted considerable support in recent years . . . places emphasis on the faith that men have in one another. Many students have pointed to the importance of informal social structures, the understandings that develop among men . . . concerning how much each man is to contribute. On the battlefield [for example] courage is contagious; to a man who is terrified and on the verge of panic, nothing provides a more stabilizing influence than the observation of others around him who retain their composure and continue doing their work. A terrified man may become even more afraid of running away, fearing what his comrades might think of him. . . . But such sacrifices are made only for comrades who are liked, whose opinions really matter.³⁰

We may interpret these last lines as meaning that a person will be most inclined to make sacrifices for a person whom he knows and deeply respects. In terms of Jesuit life, this means that if a superior wants his subjects to put on his mind, he must become just such a significant other to his subjects.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 430-431.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 585.

By his very office, of course, the superior is significant already; but this significance alone is a rather neutral thing—he may well be looked upon by his subjects as something of an elemental force, like plague, famine, or war, which one leaves out of consideration only at personal risk. If the superior wishes his subjects to be obedient in the truly Jesuit fashion, they must know him as a person. It seems most probable that they will do what he wishes wholeheartedly only if they love him. Again, just considering the matter logically, we see that if all of our troubles are coming from a lack of consensus, the obvious thing to do is to try and restore it.

We may draw two sets of conclusions from these considerations, the first for the superior, the second for the subject. The way for the superior to become a significant other and the path to consensus both lead through the land of dialogue. Dialogue is an indispensable means to our final goal. And yet, note that it is only a means and should end in some conclusion; as an end in itself, dialogue makes as little sense as any other creature. The commitment to dialogue entails a certain openness on the superior's part, and a certain human faith in his subjects which is not always easy to come by, especially if the good intentions of the man have been rejected or made light of in the past.

Is all the burden on the superior? By no means; the whole community shares it. As was said before, the chief temptation of the scholastic is to abandon the community, not to care what the superior or anyone else thinks. This is wrong, for it weakens the whole Society. Each man must take it upon himself to try to establish the consensus which is needed. In participating in this dialogue, the subject must also be open; he, too, must have faith in the other. He should be humble, realizing that he has much to learn; he should be careful, realizing that some older Jesuits today are a little uneasy about their younger brothers.

Consensus about any particular thing can not be simply imposed on a group. For example, if a superior were to say, without consulting anyone, we shall build the house of studies in such and such a place, he would be sure to get an argument from those with different views. In the same way, the superior may find himself opposed in many areas where opposition and even questioning were unthought of in the past. The principle still holds, the only way to

consensus is through dialogue. Authoritarianism only produces argument, which is dialogue with charity left out, or sullen discontent, which is harder to fight since it is harder to see.

Much has been said in this paper that might give occasion for pessimism, both about the Society of Jesus and about its younger members. Such is not the attitude of the author, and, in his opinion, such pessimism is not the result of true knowledge. As a matter of fact, we have every reason for hoping that great things will be conceived and performed in these our days. And so, we conclude on an optimistic note, or rather, in an encouraging harmony of social psychology and philosophy: "Park contended that marginal men tend to be more creative than others. . . . The larger the number of perspectives appreciated, the less an individual is monopolized by any single way of life. The major advances in any culture usually come during periods of rapid social change, and many of the great contributions are made by marginal men."³¹ Thus social psychology; Fr. Robert Johann may speak for philosophy: "For the person is not a mere rebel. He does not wish to break with what has been accomplished, but rather to broaden its scope. He does not seek to change things so much as to renew them. For he is Being's agent, ever reshaping the face of the earth in the light, not of his whims, but of the wider possibilities that his very presence to Being continually opens up to him."³²

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 581.

³² Johann, *loc. cit.*

THE PRAYER OF THE APOSTLE: A PAULINE VIEW

*A struggle with God
in favor of his mission*

STANISLAS LYONNET, S.J.

THE READER OF ST. PAUL'S LETTERS cannot help being impressed by the place given in them to prayer, especially to that kind of prayer which might be called "apostolic," that is, a prayer whose whole character both determines and is determined by the apostolate. The apostolate creates and nourishes this prayer, while in its turn this prayer prepares, accompanies, and in some circumstances even replaces the apostolate. Paul speaks of this apostolic prayer frequently when describing his own prayer or when inviting his correspondents to pray.

The pagans of Paul's day had the custom of beginning their letters with a prayer of thanks to the gods. The sands of Egypt have preserved for us a letter which a young soldier named Apion wrote to his father. The letter opens with the assurance that he prays for the good health of his family and with a prayer of thanks to the god Serapis who saved him from the dangers of a risky sea voyage. St. Paul followed this usage of his times and with such regularity that the occasional omission of such a formula immediately attracts attention. For example, Paul was not happy with the conduct of the Galatians and so begins his letter to them not with a prayer of thanksgiving but rather with a reproach: "I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in the grace of

A translation (with slight omissions) by Edward Malatesta, S.J., of "Un aspect de la 'prière apostolique' d'après Saint Paul," *Christus* 19 (1958) 222-229.

Christ and turning to a different gospel . . ." (Gal 1:6). Likewise at the beginning of 2 Corinthians, Paul replaces the act of thanksgiving by a blessing. The difference might seem unimportant. Isn't to bless God the same thing as to thank him? The fact is, however, that in his letter to the Ephesians, which begins (1:3-14) with a blessing similar to that in 2 Corinthians, Paul includes also a prayer of thanksgiving in due form (1:15-23). Furthermore, in 2 Corinthians, a letter as severe as that to the Galatians, Paul blesses God only for those favors given to himself and not for those granted to his correspondents.

Paul does not limit the mention of prayer only to the beginning of his letters, where it is expected. The theme of prayer appears frequently also in the body of his letters. To give only two examples: in the five chapters of 1 Thessalonians Paul repeats twice (2:13; 3:9) his initial prayers of thanksgiving (1:2-3), and to them he adds prayers of petition: ". . . praying earnestly night and day that we may see you face to face and supply what is lacking in your faith" (3:10). Moreover, the faithful are invited to join their prayers to his: "Pray constantly, give thanks in all circumstances; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus for you. . . . Brethren, pray for us" (5:17-18,25). There is the same insistence in the three short chapters of 2 Thessalonians:

We are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren, as is fitting, because your faith is growing abundantly, and the love of every one of you for one another is increasing (1:3).

To this end we always pray for you, that our God may make you worthy of his call, and may fulfil every good resolve and work of faith by his power . . . (1:11).

But we are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren beloved by the Lord, because God chose you from the beginning to be saved through sanctification by the Spirit and belief in the truth (2:13).

Finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may speed on and triumph, as it did among you, and that we may be delivered from wicked and evil men; for not all have faith (3:1-2).

Prayers of thanksgiving or prayers of petition, Paul's prayers or those of the faithful: they are all "apostolic" prayers. Their object when specified is always the advancement of God's kingdom. Let us attempt to discover what Paul himself thinks of this kind of prayer.

The turn of phrase employed in 1 Thess 3:10 is noteworthy. Not only is Paul's prayer continual (he prays "night and day," just as he works "night and day," 2:9), but he offers his prayer to God "as earnestly as possible" (*huperekperissou*). In Eph 3:20 the same word describes the powerful activity of God, who, working within us, "is able to do far more abundantly than all we ask or think." An almost identical form of the same word (*huperekperissôs*) qualifies the esteem which Christians should have towards their superiors (1 Thess 5:13). In the passage we are considering (1 Thess 3:10) Paul evidently wishes to stress the intensity of his supplications.

Wouldn't this suggest that for Paul prayer is a kind of struggle or combat which man engages in with God? In other passages, Paul does not hesitate to use such an image.

At the end of his letter to the Romans, after several long theological developments, Paul strikes a more personal note and tells the faithful of Rome about some of his own problems. He begs them to pray for him that he may escape the traps laid by the Jews and that the alms collected so carefully in the Gentile churches may be accepted favorably by the mother church of Jerusalem: "I appeal to you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the Spirit, to strive together with me in your prayers to God on my behalf . . ." (Rom 15:30-32).

In the letter to the Colossians the same verb describes the prayer of Epaphras, the founder of that church, for those whom he had instructed. "Epaphras, who is one of yourselves, a servant of Christ Jesus, greets you, striving earnestly for you in his prayers, that you may stand mature and fully assured in all the will of God" (Col 4:12).

Finally, at the beginning of the second chapter, the same image recurs in a similar context. The word *prayer* is not mentioned explicitly and in the preceding verse Paul uses the verb *strive* to describe all his apostolic work: "Him we proclaim, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man mature in Christ. For this I toil, striving with all the energy which he mightily inspires within me" (1:28-29). But when in the following verse (2:1) he repeats the image of a struggle, it seems, especially in view of the parallel passage in 4:12, that he intends to speak of the apostolic activity which he, like Epaphras,

exercises by prayer itself. Paul writes as a prisoner from Rome, or at any rate far from Colossae, and he insists on informing his correspondents that he is still their apostle: "For I want you to know how greatly I strive for you, and for those at Laodicea [in 4:16 he will ask that his letter be sent to them], and for all who have not seen my face . . ." (2:1). Paul certainly contributes to their growth in Christ by his imprisonment and especially by the sufferings he endures for them: "I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and in my flesh I complete what is lacking in Christ's afflictions for the sake of his body, that is, the Church" (Col 1:24). In this apostolic activity of the "prisoner," prayer has a place as it did in the case of Epaphras. Here once again Paul speaks of the struggle the apostle undergoes with God for the salvation of those confided to him.

The image is a bold one but it cannot be denied that it is in harmony with the Gospel. In the parable of the friend aroused in the night by a request for help (Lc 11:5-8), which occurs, it is worth noting, in the context of Christ's teaching on prayer (Lc 11:1-13), Christ himself repeats the doctrine which the Old Testament inculcated from the very origins of biblical history.¹ The first prayer of petition, that of Abraham on behalf of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 18:17-32), serves as model for those that follow. Moses interceded for the people of Israel while prostrating before the Lord for forty days and forty nights without food or drink (Deut 9:18-19, 25-29). Christ, the new Moses, began his messianic career after his baptism by a mysterious sojourn in the desert which Luke and Matthew evidently compare to the solemn intercession of Moses on Sinai when the first covenant was established.

Faithful to the most authentic biblical tradition, which does not fear bold metaphors, neither Christ nor St. Paul hesitated to teach that God wishes us to importune him, as it were, with our prayers, and so finally to obtain, as if by a struggle, that which we ask.

However we must not forget that we are dealing with metaphors

¹ On this parable, cf. J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1963²) pp. 157-59.

and it is important to understand their precise meaning. In the name of fidelity to Scripture, some might be inclined to think that by prayer man can induce God to want something He did not want, thus presupposing that man can influence God Himself. Or one might fail to represent God as the loving father who is always ready to give his children what is good for them (Lc 11:11-13; Mt 7:9-11), and who is more concerned about their real good than about feeding the birds or clothing the lilies (Lc 12:22-31; Mt 6:25-34). Such ways of thinking would surely be against the whole Bible, which above all safeguards the two prerogatives of the living God: his transcendence and his love.

If Paul, following the teachings of the Old Testament and of Christ, chooses to describe prayer as a struggle which man engages in with God, he does so surely to show the necessity of prayer. This can be done without prejudice either to God's transcendence or to His love. The problem is not a new one, and some excellent solutions have already been given, especially by St. Augustine, whose teaching St. Thomas makes his own with remarkable clarity.

In a passage of the *Compendium Theologiae*, one of his last and unfinished works, Thomas presents the essential of the solution:

Requests are necessary both to obtain something from men and to obtain something from God, but in each case for different reasons. When asking a man for something it is necessary first of all that the desire and need of the one petitioning be made known and then that the one asked be persuaded to concede the favor requested. But asking God for a favor is a different matter. When we pray to him, we do not intend to manifest our needs or desires because he knows all things. That is why the psalmist says, "Lord, my every desire is before you" (Ps 37:10). And in St. Matthew's gospel we read, "Your Father knows that you need all these things" (Mt 6:32).

Nor is God's will bent by human words to wish that which he did not wish before, because as the Book of Numbers says, "God does not lie like man, nor is he changed like the son of man" (Num 23:19). And he is not subject to repentance (1 Sam 15:29).

But to obtain something from God, prayer is necessary because of the one who prays; namely, so that he takes account of his defects and inclines his heart to desire with fervor and piety that which he hopes to obtain by praying. By so doing he is made apt to receive.²

² St. Thomas follows the thinking of Augustine as expressed in a passage which he quotes in the *Catena Aurea* apropos of Mt 6:8: "Quaeri potest quid opus sit oratione, si Deus iam novit quid nobis necessarium sit, nisi quia ipsa

There is still another difference between petitions addressed to men and those directed to God. Before requesting something from a man, it is necessary to know him well so as to have access to him. But the very petition which is addressed to God makes us his intimates, for when we pray our mind is raised to him, we speak to him with a certain spiritual affection, adoring him in spirit and in truth. Becoming God's intimates by prayer, we prepare the way to pray again with greater confidence. That is why the psalmist says, "I cried out," that is, with a confident prayer, "because you heard me, God" (Ps 16:6), as if once admitted into God's friendship by an initial prayer, the psalmist prayed a second time with greater confidence. So it is that in making requests of God, perseverance and persistence are not out of place, but rather pleasing to God. As St. Luke says, "It is necessary always to pray and not lose heart" (Lk 18:1). That is why the Lord directs us to make our requests: "Ask, and it will be given you . . . knock, and it will be opened to you" (Mt 7:7). But on the contrary, when one makes requests of a man, persistence would be unfitting.³

It would be difficult to express the matter with greater clarity. The effectiveness and necessity of prayer are to be found in what prayer accomplishes, not in God, but in the one who prays. God is always disposed to give us his gifts; but we by a misuse of our freedom are not always ready to receive them. Prayer disposes us to welcome God's gifts. In the last analysis the only thing we pray for is the perfect accomplishment of God's will. But precisely for God's will to be done by us it is very important for us to *pray* that it be done.

What Thomas says about the prayer the Christian offers for himself applies as well to the prayer the apostle addresses to God for those confided to him. God wishes to use us to extend his kingdom. That means concretely that through us he wishes to bring salvation and perfection to our brothers, especially to those for whom we are more directly responsible. But of ourselves we are not apt in-

orationis intentio cor nostrum serenat et purgat, capaciusque efficit ad excipienda divina munera, quae spiritualiter nobis infunduntur. Non enim ambitione precum nos exaudit Deus, qui semper paratus est dare suam lucem nobis; sed nos non semper sumus parati accipere, cum inclinamur in alia et rerum cupiditate tenebramur. Fit ergo in oratione conversio cordis ad eum qui semper dare paratus est, si nos capiamus quod dederit" (*Sermo Domini in monte*, II, 3, 14; PL 34, 1275).

³ *Compendium Theologiae*, Pars II, c. 2. For a fuller treatment of St. Thomas's view see P. J. Lécuyer, "Réflexions sur la théologie du culte selon saint Thomas," *Revue Thomiste* 55 (1955) 339-62.

struments for God's work. All prayer, and especially prayer on behalf of others, helps to make us those collaborators of God which St. Ignatius describes in our *Constitutions* [813]. Isn't this the reason why God inspired Paul as he inspired so many before him to continue that "combat in prayer" about which Paul writes?

It is not hard, then, to understand why Paul gives such an important place to what we have called "apostolic prayer," and why, faithful to the whole biblical tradition, he conceived of it as the apostle's struggle with God in favor of the mission confided to him. Far from forcing God in any way or wishing to change God's will, which is infinite love, prayer, which is itself the result of God's grace, has as its purpose to make the apostle more fit to collaborate with God and to prepare the way for God to give to us and to all humanity the gifts which proceed from His love. Such a prayer, far from being in conflict with the "necessities of the apostolate," has its *raison d'être* in the exigencies of the ministry. To fail to pray in this way is to fail in the first responsibility of an apostle.⁴

⁴In a letter to Fr. Hoffaeus, Assistant of Germany, on the responsibilities of Ours in their apostolate with the neighbor, Peter Canisius, after referring to the continual union with God which should characterize Jesuits not only in prayer but in all their activities, goes on to say: "For this a special and frequent use of prayer should be had, so that both he who sows and he who is to receive the seed be helped by the prevenient, cooperating and subsequent grace of God, for even sterile earth watered by such a heavenly rain frequently produces a good harvest. That is why the apostles, and Paul among them, continually joined prayer to their ministry and took great care that others of the faithful pray likewise. For every good and perfect gift which is given by the Father of lights (Jas 1:17) is not only received but also preserved, increased, and perfected by prayer. 'Ask and you will receive,' said the Truth, 'that your joy may be full' (Jo 16:24)." *Beati Petri Canisii, Societatis Jesu, Epistulae et acta VIII*, ed. Otto Braunsberger, S.J., (Freiburg, 1923) p. 119. In the same letter Canisius cites the different ways of prayer used by Pierre Favre, a striking example of a man of apostolic prayer. See *Mémorial*, translated and commented by M. de Certeau, S.J., "Collection Christus," No. 4 (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1960) pp. 11-15, 92-95; Nos. 21, 28, 282-283, and *passim*.

THE PRAYER OF JESUS AND HIS APOSTLES

*an integral part
of an apostolic life*

EDWARD MALATESTA, S.J.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN PRESENTS JESUS as praying on four different occasions: He gives thanks to the Father before He blesses, multiplies, and distributes the loaves and fishes which will feed the multitude (6:11); He offers a prayer of thanksgiving prior to raising Lazarus from the dead (11:41-42); at the conclusion of His public ministry He asks that the Father glorify His own name (12:27-28); and finally, before He leaves the cenacle to meet His captors in the garden of Gethsemani, He pronounces in the presence of His disciples an intimate and profound colloquy with the Father which summarizes the entire gospel (17:1-26). These four passages taken together portray a particular aspect of the Johannine view of Christ's communion with the Father. A consideration of these passages and of those where the author speaks of the apostles' prayer may show to what extent there is a continuity between the religious experience of Jesus and that of his followers.

Jesus then took the loaves, and when He had given thanks, He distributed them to those who were seated, so also the fish, as much as they wanted (Jn 6:11).

Giving thanks was an ordinary part of every Jewish meal, and although there is no mention of a blessing having been recited at the marriage feast of Cana (2:1-11), at the supper at Bethany

(12:1-8), or at the lakeside (21:9-14), we can presume that the prayer was in fact pronounced by Jesus at all His meals. The ordinary blessing over bread would be: "Blessed are you, O Lord, our God, king of the universe, who bring forth bread from the earth." John probably mentions the blessing on this occasion because, like the other prayers He reports, it is the prelude to a special sign which will reveal the glory of the Father and the accomplishment of His will. Those present will recognize in the miraculous feeding a sign that Jesus is "indeed the prophet who is to come into the world" (6:14). Besides, the sign has a relationship to the Eucharist, as the following discourse clearly shows (6:25-59), and all the narratives of the institution of that sacrament contain explicit mention of the blessing recited over the bread and the chalice. Jesus' prayer over the loaves and fishes, though in itself an ordinary one, becomes in the circumstances the preparation for the revelation and gift of Himself to others in accord with the mission confided to Him by His Father.

. . . Jesus lifted up His eyes and said, "Father, I thank you for having heard Me. I knew that you always hear Me, but I have said this on account of the people standing by, that they may believe that you have sent Me" (Jn 11:41-42).

Jesus prays before the raising of Lazarus, the last great sign of His public ministry which will cause such a stir among the Jews that His enemies will look for the first opportunity to put him to death (11:53; cf. 12:10). His prayer is again one of thanksgiving to the Father, this time thanksgiving for already having answered his request. Jesus has already been assured that it is the Father's will that this sign be performed, either at the beginning of the episode, when He first heard of Lazarus's illness and might have prayed for Him (11:4), or at the side of the tomb where, deeply moved by the grief of Mary and the bystanders, He too wept (11:33-35); for, as St. Thomas observes, "the tears which Christ shed at the death of Lazarus took the place of a prayer."

Jesus knows that the Father always hears Him, which is another way of saying that He always prays in accord with the Father's will. His conversation with the Father, as His work for the Father is always in harmony with what the Father wills for

Him in His mission. Jesus does not omit prayer because He is assured that the Father will hear Him, or because He does the work which the Father asks of Him. Rather, He is heard because He prays; He prays because both in prayer and in His ministry He always does the Father's will.

On this occasion He manifests to the bystanders that He has prayed and that the Father has heard Him, so that they may take this unity of Jesus with the Father as a sign of His having been sent by the Father, and thus believe in Him and in His mission. The prayer of Jesus becomes itself a part of His ministry, a sign, a proof that He is an apostle.

"Now is my soul troubled. And what shall I say? 'Father, save me from this hour'? No, for this purpose I have come to this hour. Father, glorify Your name." Then a voice came from heaven, "I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again." The crowd standing by heard it and said that it had thundered. Others said, "An angel has spoken to Him." Jesus answered, "This voice has come for your sake, not for mine" (Jn 12:27-30).

This episode occurs in the general context of the conclusion of Jesus' ministry (12:2-50), which includes Jesus' final entrance into Jerusalem (vv. 12-19), His meeting with the Greeks present in Jerusalem for the Passover who ask to see Him (vv. 20-36), the reflections of the evangelist on the Jewish rejection of Jesus (vv. 37-43), and a short epilogue in which Jesus makes a last appeal for faith in His person and mission (vv. 44-50).

As the mission of Jesus enters into its final and most dramatic phase, He knows that his complete fidelity to His work will lead Him to the humiliation and failure of the cross. John portrays Jesus at this moment as troubled in the face of the sufferings which begin to press upon him (cf. Ps 42:6-8,12; Mk 14:34; Jn 11:33). The Word made flesh, who shares all our emotions (cf. 4:6-7; 11:33,35; 13:21; 19:28), knows also the fear and sadness that grips each of us when faced with death. This distress of Jesus and His prayer echo the synoptic traditions on the agony in the garden (Mk 14:32-42; Mt 26:36-46; Lk 22:40-46). The Greek form of the verb, as Westcott observes, stresses the fact that "though the shock has already come, the effects continue."

Yet, according to John, Jesus does not pray to be saved from the cross. He knows too well that in the Father's providence the

cross is to be the climax of His work. There is no other alternative. He can only pray "Father, glorify your name." This petition begins, as all the prayers of Jesus, with a direct address to the Father (cf. Mk 14:36), and is an expression of the intimacy and conformity which characterize the relationship of the most perfect apostle with the one who sent Him. In His prayer Jesus presents Himself as collaborator with the Father, but in the role of instrument of the Father's work, for His sacrifice will be the means by which the Father Himself, not Jesus (contrast 17:4), or the apostles, or the world glorifies His name.

According to the gospel narratives taken together, a revelation is given from heaven at three critical moments of Jesus' ministry: after His baptism (Mk 1:11; Mt 3:17; Lc 3:22); at His transfiguration (Mk 9:7; Mt 17:36; Lc 9:36); and, according to John, just before His passion (12:27-30). St. Luke alone portrays Jesus in prayer at His baptism and at the transfiguration. In St. John, the heavenly revelation before the passion is a direct response, one might say an echo to the prayer of Jesus: "Father, glorify your name. . . . I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again" (12:28).

The Father has already glorified His name, for as J. H. Bernard remarks, all the activities of Jesus during his earthly ministry were *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. He will glorify His name still again, through the sacrifice and resurrection toward which Jesus is advancing. Once again we have an example of the close relationship John sees between the prayer of Jesus and His accomplishment of the Father's will in the work of His mission.

In this passage it is indicated that the message from heaven was not understood by those present, and yet Jesus affirms that it was given for their sake. Even if those present did not discern the words of the message, one might still find a coherent meaning in the affirmation of verse 30. Whether they heard it or not, understood it or not, the meaning of the message is that the Father has already glorified His name through the revelation of Himself in the ministry of Jesus, and He will complete this glorification by the revelation of the mystery of His love in Jesus' passion and resurrection. This *meaning* is certainly intended for the bystanders. In a way, Jesus translates the heavenly message when in the passage that follows He announces that the moment of judgment has arrived (12:31-32), and urges His listeners to walk according

to the light and to believe in the light while it is still present among them (12:35-36).

The last prayer of Christ (Jn 17:1-26)

In a chapter which C. H. Dodd calls "the climax of thought of the whole gospel" John concludes and resumes with a prayer Jesus' public life and farewell discourses, and anticipates the paschal mystery of his death, resurrection, ascension, and sending of the Holy Spirit, as well as His presence in the Church and in heaven as glorified king. Like Jesus' discourses in the fourth gospel, this prayer most probably owes much to the composition of the evangelist. But that He should choose precisely to present Jesus as offering a prolonged prayer is in itself very significant for the manner in which one strain at least of early Christian tradition contemplated the mystery of the person of Jesus as He ended His ministry and turned toward the liturgy of the passion.

Jesus begins His prayer with His customary address of the Father (v. 1) which he repeats four more times (vv. 5,11,21,24). His prayer recited aloud is intended for the benefit of the apostles who are with Him, just as His prayer near the tomb of Lazarus and the heavenly voice at the end of His ministry were intended for the bystanders: "I speak these words while I am still in the world, so that they may have my joy within them in full measure" (v. 13). Throughout the entire prayer Jesus speaks with the Father about His mission and its consequences. It would be impossible in the present article to give an adequate analysis of the various themes mentioned by Jesus in connection with His mission. But attention can be drawn at least to the petitions He makes.

The first is for Himself. Yes, the Word incarnate prays for Himself. Twice He asks the Father to glorify Him (vv. 1,5). But the glory for which He prays is ordered to the glory of the Father, for as in 12:28 Jesus is praying once again that the Father's will be accomplished in Him, that through His paschal mystery there shine forth the love of the Father who has given His only son for the salvation of the world.

Having prayed for His own fidelity to the Father's redemptive plan, Jesus turns His attention to His apostles, those who have been His special concern, the associates of His labors, His confidants in these last moments, and who will be His successors in

continuing to announce the good news of God's love. Jesus asks that the Father keep His apostles in His name so that they may be one, even as He and the Father are one (v. 11), that the Father keep them from the evil one (v. 15), that He sanctify them in truth (v. 17).

Widening the circle of those for whom He intercedes, Jesus prays, next for all future Christians who will believe in Him through the preaching of His apostles (v. 20). His request for them, as for the apostles themselves, is that they be one as He and the Father (v. 21). He does not ask, as He did for the apostles, that they be kept in the Father's name and free from the evil one, nor that they be sanctified in truth. Instead, He asks in one short phrase that they be one *in Him and the Father* (v. 21), a petition which embraces every other.

Finally, Jesus expresses one last wish: that His disciples and those who believe, that is, all those who have been given to him by the Father, finally be with Him to see the fullness of his glory which He received from the Father's love even before the creation of the world, and which will be manifested in His humanity after His return to the Father (v. 24).

The very order in which Jesus makes these petitions merits attention. He prays first for His own union with the Father on which depends the success of His work (vv. 1,5) because He must first be consecrated Himself so that His apostles may be consecrated (v. 19). Next He asks for the mutual union and sanctification of His apostles, and then of all future believers (vv. 11,15,17,20). Their mutual union in the Father and the Son will have its effect on their mission: the world will believe and know that Jesus has been sent by the Father, will know that the apostles, like the Son, are the special object of the Father's love (vv. 21,23). Lastly Jesus directs His sanctification and that of His disciples and followers, as well as the success of their mission to the world, to the final union in glory of His own with Him. The petitions of Jesus are for sanctification, mission, and glory. The sanctification of the individual members of Christ and of the Christian community as a whole is a condition for the success of their apostolate. The apostolate itself has for its ultimate purpose the glory of God.

We can now turn our attention to the three instructions on

prayer Jesus gives to his apostles during His last discourses to them.

Whatever you ask in my name, I will do it, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If you ask Me anything in My name, I will do it (Jn 14:13-14).

This first mention of the prayer of the apostles occurs in the context of an exhortation to believe (14:8-14). Philip asks that Jesus show the disciples the Father so that then they can know the Father (v. 8). His lack of faith merits a rebuke from Jesus. By this time Philip should have known Jesus Himself well enough to realize that He is the perfect revelation of the Father because He is intimately united to Him (v. 9). The words Jesus speaks and the actions He performs have their source in the Father who dwells in Him (v. 10).

The apostles are then urged to believe Jesus when He says that He is in the Father and the Father in Him. If they refuse to believe His words they should at least believe because of the works He has done (v. 11).

Jesus next describes with emphasis the power given to one who believes. "Truly, truly I say to you, he who believes in Me will also do the works that I do; and greater works than these will he do, because I go to the Father" (v. 12). Faith in the person and mission of Jesus will confer a union with Him that will result in an apostolate similar to His own but which will extend even beyond the limits Jesus placed upon His own ministry. Faith will have such efficacy because Jesus will have gone to the Father. Once glorified, Jesus will inaugurate His kingly reign in the Church by sending His Spirit (cf. 7:39), and He will continue His work among men through His apostles in an even more effective way.

Jesus adds to this assurance of accomplishing great things for His kingdom a promise of hearing the prayer of His apostles. He will do whatever they ask in His name. And in the following verse He reiterates this promise (vv. 13-14) to which John attaches great importance, for Jesus will repeat it still five more times (15:7,16; 16:23,24,26). To pray in Christ's name is to pray in and with Christ, and therefore to pray as Christ. Since Christ's prayer, as we have seen, was in perfect conformity with the will of the Father, it was already heard. Likewise prayer made in Christ's name will always be heard. Here Jesus says that He Himself will answer the

prayer of His apostles. This is a natural first step in the explanation of prayer. The Christian praying in union with Christ prays to Christ, and Jesus Himself hears him whose will is one with His own. But there is more to say and Jesus will say it further on, when He returns to the same theme in a more profound way.

“That the Father may be glorified in the Son” (v. 13b). All Christ’s prayer was directed to the faithful accomplishment of the Father’s will, and so to the glory of the Father in the Son, His perfect servant. The prayer of the apostles when made in union with Christ, that is, in accord with the Father’s will, will have, when heard, the result of the realization of the Father’s plan of salvation in the Son and in those who work in union with the Son. The object of the apostles’ prayer is thus the accomplishment of their mission to the glory of the Son and the Father.

If you abide in Me, and My words abide in you, ask whatever you will, and it shall be done for you. . . . You did not choose Me, but I chose you and appointed you that you should go and bear fruit and that your fruit should abide; so that whatever you ask the Father in My name, He may give it to you (Jn 15:7,16).

Jesus places his second instruction on prayer within the allegory of the vine and the branches (15:1-17). Immediately after mentioning that He himself is the true vine (v. 1), Jesus turns His attention towards the Father. It is the Father who cultivates the vine, cutting off useless branches and cleansing those that already bear fruit so that they may bear more (v. 2). The revelation brought to the apostles by Jesus has already made them clean (v. 3; cf. 13:10). However, in order to remain purified and efficacious they must continue to be united with Jesus (vv. 4-6). Otherwise they will be cast aside as useless.

In this context of union with Him through acceptance of His message of salvation (v. 7a), Jesus once again tells His apostles that whatever they ask for will be given to them (v. 7b). This promise, formulated in a different manner than the preceding one (14:13-14), stresses that whatever the apostles wish will be granted them if they ask for it. This stress on the will of the apostles is consistent with the theme of the passage. Because of their insertion into the life of Christ the vine, and because of the presence of His message within them, their wills will be one with His. Whatever

they wish will already be the wish of the Son and the Father. Their prayer, expression of this conformity, will necessarily be heard always. The answer to their prayer resulting in an efficacious ministry, which proves to all that they are Jesus' disciples, will bring glory to the Father (v. 8). As in the life of Jesus, so, too, in the life of the apostles, prayer, ministry, and the glory of God belong together.

In verse 16 Jesus makes explicit another dimension of the prayer of His apostles whom He has made His friends: *prayer is part of their vocation*. He has chosen them, they have not chosen Him, and He has appointed them to go out on their mission and to pray. Jesus intends their work to be successful and to have lasting effects. He intends just as seriously that they pray to the Father in His name so that the Father himself will grant them what they ask. With Westcott we can say that the clause on the apostles' prayer is both subordinate to and coordinate with the preceding one. The perfection of prayer grows out of fruitful obedience and fruitful obedience coincides with the fulfilment of prayer.

Verse 7 merely stated they would receive whatever they asked, without specifying to whom their prayer should be addressed, how it should be made, or who would answer it. In 14:13-14 we saw that the prayer was to be addressed to the Father in Jesus' name and that Jesus Himself would answer it. The thought of the present verse goes a step further. It is not only the Son who will answer but the Father Himself, source of all that the Son has or gives. This nuance highlights the union the apostles will have with the Father Himself.

In that day you will ask nothing of Me. Truly, truly, I say to you, if you ask anything of the Father, He will give it to you in My name. Hitherto you have asked nothing in My name; ask, and you will receive, that your joy may be full. I have said this to you in figures; the hour is coming when I shall no longer speak to you in figures but tell you plainly of the Father. In that day you will ask in My name; and I do not say to you that I shall pray the Father for you; for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved Me and have believed that I came from the Father (Jn 16:23-27).

Jesus completes His teaching on prayer by relating it to the accomplishment of His mission and to the dawn of a new age, the era of the Spirit (16:11-27). After the passion of Christ, a period of weeping and lamenting, the grief of the apostles will be changed

into joy (vv. 20,22a) when He comes after His resurrection to inaugurate a new relationship with them. The paschal gift of His Spirit will so enlighten them that they will no longer ask Him questions as they have been doing throughout the last discourses (e.g., 13:24f.,37; 14:5,8,22; 16:17f).

In this context the apostles are assured that if they address their petitions to the Father, He will grant them in Jesus' name. Therefore not only will the apostles make their prayer in Jesus' name (14:13-14; 15:16); not only will the Father answer it (15:16), but He will answer it in Jesus' name (16:23). The apostles' prayer made in union with Jesus ascends to the Father through Him. Likewise the gifts of the Father, beginning with the Spirit who will be sent in His name (14:26), descend to the apostles through Jesus as through the vine to the branches.

While Jesus was with them the apostles did not yet have a full knowledge of His person because they did not fully grasp His role as universal mediator between all men and the Father. When Jesus will have left them to go to the Father, they will understand in the light of post-resurrection faith that their prayers should be "in His name," that is, in terms of His mission as savior and as an expression of their union with Him and of their participation in His work (16:24). The command of Jesus, "Ask, and you will receive" (16:24b), can be understood, since the Greek verb "ask" is in the present tense, as an exhortation to continual prayer (cf. Mt 7:7; 1 Thess 5:17-18; Eph 5:20; Col 3:17). The apostles are thus invited in their work and in all they do to be as Jesus Himself, to have their attention turned toward the Father in an attitude of confident thanksgiving and request.

Jesus concludes His teaching on prayer by taking His apostles still another step into the mystery of communion with God. The fulness of knowledge which will be theirs after the resurrection will permit them to have access to the Father Himself. Since they will always pray in Jesus' name, His intercession will always be necessary and present (cf. 1 Jn 2:1f.). But Jesus wishes to stress here that His apostles, by reason of their spiritual rebirth as adopted sons of the Father, will have been so assimilated to Himself that the Father will hear them as He hears Jesus. Because they have loved Jesus and have believed in Him, the one sent by the Father, the apostles have

accepted the gift which the Father offered them and so have become in still a new way recipients of the Father's love.

Prayer made in Jesus' name and the effects which follow upon it result in a sharing of the joy which is Christ's own joy (16:24). In His development of the allegory on the vine and the branches, which contains an invitation to prayer, Jesus himself says, "These things I have spoken to you so that My joy may be in you and that your joy may be full" (15:11). In His final prayer He states, "These things I speak in the world that they may have My joy fulfilled in themselves" (17:13). One of the signs of the apostle of Jesus, as of Jesus Himself, is that joy which is neither sentimentality or naiveté, but a happiness in the realization that one is a child of the Father, a brother of Christ, and the servant in prayer and in work of the community of one's brothers. No power on earth can uproot this joy from the hearts of those who are Christ's (16:22; cf. 3:29; 1 Jn 1:4; 2 Jn:12).

It is hoped by the writer that these few pages may serve as a modest contribution to the current discussion on community and private prayer in the Society.¹ In seeking the solution of the problem of prayer as well as of the other problems which face us, it would seem that the Society would do very well to follow the example given by the Church during the conciliar period. It can be said without exaggeration that before all else the Church listened to the Word of God. Through this docility to the Spirit who speaks to us through the Scriptures, the Church was endowed with an unexpected keenness and breath of vision and with an uncommon courage and charity which have enabled her to begin a new period in her history. Likewise, we of the Society can find in the word of God proclaimed, meditated, and studied in our midst a privileged expression of God's will for our own renewal as a religious order at the service of the post-conciliar Church.

As an example, what St. John's gospel has to say on the prayer of Jesus and the apostles can provide some suggestive avenues of reflection to those who look for the answers to such questions as: Is prayer indispensable in the life of an apostle? What does prayer

¹ See R. E. McNally, S.J., "St. Ignatius: Prayer and the Early Society of Jesus," WOODSTOCK LETTERS 95 (1965) 109-34; J. M. Demske, S.J., "The Wisdom of a Change," *Ibid.*, pp. 135-38.

have to do with the glory of God? Do efficacious apostolic work and conformity to God's will presuppose prayer?

The fourth gospel would also seem to have a significant contribution to make to our deliberations about what kind of "rule" the Society should have concerning prayer. To understand this contribution it is necessary first of all to situate our discussion in the proper context.

All Christians, and a fortiori all religious, are called to a service of love to be lived in a spirit of freedom, the freedom proper to those reborn in Christ.² Their ultimate *law* of activity, that is, the dynamic source of their love and service, which gives purpose and direction to their whole lives, is to be found not in some obligation or code outside themselves, but within them, in the person of the Spirit of love, who has been given to them in accord with the promises made and prepared for in the Old Testament and finally realized and announced in the person of Christ. This new law, the interior law of charity of which St. Ignatius speaks in the *Proemium Constitutionum*, brings to every Christian a new freedom and abolishes the old slavery to exterior prescriptions which one is in fact powerless to observe by oneself. This new and unique law, the presence of Christ's Spirit, confers the power necessary to accomplish God's will with love and joy, and is therefore more demanding than the old law of a multiplicity of prescriptions because it does more than trace a line of conduct impossible to observe by one's own forces; it actually accomplishes what it proposes.

This does not mean, however, that after the advent of the new law exterior laws no longer have any function at all. Christ came not to abolish the law, but the slavery that accompanied it (cf. Mt 5:17). But the new law requires that all other prescriptions be made, proposed, and observed according to their particular purpose, which is to be not an end in themselves, but only a means for helping man advance toward that perfection of freedom and love to which he is called. The Spirit sent by the glorious Christ to His mystical members has not yet fully transformed them. That is why the Spirit is called "a guarantee of what is to come" (2 Cor 1:22;

² See the very pertinent reflections of S. Lyonnet, S.J., "Liberté chrétienne et loi de l'Esprit," in I. de la Potterie, S.J., and S. Lyonnet, S.J., *La vie selon l'esprit, condition du chrétien* (Paris: Cerf, 1965) pp. 169-95.

5:5; Eph 1:14), and "the firstfruits of the harvest to come" (Rm 8:23). In his present pilgrim state man can choose to be selfish and reject the inspirations of the Spirit of love, or he can so becloud with specious reasoning his already dim grasp of the truth that he does not see clearly the course of action God wishes him to follow. The Christian is not only capable of committing such faults, but he actually does. Because of such weakness, exterior laws must be formulated to help him live according to the Spirit. They stabilize the will that wavers and prepare it to act in accord with the interior exigencies of charity. Such laws propose with constant clarity to the mind that gropes in darkness the ideals of a life in Christ, light of the world.

On the basis of these principles one can conclude that in the Society a line of conduct can and should be traced in regard to prayer, but only as a *help* toward living according to the *primary and interior law which is the Holy Spirit*.

The preceding pages have shown that the gospel of John describes the prayer of Jesus and the prayer of the apostles as an intimate communion with God which is an integral part of an apostolic life. Such prayer can be taught and encouraged, as Jesus taught and encouraged it by His example and by His words. And such prayer can be prescribed, as Jesus prescribed it to His apostles (16:24; cf. 15:7). But above all, the fourth gospel, not only in the passages which treat of prayer, but from beginning to end, surely presupposes that that community will pray whose members dwell in habitual faith in Jesus Christ and in mutual love for each other. Where there is such faith and such love, there the Father, who is spirit, will find those who worship Him in spirit and truth (cf. 4:23).

THE DELIBERATION OF OUR FIRST FATHERS

truly a community of fraternal love

A creative return to an original inspiration is always invigorating. The simplicity and vitality which accompanied the birth of an idea or an organization are like a perennial fountainhead. An individual or a community can go back and draw new strength from its clear waters when the initial spirit has lost its power and freshness.

Pope Paul VI, addressing a group of religious superiors assembled in Rome on May 23, 1964, reminded them that: "A religious institute retains its vitality and vigor only so long as the spirit of its founder survives intact in the order's discipline and work and in its members' conduct." This admonition was reiterated by Vatican II in its decree on religious life. To effect an appropriate renewal of spirit, we were told, it is not sufficient to consider current conditions and challenges and then simply adjust to them. Con-

Translation and introduction by Dominic Maruca, S.J. The original text, with critical apparatus and cross-references to other Society documents, may be found in *ConsMHSJ, I (Monumenta Constitutionum praevia)*, pp. 1-7. We have followed the paragraph enumerations and subtitles of the original.

tinuity with the past must be assured by a deeper penetration into the original inspiration of the founder which was formulated, then sealed by papal approval, and commissioned for the service of the Church.

We of the Society are particularly fortunate in having a record of the immediate considerations and discussions which gave rise to our order. This document, entitled Deliberation of Our First Fathers, shows us how Ignatius and his associates first resolved to preserve their nascent brotherhood, then went further and decided to form a religious order. This vivid account of their proceedings, preserved in the handwriting of either Jean Codure or (more probably) Pierre Favre, enables us to be present at those initial "brainstorming" sessions of 1539, and to witness a marvelous exercise in group dynamics.

*As far as I can discover, no complete translation of this document is readily available in English. Fr. James Brodwick in his *Origin of the Jesuits* (New York: Longmans, 1940, pp. 69-72) and Fr. William V. Bangert in his *Life of Favre, To the Other Towns* (Westminster: Newman, 1959, pp. 63-66), translated and paraphrased some sections. But if we wish to utilize this document as a guide in grappling with contemporary problems in our Society, a complete translation is necessary.*

We can study at first hand the original method of arriving at a consensus: how each person had his opportunity to speak, each was listened to respectfully, each man's arguments were welcomed and weighed. The striking contrasts will impress us: the freedom of spirit and docility to the Spirit, breadth of vision and allegiance to the Church, personal integrity and openness to others, astounding unity amid diversity of temperament and views. One can sense the warm esprit de corps: the mutual respect and affection, the sense of spiritual solidarity. It becomes evident why these men called themselves companions—men who broke bread together in Christ. They were truly a community of fraternal love. They are our model and inspiration as we follow Christ in the service of the Father.

(1) Unity of hearts amid diversity of opinions

It was just before the end of Lent. The time was drawing near when we would have to be separated from one another.¹ We were looking forward to this dispersal with great anticipation, recognizing it as a necessary means for attaining more quickly the goal which we had conceived and set as the object of our hearts.

We decided to assemble before the day of separation and discuss for a number of days our common calling and the style of life we had adopted. After a number of such sessions, we found ourselves divided. Some of our group were French, others Spaniards, still others Savoyards or Portuguese; our views and opinions were diversified. We were in perfect accord in singleness of purpose and intent; namely, to discover the gracious design of God's will within the scope of our vocation. But when it came to the question of which means would be more efficacious and more fruitful, both for ourselves and for our neighbor, there was a plurality of views.

No one should be astonished that among us, weak and frail men, this difference of opinion should have arisen, since even the princes and apostolic pillars of the most holy Church (Gal. 2:11), and many other holy men with whom we are in no way worthy to be compared, experienced a similar diversity of opinion and, at times, were in open conflict. They even left us a written record of their controversies. Well, then, since we too were of diverse opinion, we were anxious to find some course clearly indicated as the path to follow in offering ourselves as a holocaust to God, to whose praise, honor, and glory all our actions might be dedicated.

Finally, we decided and resolved unanimously to devote ourselves to prayer, the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice and meditation, in a manner even more fervent than usual; and after we had diligently expended all human effort, we would then cast all our cares upon the Lord, trusting in Him who is so good and generous. He imparts His good spirit to everyone who petitions Him in humility and simplicity of heart; in fact, He is incredibly lavish in His gifts to everyone (Jas. 1:5), never does He disappoint any-

¹ In 1539, Paschase Bröet and Simão Rodrigues were sent to Siena; Pierre Favre and Diego Laynez, to Parma; Nicolas Bobadilla, to Naples.

one. We were confident that He would in no way fail us, but since His kindness is without measure, He would assist us beyond our fondest hopes and expectations.

(2) They decide to pray privately, then hold common consultations

We began, therefore, to exercise our human energies, setting before the group questions considered worthy of careful consideration and prolonged inquiry. Our procedure was this: all day long we reflected and meditated on the subject; prayer was also enlisted as a source of light. At night each person proposed to the group what he considered the better and more expedient course. In this way we hoped that all of us could embrace as the truer judgment the view which was recommended by the force of stronger arguments and enjoyed a majority of votes.

(3) Their decision: the society should be strengthened

During the first night's discussion, the question posed was this: we had offered and dedicated our lives to Christ our Lord and to His true and lawful vicar on earth, so that he might dispose of us and send us wherever he might judge us more capable of producing better results, whether it be to (the Turks),² to the Indies, to the heretics, or to any other group of Christians or pagans—would it be more advantageous for us to be so joined and united into one body that no physical separation of our persons, be it ever so great, could divide our hearts? Or, on the contrary, would such an arrangement be not at all desirable? An example is at hand to illustrate the urgency of this question. The Pope is about to send two of our company to the city of Siena. Should we have a mutual understanding so that those who are sent from our midst will still be the object of our affectionate concern as we will be of theirs, or should we have no more concern for them than for others who are strangers to our fraternity? After much discussion we came to a decision in the affirmative. Since our most merciful and affectionate Lord had seen fit to assemble and bind us to one another—we who are so frail and from such diverse national and cultural backgrounds—we ought not to sever what God has united and bound together. Rather,

² The word "Turks" is interpolated from a parallel passage in the First Formula of the Society.

with each passing day we ought to confirm and strengthen the bond of union, forming ourselves into a single body. Each should have a knowledge of and a concern for the others, leading to a richer harvest of souls; for spiritual power, as well as natural, is intensified and strengthened when united in a common arduous enterprise far more than if it remains fragmented in many parts. In all these matters which have been narrated and in those still to be described, we wish it to be understood that absolutely no course of action adopted by us was the fruit merely of our own personal ingenuity and reasoning. Rather, we simply assented to whatever the Lord inspired and the Apostolic See subsequently confirmed and approved.³

(4) Question: should a public vow of obedience be pronounced?

After this first question had been decided and resolved, another more difficult, worthy of no less deliberate consideration, presented itself. The question was this: all of us had pronounced perpetual vows of chastity and poverty in the presence of the Most Reverend Legate of His Holiness when we were working among the Venetians⁴—would it be expedient for us to pronounce a third vow, namely that of obedience to one of our number, so that we might be able to fulfill the will of the Lord our God in all things with greater integrity and merit and greater glory to God, and at the same time fulfill the wish and directive of His Holiness, to whom we had offered most willingly our entire persons—will, intellect, strength, and so forth?

(5) The question is discussed and resolved

We devoted many days to personal prayer and reflection in seeking a solution to this question, but could find none which set our minds at peace. We put our trust in God and began to discuss ways to resolve this impasse. Would it be expedient for all of us to withdraw to some secluded place and remain there for thirty or forty days, devoting our time to meditation, fasting and penance, in order that God might heed our pleas and communi-

³ The secretary apparently wished to emphasize that this mode of procedure was followed by the Fathers in all their deliberations.

⁴ They were ordained to the priesthood in 1537 by Vincenzo Nigusanti, Bishop of Arbe.

cate the solution to this question? A second possibility was that just three or four of us, as representatives of the entire group, should retire to such a retreat for the same purpose. Still a third course of action called for no one to go into seclusion; rather, remaining in the city, we would devote half of the day to this principal concern of ours, so that the more suitable and lengthier part of the day would be given to meditation, reflection and prayer, while the remainder of the day would be spent in our usual practice of preaching and hearing confessions.

(6) At length, after much deliberation and examination of these various courses of action, we came to a decision: all of us were to remain in Rome. Two considerations were decisive: first, we feared that we might give rise to gossip and scandal within the city and among the populace; since men are rather prone to form rash judgments, they might conclude that we had either fled from Rome and turned to some new endeavor, or that we lacked constancy and firmness in pursuing tasks undertaken. Secondly, we decided to remain in Rome so that the benefits which we saw resulting from our work in the confessional, our preaching and other apostolic activity might not be lost due to our absence. For even if our number were four times as great as we are, we would be unable to meet all the charitable demands made upon us, just as we are presently unable to meet all requests.

Then we determined a mode of procedure for seeking a solution to our problem, prescribing for each and every one the following three steps. First, each should so dispose himself, so devote himself to prayer, the Holy Sacrifice, and meditation, that he make every effort to find peace and joy in the Holy Spirit concerning the vow of obedience. Each must strive, insofar as it depends on his personal efforts, so to dispose himself that he would rather obey than command, whenever glory to God and praise to His Majesty would follow in equal measure. The second preparatory step was that no one of our band should talk over this matter with another or ask his arguments. In this way, no one would be swayed by another's reasoning or disposed more favorably towards embracing obedience rather than towards rejecting it, or vice versa. Our aim was for each to consider as more desirable what he had derived from his personal prayer and meditation.

The third preparatory step was that each should consider himself unrelated to our company, into which he never expected to be received. With such a disposition, no emotional involvement would sway his judgment more one way or the another; rather, as an external, he might freely advance for discussion his opinion concerning the taking or rejecting of obedience, and thus he could judge and approve that course of action which he believes will promote God's greater service and most securely assure our Society's permanence.⁵

(7) With these dispositions of mind and heart as a preparation we were to assemble on the following day. We agreed that each in turn should propose all disadvantages whatsoever against obedience and all the counterarguments which he had derived from his private reflection, meditation and prayer.

For example, one said: "It seems that this term 'religious obedience' has fallen into disfavor and has been discredited among Christian people, due to our shortcomings and sins." Another remarked: "If we wish to live under obedience, perhaps we will be obliged by the Pope to live under some rule which is already formulated and approved. In such a case, it might happen that the rule will not provide ample opportunity and scope to labor for the salvation of souls; yet it was to this single end, after our own salvation, that we dedicated ourselves. All our fondest dreams, conceived, as we believe, under God's inspiration, would come to nought." Still another commented: "If we vow obedience to someone, the number of prospects entering our congregation to labor faithfully in the Lord's vineyard will decrease. Though the harvest is great, only a few genuine workers can be found; such is the weakness and inconstancy of men that many seek their own advantage and the fulfillment of their own will rather than the interests of Christ (Phil. 2:21) and their own total self-abnegation." We proceeded in this manner with a fourth, a fifth, etc., each successively bringing forth the disadvantages which accompanied the vow of obedience.

Then on the following day our discussion centered on the contrary view, advancing for consideration all the advantages and benefits of the vow of obedience which each had drawn from his prayerful reflection. Thus each in his turn proposed the conclu-

⁵ Cf. *Spiritual Exercises*, #185.

sions at which he had arrived, at times deducing the unrealistic consequence of a hypothetical proposition, or again simply arguing by direct affirmation. For example, one reduced the case to this absurd impossibility: if this congregation of ours should undertake responsibility for a project without the gentle yoke of obedience, no one would have a specific assignment, since each would throw the burden of decision on another, as we have frequently experienced. Likewise, if our congregation does not have the benefit of a vow of obedience, it will not endure and continue steadfast; yet this is contrary to our initial resolution of preserving our Society forever. Therefore, since nothing preserves any congregation more than obedience, this vow seems essential, especially for us who have vowed perpetual poverty and are engaged in arduous and continual labors, both spiritual and temporal, since such enterprises are not in themselves conducive to preserving a society.

Another spoke in support of obedience by direct argument: obedience occasions continual acts of heroic virtue; for a person who genuinely lives under obedience is most prompt to do whatever is imposed upon him, even if it be extremely difficult or even likely to expose him to the laughter and ridicule of the world. Suppose, for example, I were commanded to walk through the streets and squares of the town naked or dressed in unusual garb. Now, even though such a command might never be given, as long as a person is perfectly willing to carry it out, by denying his own judgment and personal will, he has an abiding heroic disposition and is making acts which increase his merit.

Another remarked: "Nothing lays low pride and arrogance as does obedience; for pride makes a point of following one's own judgment and will, yielding to no one. It is preoccupied with grandiose projects beyond its capacity (Ps. 131:1). Obedience is diametrically opposed to this attitude; for it always follows the judgment and will of another, yields to everyone, is associated as much as possible with humility, the enemy of pride. And although we have professed total obedience, both in general and in particular details, to our supreme Pontiff and Shepherd, nevertheless the Pope would not be able—and even if he could it would be unbecoming for him—to take time to provide for our incidental and personal concerns, which are numberless.

(8) **The decision: unanimously affirmative**

For many days we discussed the various aspects of this question, analyzing and weighing the relative merits and cogency of each argument, always allowing time for our customary practices of prayer, meditation and reflection. Finally, with the help of God, we came to a decision. We concluded, not only by a majority vote but indeed without a single dissenting voice, that it would be more advantageous and even essential for us to vow obedience to one of our number in order to attain three aims: first, that we might better and more exactly pursue our supreme goal of fulfilling the divine will in all things; second, that the Society might be more securely preserved; and finally, that proper provision might be made for those individual matters, of both spiritual and temporal moment, that will arise.

(9) **Other discussion and decisions followed**

We continued in these and other deliberations for almost three months—from the latter part of Lent⁶ to the feast of John the Baptist—adhering to this same mode of procedure in our analysis and discussion of each issue, always proposing both sides of the question. By the feast of St. John, all our business was pleasantly concluded in a spirit of perfect harmony. But it was only by first engaging in prolonged vigils and prayers, with much expenditure of physical and mental energy that we resolved these problems and brought them to this happy conclusion.

⁶ In 1539, Ash Wednesday or the beginning of Lent fell on February 19th; Easter Sunday, April 6th.

TERRA FIRMA

Kicking Wildwood sand,
strolling through towels
impressed with women
and sometimes lumps of men,
I questioned sister sea.
Simply shrugging
as I waded into
her cold shoulder,
she didn't care
so why should I?
Everyone tastes her salt
and surrenders to thirst.

Riding a particular wave,
taut back arched and weak
from cold spines of sea,
I questioned brother land,
and he rose up proud,
aggressively indignant,
glaring with father sun,
dragging my torso back
to a rainbow of towels
to boots of sand
and stifling heat
of human reality.

THOMAS KRETZ, S.J.

INTER-FACULTY PROGRAM INQUIRY REPORT

The following account is a major portion of the report issued by the Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry. The Inquiry itself was constituted by the mandate of the Fathers Provincial of the American Assistancy. The meetings of the group were held at Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri; the report was issued from these meetings and has come to be known as the "Rockhurst report."

The idea of an Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry (IFPI) was first suggested at Fordham during the 1965 Easter meeting of the Theologate Deans of the United States and Canada. It was noted, for instance, that thus far much of local thinking and experimentation: (1) concerned pedagogy, and classroom techniques and procedures rather than the more basic problem of curriculum content; and (2) tended necessarily to reflect local limitations of numbers, personnel, morale, administration etc. Further, a concern for our current students' theological education, especially in these times of rapid change, underscored the urgency of reviewing the regular studies program. It was proposed, therefore, that a representative group of professors be convened as soon as feasible to explore the theology curriculum problem from the larger point of view of the educational ideal.

First through Very Rev. John J. McGinty, S.J., of New York, and later through Very Rev. John J. Kelley, S.J., of Oregon, the Fathers Provincial gave their full and enthusiastic approval of such an "Inquiry to make recommendations for reformation of the theology curriculum." Meanwhile, the decrees *De scholasticorum institutione praesertim in studiis* (31st General Congregation) and *De institutione sacerdotali* (Vatican II) were promulgated, and both these decrees seemed to encourage the type of inquiry proposed.

Very Rev. Maurice E. Van Ackeren, S.J., graciously invited the group to hold its meetings at Rockhurst College. The dates of the Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry were set for Sunday evening, 7 November, to Saturday noon, 13 November 1965.

Present were:

Frs. Thomas E. Clarke, S.J. (Woodstock), Harry T. Corcoran, S.J. (Alma), Frederick E. Crowe, S.J. (Regis), Robert H. Dailey, S.J. (Alma), Joseph J. DeVault, S.J. (Bellarmino School of Theology), Joseph A. Devenny, S.J. (Weston), Avery Dulles, S.J. (Woodstock), Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J. (Woodstock), Gilles Langevin, S.J., (L'Immaculée-Conception), Dennis J. McCarthy, S.J. (St. Mary's) Richard A. McCormick, S.J. (Bellarmino School of Theology) Edward D. McShane, S.J. (Alma), Robert L. Richard, S.J. (Weston), Edward Sheridan, S.J. (Regis), Richard F. Smith, S.J. (St. Mary's), David M. Stanley, S.J. (Regis), Terrence Toland, S.J. (Woodstock), Gerald F. Van Ackeren, S.J. (St. Mary's), Maurice B. Walsh, S.J. (Weston), John H. Wright, S.J. (Alma).

The steering Committee was composed of Frs. Crowe, McCarthy, McCormick, and Dulles (Chairman). The Report Drafting Committee was made up of Frs. Corcoran, Devenny, McCarthy, and Toland (Chairman). The General Chairman of IFPI was Fr. Dulles. The Executive Secretary of IFPI was Fr. Toland.

On the original roster but unable to attend were: Frs. Jean-Louis D'Aragnon, S.J., (L'Immaculée-Conception), William P. LeSaint, S.J., (Mundelein), and Robert E. McNally, S.J., (Woodstock).

The following resolutions reflect the major conclusions of the IFPI sessions at Rockhurst. While the rubric "resolution" has been used, the Inquiry members were aware that they were not established as a legislative body but were convened rather "to make

recommendations for the reformation of the theologate curriculum.”

All resolutions were carried by majority vote, many unanimously. Where the written record indicates opposing votes or abstentions, mention is made of this below. In a few instances, a note clarifying the intention of the resolution is also added.

For several reasons the IFPI looks on the proposed program as an “interim” program. For instance, varied experimentation according to local faculties and exigencies will be useful, if not necessary, for further refinement; also, the implementation of the proposed pre-theologate theology program would undoubtedly affect the theologate theology program; and more specifically, the “closer alignment” of philosophy and theology, as recommended by the decrees of Vatican II (*De institutione sacerdotali*, #14) and the 31st General Congregation (*De scholasticorum institutione praesertim in studiis*, #21), implies change in the content, structure, and length of future priestly education.

It should be noted, finally, that besides the topics resolved below, discussion was initiated on many other subjects which never reached a resolution formula for lack of time, failure to achieve consensus, etc. In other words, the group feels that the IFPI has made a significant contribution to the “reformation of the theologate curriculum,” but that much work remains to be done.

A. GRATITUDE

RESOLUTION 1: The members of the Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry express their sincerest gratitude to the Fathers Provincial who gave such enthusiastic support to this Inquiry, and who placed such encouraging confidence in the work of the participants.

RESOLUTION 2: The members of the Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry express their sincerest gratitude to Very Rev. Maurice E. Van Ackeren, S.J., to Rev. John J. Gibbons, S.J., to Rev. Hugh M. Owens, S.J., and to all the members of the Rockhurst College community. The warm hospitality and friendliness, and the genuine concern for so many details of efficiency and convenience will be remembered prayerfully by all participants in the Inquiry.

RESOLUTION 3: Special thanks are expressed by the Inter-

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

Faculty Program Inquiry to the staff members of the Dean's Office for such complete and congenial cooperation throughout the week.

B. IMPLEMENTATION OF IFPI RECOMMENDATIONS

RESOLUTION 4: Steps should be taken at once to set up programs corresponding to the recommendations of the IFPI, and the new arrangement should begin as far as possible with the academic year, 1966-67 (2 abstentions).

RESOLUTION 5: The Theologate Deans should include on the agenda for all regular meetings an exchange of information on how the IFPI recommendations are being implemented in the houses of study of the individual provinces.

RESOLUTION 6: (*Note*: at first several were reluctant to approve this lest it appear that IFPI was trying to constitute itself a continuing body. It was pointed out that the resolution does not intend a reconvening of the same personnel though it might be desirable that many of the original IFPI members reconvene so as to profit from the experience of the Rockhurst sessions. On this basis the resolution was passed.) Following the academic year 1966-67, an inquiry similar to the Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry should be again convened to continue the work begun at Rockhurst.

RESOLUTION 7: In view of the urgent updating of the theological training and the necessary distinction of the four theological areas, it is imperative that the provinces see to the preparation of a greatly increased number of competently trained professors in all areas.

RESOLUTION 8: Adequate implementation of the proposed program, especially in its graduate phase, demands close contact with a full university complex to insure a proper range of offerings (3 abstentions).

C. FOUR-YEAR THEOLOGY PROGRAM

a) General

RESOLUTION 9: It is desirable that the pre-theologate or the first-year theology program contain a course on the religious needs,

difficulties, and aspirations of contemporary man, so that the total program of theology may be more evidently relevant.

RESOLUTION 10: A high proportion of electives should be incorporated into the four-year program (3 opposing votes).

RESOLUTION 11: It is recommended that in all areas where this notably affects the manner of instruction and is feasible, all teaching of courses in cycle be eliminated (2 abstentions).

RESOLUTION 12: In a four-year theology program those students who are qualified should devote at least the last year to specialization leading to academic or professional graduate degrees in theology.

RESOLUTION 13: (1) The degrees in this theological program should be civil degrees; (2) the bachelor's program should lead to the B.D. (Bachelor of Divinity), or equivalent; (3) the master's programs should lead respectively to the Th.M. (Master of Theology), or the M.R.E. (Master in Religious Education), or their equivalents; (4) if it be judged necessary or wise by the deans and provincials, the civil B.D., Th.M., and M.R.E. should be recognized as the equivalent of the ecclesiastical S.T.B. and S.T.L., respectively (i.e., the program should be submitted by the provincials of the region to the competent authority for such recognition) (1 abstention).

b) Bachelor level phase

RESOLUTION 14: The order of courses in the bachelor's program is left to the determination of the individual theologates; however, it is recommended that, when feasible, the courses be presented genetically (1 opposing vote).

RESOLUTION 15: There should be comprehensive examinations to qualify the student for the specialization recommended in Resolution 12.

RESOLUTION 16: These comprehensive examinations should test the student's knowledge in four distinct areas of theology: biblical, historical, systematic, and theologico-pastoral. The general subject matter for these areas is indicated by the examples found in Appendices 1, 2, 3, and 4. (*Note: it should be clearly noted that these Informal Memoranda were only samples prepared by*

one, a few, or several participants in the Inquiry. They were not subjected to deliberation by the group and do not, therefore, represent a recommendation of the Inquiry itself, but may serve as a general indication of the type of concrete program which the Inquiry had in mind.)

RESOLUTION 17: Not all of the matter to be included in either comprehensive or course examinations need be presented in lectures, seminars, or other types of formal instruction.

RESOLUTION 18: For admission to the bachelor's comprehensives, 72 hours are normally required. This number is not to be understood as prejudicing the fixing of a different number of hours in an individual theologate. Moreover, a student may be admitted to these comprehensives before completing the normal number of hours at his own request, as approved by a faculty committee.

RESOLUTION 19: For purposes of course work and comprehensive examinations in the baccalaureate program, each of the four areas of theology should be given approximately equal weight. This is understood as implying that if, for example (as noted in Resolution 18), 72 credit hours were to be allotted, not more than 21 nor less than 15 should be required in any given area. More precise determination should be left to local initiative and experimentation. Such latitude seems especially necessary in view of the fact that there is not yet perfect agreement as to the contents of each of the four areas (10 favorable votes; 5 opposing votes; 2 abstentions).

RESOLUTION 20: (*Note:* the group voted to include here a synopsis of the discussion which preceded this resolution. *Discussion:* To the suggestion that the length of time for the bachelor's program be left free, it was objected that this would complicate exchange of students. It was noted that it was not desirable to have students transferring during the bachelor's program, but for the graduate program opportunity for transfer would be desirable. Those students who transfer would have to meet the prerequisites for admission to the graduate program in the theologate to which they transferred.) The example of 72 credit hours in Resolutions 18 and 19 is taken without prejudice to a two-year, a two-and-a-

half-year, or a three-year bachelor's program (10 favorable votes; 2 opposing votes; 3 abstentions).

RESOLUTION 21: The program should reflect the provisions both of the decree *De institutione sacerdotali* (#16), concerning the "application of the eternal truths of revelation to the changeable condition of human affairs and their communication in a manner suited to men of our day," and of the decree *De scholasticorum institutione praesertim in studiis* (#25), drawing attention to questions "which have influence at the present time." In the case of scholastics with suitable backgrounds and with faculty approval, permission may be given for some course work in fields which have theological implications. Instances are: literature, art, sociology, psychology (especially of religion), recent economic history, philosophy (especially of religion), and philosophy of science (2 abstentions).

RESOLUTION 22: In the theology program there should be provision for all to participate in *practica*, i.e., the students should practice some aspect of the ministry (catechizing, counseling, preaching, etc.) under competent supervision and advice (1 opposing vote, 1 abstention).

RESOLUTION 23: The following statement on liturgy is approved in detail by the Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry:

Liturgy: Its Place in the Theology Course

1. In keeping with Vatican II, *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (#16), the "mystery of Christ and the history of salvation" should permeate all the areas of theological instruction. As one way to effect this, explicit "liturgical" propositions are to be included in the examination matter for all four areas.

Further, the theology of liturgy (or worship) should be explicitly included, for example, in the teaching of sacraments. Also, the rites training program should be revised, if necessary, to incorporate the best thinking on pastoral liturgy (e.g., that the administration of rites is a fully human action incarnating the sacred meaning of these rites, etc.).

2. According to the above named Constitution (and cf. also Vatican II, *De institutione sacerdotali*, #16), a separate course

on liturgy should also be included in the undergraduate theological program and taught by a trained liturgist. It is suggested that this should be an academic-type course illustrating, e.g., the formation of the Roman liturgy from scriptural and historical factors; seeing liturgy as a source or illustration of the Church's belief; etc.

3. The theology and history of the liturgy should have a place in the graduate level program (e.g., from textual work).

4. In all of this it is presupposed that men coming to the theologates will have a thorough acquaintance with the practice of the liturgy through their experience as Christians and religious, and some academic training provided by the pre-theological course.

c) Graduate level phase

RESOLUTION 24: The following proposal on the graduate level theology program is approved in detail by the Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry:

Graduate Level Theology Program

1. The object of the program is to allow the students a specialization and concentration taking into account aptitudes, interests, and future ministries. This implies two broad divisions, one leading to a higher academic degree, the other to a higher professional degree.

2. These may serve as a descriptive definition of the two divisions. The academic degree would involve courses and seminars of the sort that prepare more or less proximately for the research doctorate (Ph.D. in the U.S.). The professional degree would involve courses and seminars directed toward the more immediate application of theology to the various ministries. In this program, therefore, there should be an effort to provide a variety of courses and seminars corresponding to the variety of ministries exercised by Ours, e.g. missionary work, preaching, retreat work, parochial ministries, counseling, high school and college teaching (of non-theological subjects).

3. Students in either program should be given some experience of the type of work involved in the other.

Academic Degree

4. Majors should be offered in all four areas accepted for the comprehensive examinations for the bachelor's degree in theology according to the availability of faculty. Minors will be determined by the local faculty.

5. Upper division undergraduate theology courses would be available for and constitute part of the strictly graduate level program according to standard university practice.

6. The local faculty could require 24 credit hours plus thesis, 30 hours without thesis, or it could offer both of these alternatives. As an example, the course might be distributed as follows:

Major: 15 credit hours (9 required matter, 6 free)

Minor: 6 credit hours (3 required)

The remaining 3 hours must be chosen from the graduate professional courses.

7. In the 30 hour program, 3 of the additional 6 hours must be taken in the major and 3 in either the major or the minor.

8. Final examinations would be comprehensives in the fields touched upon in the courses and seminars taken in the graduate program.

9. Nothing prevents the qualified student in this program from doing academic work beyond the master's level during the 4 years of theology.

Professional Degree

10. A typical professional degree would conform to the following example. Thirty credit hours would be required. Normally 24 of these would be acquired in course and seminar work, and at least 3 of these hours must be chosen from the strictly academic degree offerings. The remaining 6 hours would be acquired through directed practice. In certain specialties more credits would be acquired in this manner.

11. The final examination for the degree would be a comprehensive in the field of specialization.

RESOLUTION 25: Students who have passed the bachelor's program in theology should be allowed, subject to faculty ap-

proval, to pursue all or part of the master's program (either academic or professional) elsewhere, not excluding non-Jesuit or non-Catholic institutions, where courses and conditions would more correspond to their needs (cf. *De scholasticorum institutione praesertim in studiis*, #32; *De institutione sacerdotali*, #18).

D. PRE-THEOLOGATE THEOLOGY

RESOLUTION 26: Concerning the scholastics' theological training from the novitiate on, IFPI addresses to the American Fathers Provincial the following recommendations:

1. Since the early theological training must be coordinated with later full-time theological training, the faculties of the respective theologates should have a decisive voice in determining the content of the early theological curriculum within the related provinces.

2. In view of the hoped-for exchange of theological students among the provinces, a uniform program should be adopted in the early stages of theological training in all the provinces of the United States and Canada, without prejudice, however, to experimentation.

3. For this curriculum to achieve its desired effect, all courses in the early stages of theological training should be taught by academically competent theologians.

4. The courses given in the novitiate should be of serious academic character, for college credit, and with adequate examinations (1 abstention from #4).

RESOLUTION 27: The following proposal on pre-theologate theology is approved in detail by the Inter-Faculty Program Inquiry:

Pre-theologate Theology for the Jesuit Scholastic

I. General Comments

1. The purpose of pre-theologate theology for the Jesuit scholastic of the United States and Canada is threefold: (a) the personal spiritual benefit of the scholastic; (b) assistance to the scholastic in his own studies and in his work with others; (c) the preparation of the scholastic for a more intensive and specialized study of theology.

3. It is thought that this curriculum will result in at least the equivalent of a respectable undergraduate major in sacred studies by the time the scholastic advances to the full-time study of theology.

4. For this curriculum to achieve its desired effect all the courses should be taught by academically competent theologians.

II. Proposed General Curriculum

(*Note*: the order of courses suggested within each stage of the pre-theologate training (i.e., novitiate, juniorate, philosophate or their equivalents) is not rigid; it may be adjusted according to local needs, provided that the subject matter here proposed be adequately covered within the stage.)

5. Novitiate: four courses of 3 credit hours each in the New Testament, that is, the Synoptics, John, Paul, Acts, and the remainder of the NT books. Where feasible, an academic course in ascetical theology should be introduced into the second year of novitiate.

6. Juniorate: two courses of 3 credit hours each in the Old Testament (second millennium B.C. and first millennium B.C.), and one 3 credit hour course each in Christology and the liturgy.

7. Philosophate: four courses of 3 credit hours each in:

(a) Revelation, Faith and the Modern Man;

(b) Christian Life (somewhat as in Mersch, *Moral Theology and the Mystical Body*); expandable on local option to 6 credit hours (**);

(c) historico-systematic study of the Pre-Reformation Church and Theology;

(d) historico-systematic study of the Reformation and the modern Church.

(**) *Note*: the course on Christian Life is not conceived as a preliminary or superficial "confessional casuistry." It should be a course in the theology of Christian, of supernatural living; of the general principles, moral and ontological, of Christian action and conduct.

This implies emphasis on the religious and supernatural character of Christian morality viewed as response to vocation and

grace; on law, i.e., moral law, natural law, law of Christ; on man's participation in the grace of Christ, incorporation in the Body of Christ as cause of Christian action; on the virtues, theological and moral, acquired and infused, as motors of the supernatural and meritorious act; on the gifts of the Spirit. It calls for the treatment of: conscience and the nature and value of its dictates; Christian prudence; sin; the obligations of the theological virtues; theological and psychological development of the virtue and act of faith, if not provided for elsewhere; charity, the form of the moral virtues; every virtuous act as mediation of charity in the concrete context; the penetration of charity into every aspect of special moral theology; the virtue of religion.

The course would include elements from and wide reading in:

Häring, *The Law of Christ*, vol. I and II.

Gilleman, *The Primacy of Charity in Moral Theology*.

Fuchs, *Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis* I and II (available in translation).

Fuchs, *The Natural Law: A Theological Interpretation*.

Mersch, *Moral Theology and the Mystical Body*, vol. I; and vol. II, if available in translation.

Royo-Aumann, *The Theology of Christian Perfection*.

POSITION STATEMENT: (As noted above, many topics were introduced during the IFPI discussions but were not resolved. The following statement, passed by vote, draws attention to one important topic in this category. A similar statement would be applicable to many other topics.) Recognizing the need of a program specially designed for the priest who has an added heavy professional obligation, such as the priest-physicist, the priest-musicologist, etc., the committee regrets that in the time at its disposal it has been unable to provide completely for this need (1 abstention).

[As stated in Resolution 16: "It should be clearly noted that these [following] *Informal Memoranda* were only samples prepared by one, a few, or several participants in the Inquiry. They were not subjected to deliberation by the group and do not, therefore, represent a recommendation of the Inquiry itself, but may serve as a

general indication of the type of concrete program which the Inquiry had in mind."—Ed.]

APPENDIX 1: INFORMAL MEMORANDUM
SACRED SCRIPTURE

1. Syllabus for (bachelor) comprehensive examinations:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1) History of Israel | 1) NT Times and Background (63 B.C. to 135 A.D.) |
| 2) Introduction to the OT | 2) Introduction to the NT |
| 3) Theology of the OT | a) Gospels (individual, Synoptic problem, Form Criticism, Formation of Gospel Tradition) |
| 4) Biblical Archeology | b) Rest of the NT |
| 5) Complementary readings to courses: | 3) Theology of the NT |
| a) Pentateuch | 4) Readings complementary to exegetical courses. |
| b) Period of Kings | a) Acts—Paul |
| | b) a Synoptic—John |

2. Sample bibliography:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) J. Bright, <i>History of Israel</i> (Phila.: Westminster, 1959) | 1) R. H. Pfeiffer, <i>History of NT Times</i> (N.Y.: Harper, 1949), pp. 1-230; C. K. Barrett, <i>NT Background: Selected Documents</i> (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1961) |
| 2) A. Weiser, <i>Old Testament: Its Formation and Development</i> (N.Y.: Association Press, 1961) | 2) D. Guthrie, <i>NT Introduction</i> (3 vols.; London: Tyndale, 1961, 1962, 1965); or A. Wikenhauser, <i>NT Introduction</i> (N.Y.: Herder and Herder, 1958) and R. M. Grant, <i>A Historical Introduction to the NT</i> (N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1963) |
| 3) Either W. Eichrodt, <i>Theology of the O. T.</i> (2 vols.; Phila.: Westminster, 1961—); or G. von Rad, <i>O. T. Theology</i> (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962—). | |
| 4) G. E. Wright, <i>Biblical Archaeology</i> (Phila.: Westminster, 1962) | |

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

- 5) G. von Rad, *Genesis* (Phila.: Westminster, 1961); J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Israel* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962)
- 3) A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the NT* (London: SCM, 1958)
- 4) V. Taylor, *Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London: Macmillan, 1949); C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1954); D. E. H. Whiteley, *Theology of St. Paul* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964); some commentary on a Synoptic Gospel (to be assigned by professor).

3. Courses for the bachelor program: (*)

- OT: 1) Pentateuch (3 credit hours)
2) Period of the Kings (3 hours.)

These are required courses. In case of 2½ or 3 year bachelor program, also (3) OT Theology (3 hours); the latter would admit of substitution within the biblical area.

(*) Courses in Hebrew, Aramaic, NT Greek, Wisdom Literature, Psalms, Job, Apocalypse, Hebrews, Dead Sea Scrolls would be samples of offerings in graduate level programs.

- NT: 1) Introduction to Gospels (Individual, Synoptic Problem, Form Criticism, Formation of Gospel Tradition (3 credit hours)
2) Acts—Paul (3 hours)
3) A Synoptic—John (3 hours)

These are required courses. In case of 2½ or 3 year bachelor program, also (4) NT theology (3 hours)

Admit of substitution within the biblical area: (3) and (4).

APPENDIX 2: INFORMAL MEMORANDUM HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Note: The explanation is added with regard to this area (historical theology) that it is understood to include not only what is now generally known as Church history, but also patristics, and the history of theology, heresies, and dogma; the intention is that these subjects should be treated from a more historical perspective and with the measure of autonomy proper to history.

A. GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

1. Syllabus for (bachelor's) comprehensive examinations:

Since this is a survey course, it is not reasonable to demand the entire field of Church History as matter for the comprehensives. Thus it should be within the judgment of the Church historian to select certain subjects, together with a book (or books) in which the matter is well treated. These readings are beyond general histories or the articles that will be appearing in the NCE. The following topics are proposed as examples:

- 1) Life in the primitive Church (rigorism, the *koinonia*, Church organizations, etc.).
- 2) The Persecutions (by rescript and by edict) and the hagiographical problems relating to the martyrs.
- 3) Growth of papal power from Gregory I (590-604) to its decline under Boniface VIII (1294-1303).
- 4) The political and theological background for the schism of Photius and Michael Cerularius.
- 5) The medieval crisis over lay investiture and the *Eigenkirche* (proprietary church).
- 6) Monasticism: a description of the Antonian, Pachomian, Columban, and Benedictine systems; significance of the Cluniac (liturgical and administrative) and Cistercian (agricultural) movements.
- 7) The "Respublica Christiana" (Augustinian theocracy as found in the 19th Book of the *City of God* and its implementation in the Carolingian Empire).
- 8) The new Catholic view regarding the person and achievement of Martin Luther.
- 9) The Henrican schism and the controversy over Anglican orders.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

- 10) The factor which prevented reform in *capite et membris* during the critical century (1417-1517).
- 11) Anti-Romanism as displayed in the Gallican articles, the policies of Empress Maria Theresa and Joseph II of Austria, Febronianism, the Napoleonic dominance, the *Risorgimento*, the *Kulturkampf*.

2. Readings:

Lebreton-Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church*

Duchesne, *Early History of the Church*

Allard, *Ten Lectures on the Martyrs*

Palanque et al., *The Church in the Christian Roman Empire*

Delehaye, *The Legends of the Saints*

Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*

Duchesne, *The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes*

Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*

Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*

(These for numbers 1-4; similarly for numbers 5-11)

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN IDEAS

3. Sample syllabus:

- 1) The formation of creeds.
- 2) The Apostolic Fathers, Apologists, Irenaeus, and early Alexandrians.
- 3) The Arian crisis and the Councils of Nicea and Constantinople.
- 4) The Fathers most directly involved in the above crisis and councils.
- 5) The Christological controversy and the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.
- 6) The Fathers involved in the above controversy and councils.
- 7) Pelagian and semi-Pelagian controversies, and the Council of Carthage and II Orange.
- 8) Augustine and his influence.
- 9) The 4th Lateran Council.
- 10) The two councils of union: Lyons and Florence.
- 11) The conciliar movement and the Council of Basel.
- 12) Wycliffe and Hus.
- 13) The Council of Trent and the ideas of Luther and Calvin.

- 14) The theologians of the counter-Reformation.
- 15) The *De auxiliis* controversy.
- 16) Baianism and Jansenism.
- 17) 19th century rationalism and fideism.
- 18) Newman, Moehler, and Scheeben.
- 19) Modern Protestant Christianity.
- 20) Anti-modernist documents.
- 21) Selection of more important papal documents and encyclicals.

4. Readings:

J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*

Writings of the Apostolic Fathers

Gill, *The Council of Florence*

Dillenberger, *Selections from Martin Luther*

Etc., etc.

Note: in general, one cannot reasonably expect more than about 20 books of 200-300 pages. Sometimes dictionary articles can be substituted for books to bring the total reading required within limits. But a strong emphasis on the original writings of the Fathers and the Acts of the councils is recommended.

5. Minority report:

The topics of SPECIAL HISTORY represent the majority opinions at the caucus, but it does not seem to be the best expression of the principles operative in setting up the area of historical theology, the emphasis being taken away somewhat from the dialectic of creative ideas and put rather on the judgmental decision of the Church. However, it can be "interpreted" locally as long as the principle of the original motion is saved.

APPENDIX 3: INFORMAL MEMORANDUM SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

A. FUNDAMENTAL THEOLOGY

1. Material for comprehensive examinations:

1) Introduction to theology:

Notion of theology

Purposes of theology

Principal forms which theology has taken

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

2) Nature of revelation:

Ways in which God has revealed Himself
Attributes of Christian revelation
"Closing" of revelation in apostolic age

3) Religious anthropology:

Religious needs, aspirations, and difficulties of modern man

4) Christianity among the religions:

Problem of Christianity as one among many
Theological evaluation of the "other religions"

(At discretion of the individual theologate: a general knowledge
of the major non-Christian religions)

5) Apologetics:

Official doctrine of the Church on relations between faith and
reason

Some of the main apologetical systems

The Church as a sign of credibility

Claims of Jesus

Faith of the primitive Church in Jesus as Lord and Messiah

Miracles of Jesus

Resurrection of Jesus

Jesus and the origins of the Church

Nature and recognition of miracles

6) Doctrine concerning Scripture:

Church teaching concerning the canon, inspiration, and inerrancy
(including knowledge of *Divino Afflante Spiritu*)

Speculative treatment of problem of inspiration and inerrancy

7) Tradition and magisterium:

Ways in which revelation is transmitted in the Church

Authority of the teaching Church

Theological notes

Question of the material sufficiency of Scripture

8) Faith:

Qualities of the act of faith in Church doctrine (Vatican I and
II) seen in relation to the biblical doctrine on faith

2. Readings:

For the entire matter in numbers (1) to (8) above appropriate readings should be assigned by competent professors: books, articles, and private notes. It is estimated that the student should be responsible for about 2,000 to 3,000 pages in all, with some variation for different classes of students.

Books should generally be of a sort directed to theology students on the seminary level, such as the following:

- Bulst, *Revelation*
- Latourelle, *Théologie de la révélation*
- Baumer, *Religion and the Rise of Skepticism*
- Schlette, *Die Religionen als Thema der Theologie*
- Cuttat, *The Encounter of Religions*
- H. Smith, *The Religions of Man*
- Cristiani, *Why We Believe*
- Rahner, *Inspiration in the Bible*
- Moran, *Scripture and Tradition*

B. SPECIAL SYSTEMATICS

3. Material for comprehensive examinations:

1) God One and Three:

- Trinity: psychology analogy; missions
- Providence and predestination
- Divine immanence and transcendence
- Problem of atheism
- Creation: Bible and Vatican I

2) Christ the Savior

- Christology: knowledge, consciousness, and liberty; cosmic Christology; causality of mysteries; hypostatic union; theories of redemption

3) Christian Anthropology

- Indwelling of Holy Spirit
- Nature and grace
- Justification in Paul and Trent
- Christian virtue
- Analysis of act of faith
- Theology of work
- Evolution and monogenism
- Theories of original sin

4) Church and Sacraments:

- Images and concepts of the Church
- Theology of ecumenism
- Universal salvation
- Church and state: religious freedom
- Church in the modern world

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

States in the Church
Presence of Christ in the Church
The Liturgical Mystery
Sacramental system
Causality of the sacraments
Theology of individual sacraments, e.g., Eucharist: presence,
sacrifice, banquet
Fundamental principle of Mariology

5) Eschatology:

Universal eschatology
Mediate eschatology

4. Readings:

Samples of some readings which could be assigned in preparation for the comprehensive examination:

In general:

The pertinent sections from St. Thomas, especially in the *Summa Theologica*

The pertinent articles in various "Dictionaries" (D.T.C.; L. Th.K.; etc.), and very soon the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, which will also provide bibliographies that will be up to date for the past few years

Scheeben, *The Mysteries of Christianity*

Volumes of *20th Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism*

Davis, *Theology for Today*

1) God One and Three:

Danielou, *God and the Ways of Knowing*

de Lubac, *The Drama of Atheistic Humanism*

Lonergan, *Trium Personarum analogiam*, etc.

Murray, *The Problem of God*

Teilhard de Chardin, *The Divine Milieu*

Weigel and Madden, *Religion and the Knowledge of God*

2) Christ the Savior:

Adam, *The Christ of Faith*

de la Trinité, *What is the Redemption?*

Durrwell, *The Resurrection*

Guardini, *The Humanity of Christ*

Lonergan, *De constitutione Christi*

Rahner, "Current Problems in Christology," *Theological Investigations*, I

3) Christian Anthropology:

Küng, *Justification*Gleason, *Grace*Rahner, "Theological Reflections on Monogenism," *Theological Investigations*, I_____ "The Theological Concept of *Concupiscentia*,"
*Ibid.*Scheeben, *The Glories of Divine Grace*Guardini, *Freedom, Grace, and Destiny*Mouroux, *The Meaning of Man*

4) Church and Sacraments:

Schillebeeckx, *Christ, the Sacrament of the Encounter of God*Martimort, *The Signs of the New Covenant*Journet, *The Church of the Incarnate Word*Küng, *Structures of the Church*McNamara, *Mother of the Redeemer*Rahner, *The Church and the Sacraments*_____, *The Dynamic Element in the Church*

5) Eschatology:

Garrigou-Lagrange, *Life Everlasting*Gleason, *The World to Come*Guardini, *The Last Things*Rahner, *On the Theology of Death*Winklhofer, *The Coming of His Kingdom*APPENDIX 4: INFORMAL MEMORANDUM
THEOLOGICO-PASTORAL THEOLOGY

1. The comprehensive examinations for this department will include material from the following sections: moral-canonical and pastoral liturgical, as ascetical-mystical, catechetics, homiletics). The following is intended merely as an example of one possible syllabus.

A. MORAL-CANONICAL

1. Foundations of Christian moral life:

Meaning of morality

Religious and personal character of Christian morality

Nature of law (moral and canonical)

Theology of the natural law

Conscience, its nature, function

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

Prudence and the prudent formation of conscience
Nature of the moral act (its personal character and freedom)
Reduction of freedom
Supernaturality of the moral act
Sin
Imputability of effects in the moral life

2. Theological virtues:

Faith: its acceptance, cultivation, profession, preservation
Hope: its significance in Christian life
Charity: the twofold precept and its practical applications

3. Moral virtues:

Virtue of religion (duties of worship and reverence)
Piety and obedience (theology of the family and patriotism)
Justice (commutative, distributive, social; this will include matter sometimes taken under title of 5th, 7th, 8th commandments and Catholic social teaching, specifically *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris*)
Temperance (sobriety, mortification, chastity; this latter will include conjugal chastity and celibacy)

4. Theology of the states of life (religious, clerical, lay)

5. Sacraments in Christian morality: Moral and canonical aspects

B. PASTORAL

- 1) Basic principles of pastoral psychology and counseling.
- 2) Principles of practice of liturgical worship.
- 3) Principles of ascetical-mystical theology.
- 4) Principles of catechetics and homiletics.

2. Those who prepared this Memorandum feel that 18 semester hours are required for the moral-canonical section of the program. These hours are to be distributed according to local arrangements.

3. Readings: Books of the calibre of the following are considered to be of real utility in preparing the comprehensive examination:

Gilleman, *The Primacy of Charity in Moral Theology*

Fuchs, *Natural Law*

Ford-Kelly, *Contemporary Moral Theology*

Schnackenburg, *Moral Theology of the New Testament*

TOWARD A NEW THEOLOGY

the implications of Rockhurst

JUSTIN S. KELLY, S.J.

PENDING THE APPROVAL of higher superiors, the resolutions made at Rockhurst last November will begin to take effect this fall in the theologates of the United States and Canada. The proposed revision of the theology curriculum has been widely welcomed, yet already certain rumbles of discontent have been heard. Some profess to find the new program unintelligible, while others claim it represents no real advance over the status quo. The new curriculum, they say, is only the old one parcelled out a little differently. "They've rearranged the dust, instead of sweeping it out," complains a disappointed reformer.

What will actually happen as Rockhurst becomes reality is, of course, anybody's guess. Only a year or two's experimentation can uncover the program's practical possibilities. But the Rockhurst recommendations themselves, I believe, mark a radical change in theology—a transformation of the basic conception of theologate formation. The new program is sufficiently continuous with the present situation to be practicable now, yet revolutionary in its implications for the future. The following pages are offered as a (highly unofficial) commentary on the Rockhurst Report and an interpretation of its overall direction.

The principle of diversification

The first major change embodied in the new curriculum is its recognition of individual needs and differences. In place of the traditionally uniform order of courses, Resolution 10 urges that "a high proportion of electives" be incorporated into the four-year program. Resolution 12 permits qualified students to devote at least their final year of theology to specialization, which is to lead to a graduate degree. Resolution 21 provides for some undergraduate coursework in fields cognate to theology, including literature, art, sociology, psychology, and philosophy. Students who have passed their bachelor's comprehensives are allowed by Resolution 25 to pursue part or all of their master's program outside the theologate. They may attend non-Jesuit and even non-Catholic institutions, the purpose being always to find conditions and courses which would "more correspond to their needs."

This effort to adapt theology to the needs, interests, and abilities of the individual theologian represents a major breakthrough. It concretely embodies some of the provisions of the current General Congregation's decree on the intellectual training of scholastics. At one level, it can be seen simply as the practical recognition of an evident fact: the presence in our theologates of men of widely diverse personalities, backgrounds, talents, and future ministries. The resolutions cited above attempt to take advantage of this diversity, so the individual can make the best possible use of his years of theology. In itself this is hardly remarkable; what is new is the recognition that theology is something which can and ought to be so adapted.

The Rockhurst Report, in other words, appears to envision theology more in terms of a personal appropriation, and less in terms of the simple "taking on" of an objective body of knowledge. The theological formation of the past, it seems safe to say, was centered chiefly on the matter to be covered. That matter, like the multiplication table, was conceived to be the same for everybody. So all took the same basic course, with the possible addition of an elective seminar or "special discipline" in third or fourth year. The only individual difference officially acknowledged by the curriculum was the one implied in the division into "long" and "short" courses. Like geometry or Latin grammar, theology was something to be

imposed uniformly on all minds, without difference or distinction. The Rockhurst provisions, on the other hand, recognize that the mind which comes to theology steeped in science, or literature, or psychology, receives it in a distinctive way. The theologian is not a lake freighter, coming to be filled with precious ore before being sent out upon the waters. Whatever theology is, it is evidently not—in the eyes of the Rockhurst delegates—indifferent to the human material it works with. It is something to which the individual theologian's aptitude and special training can and must be related.

The principle of comprehension

Another step in the direction of updated educational practice is taken in Resolutions 15 to 17 of the report. To qualify the student for the specialization mentioned earlier, comprehensive examinations are established for each of the four areas of theology (biblical, historical, systematic, and theologico-pastoral). Resolution 17 states explicitly that "not all of the matter to be included in either comprehensive or course examinations need be presented in lectures, seminars, or other types of formal instruction." Examination material will be defined in terms of topics and related reading material. The individual student may even (at his own request and with faculty approval) take his comprehensives before completing the 72 hours of course work which is the normal prerequisite for the exams (Resolution 18).

The new element here, obviously, is not that the student's proficiency be tested by examinations, but that this competence is now defined in terms of his understanding of theology, and not of hours logged in the classroom. Intellectual mastery has always been the goal of theologate education, but it seems painfully evident today that such comprehension has often been measured in excessively formal terms. Belief in the *ex opere operato* virtue of classroom instruction—that "talking is teaching and listening is learning," as a satirical maxim puts it—has fortunately been on the wane for some time. Most theologates have already adopted some form of reduced schedule or optional attendance at lectures. The Rockhurst resolutions weave this principle into the curriculum itself, so that it appears less as a concession to human weakness and more as a positive ideal. A comprehensive grasp of theology, rather than sheer patient endurance, becomes the norm. Whether it will be so in

practice, rather than merely on paper, depends almost entirely on the way the examinations are conducted. If passing the comprehensive means no more than being able to hold the examiners at bay with an arsenal of "magic words," remembered definitions, and Denzinger numbers, the last state of today's theologian may be no better than the first. Then perhaps the only effect of the Rockhurst meeting will have been to set up a quadruple *ad grad* in the middle of third year. If, on the other hand, it becomes clear that the accent falls on *comprehension*, then the classic description of theology as *fides quaerens memoriam* may well be obsolete. In that case the Rockhurst recommendations will have attained their evident goal of a more realistic norm of theological competence.

The principle of relevance

Another noteworthy aspect of the Rockhurst memorandum is its insistence on contemporary relevance and on practical steps to achieve it. Resolution 7 calls for a great increase of competently trained professors in all areas, giving as a reason the need for an "urgent updating of theological training." Resolution 8 posits close contact with a complete university complex as a basic prerequisite for the success of the whole program. Next, a course on the religious needs and difficulties of contemporary man is inserted into the pre-theologate or first year theology program; again, the reason cited is the need to make the total course of theology studies "more evidently relevant." Resolution 21 refers to Vatican II's Decree on Priestly Formation and to the present General Congregation's decree on studies, both of which emphasize the importance of contemporary adaptation and communication of the Christian message. Theology's need to consider questions "which have influence at the present time" is the reason for permitting theology students to take courses in related fields, like literature, sociology, and philosophy. Finally, the *practica* for which Resolution 22 provides—including such ministries as counseling, preaching, etc.—are recognized as an intrinsic part of the theology program, rather than as para-theological diversions, a substitute for Thursday picnics.

All these proposals are valuable and important—none more so in the concrete, perhaps, than that which urges that the theologates be closely affiliated with a university. Yet theology will not be made relevant by resolutions. Catholic seminaries have often been situated

on or near a university campus for generations, without this having any measurable influence on the theology taught there. One may even question whether theology as traditionally taught is *capable* of being affected by other disciplines and "outside" activities. In the first essay of the *Schriften*, Karl Rahner points out that today's manuals of theology differ in no significant way from those of two hundred years ago. Yet the last two centuries have been a time of unparalleled cultural change, some of it with enormous influence on man's attitudes towards himself and his world. If apart from the "New Theology"—which is only beginning to trickle down into the theologate lecture hall—the transformations undergone in the last few generations by philosophy, art, psychology, the physical sciences have had little or no impact on the teaching of theology, what hope is there that theology will suddenly "become relevant"? How is it going to be fertilized by *practica*, university affiliation, or outside course work?

Admittedly, it is difficult (perhaps impossible) to see what art or psychology or the philosophy of science could contribute to the standard "tract" in Christology or the Trinity, not to mention canon law. Yet it is equally clear that in the judgment of the Rockhurst delegates, there "non-theological" disciplines can and should be made relevant to theology. It follows, therefore, that the Rockhurst delegates do not limit theology merely to what is currently found in tracts and manuals. A broader concept of theology, and of the meaning of theological formation, seems to underlie the twenty-nine resolutions made at Rockhurst. It is the notion of a theology to which all the forms of human self-understanding (and not just the auxiliary disciplines of historical criticism and exegesis) are somehow relevant.

Thus a "redefinition" of the nature of theology appears to be implicit in the practical measures adopted at Rockhurst. The theologians of the IFPI evidently do not wish theology to be an absolutely self-sufficient discipline, living purely by its own traditions and rules and hermetically sealed against outside influences. They seem to feel that the changes in modern man's intellectual and spiritual outlook can be incorporated into theology, and not simply juxtaposed to it. As noted above in the section on diversification, they think that theology will be (or ought to be) learned differently

by the scientist than by the artist, the mathematician, the humanist. Theology *itself* will be somehow different, and not just the learning process. How is this possible?

The answer, insofar as the Rockhurst report gives one, will be found in its division of dogmatic theology into two areas: historical and systematic. The remaining pages of this article will be devoted to a discussion of the principle underlying this division, which may well be the key to the success or failure of the Rockhurst program. Here, unfortunately, the printed report gives little direct assistance. The distinction between historical and systematic areas in theology is presupposed rather than explained in the text itself. The sample curricula proposed as illustrations in the appendices seem to indicate a certain confusion, or at least disagreement, regarding the division. What follows, then, will have to be largely my own interpretation of the two areas, and not necessarily that of the majority of Rockhurst delegates.

Historical theology

Fundamental to the whole concept of a "historical" theology is the intention to treat certain past ideas *as historical*, i.e., as past, no longer current. It presupposes the possibility of achieving historical perspective—some degree of distance, of separation, from the theological views of the past. Without denying all permanent value to the problems posed and solved by St. Augustine or St. Thomas, it nevertheless recognizes that these problems are not always our problems, nor their way of solving them necessarily our way. A historical theology, in other words, depends on the correlative possibility of a theology which would *not* be historical—or not primarily. Its existence as a distinct area of dogmatic theology makes sense if, and only if, there also exists a *contemporary* theological problematic: that is, a contemporary framework of questions and methods which is distinct from the framework of the sixteenth century, or the thirteenth, or the fourth. It is this distinctively modern problematic which I take to be the province of "systematic theology."

Historical theology, then, discusses the theological questions and answers of the past; systematic theology explores *our* questions. It is the inability to see any real difference between the two, one suspects, which leads to the charge some have made, that Rockhurst's historical-systematic distinction is artificial and unnecessary.

In that case, the division of dogmatic theology into two areas looks like a clever ploy on the part of the "dogmaticians" to get a double share of the new curriculum (which is how one indignant scripture teacher viewed it). But certain professors of dogma are no better satisfied, because for them the theological queries of Nicea, or of Aquinas, are the only questions possible: they are the natural and inevitable inquiries of the human mind faced with the mysteries of revelation. The problems of the past *are* their problems, the only ones of any importance. For them, *all* theology is historical—or rather, none is, because they lack precisely that sense of the *pastness* of the past which constitutes historical consciousness. If one must ask the question St. Thomas asked, and in the terms in which he asked it, then historical perspective is impossible. St. Thomas is a contemporary, and all speculative theology is "systematic theology."

But the Rockhurst delegates affirm the possibility and even necessity of a distinct area of historical theology. It is to be a history of Christian ideas, uniting dogmatic definitions, theological thought, and history (secular and ecclesiastical). Its aim will be to replace both dogma and theology in their historical setting. This will involve more extensive use of political, social and cultural history than is possible under the "tract" system, yet the focus will ultimately be theological. Institutional history will be subsumed into the history of Christian thought, with special (but not exclusive) emphasis on the Church's official pronouncements.

The foregoing objections to the idea of a historical theology help to clarify the difference between the discipline approved at Rockhurst and the ordinary theological treatise. The latter, to be sure, often contains a "historical" section which follows the growth of a certain theological opinion or doctrine from Holy Scripture to the late nineteenth century (rarely beyond). Yet, to a large extent, the views selected in this way must be abstracted from their historical contexts taken absolutely, in their timeless intelligibility. The proposed area of historical theology, on the other hand, will study eras and milieus, instead of isolated theories. Rather than following the thread of Trinitarian speculation from the Old Testament to Lonergan, it will consider the whole theological thought of a given era, like the patristic period or the Reformation. (*Within* a given period, it may still be found useful to arrange the material according to

themes—i.e., somewhat on the lines of J.N.D. Kelly's *Early Christian Doctrines*—rather than according to individual theologians, as in the usual patrology course.)

The advantages of such a “contextual” approach to theology are evident. Not only will Christian thought and doctrinal development be seen in relation to secular and ecclesiastical history, but the *unity* of theology itself will begin to be more apparent. One of the great handicaps of the current treatment by “themes” is that it fragments dogmatic theology into a dozen or more tracts, each of which tends to become a little theological world of its own. Every time a new tract is begun, one is faced with the task of rebuilding the whole of theology again, and of tracing out the development of one more dogma from Moses to Cardinal Franzelin. Because the ideas are taken in relative isolation from each other and from their cultural contexts, historical perspective is lost. The student often has the impression that the purpose of the course is to present him with an option for some great theological controversy of the past. Will he be an Alexandrian, or an Antiochene? a Banezian, or a Molinist? The standard dogmatic treatment makes these alternatives appear to be current and vital choices. Yet surely the function of historical theology ought to be to show such ancient controversies in perspective—as growing out of their respective eras and limited by their concerns and presuppositions. If any conclusion at all can be drawn from the perdurance of such disputes down the centuries, it is the likelihood that a basic misconception is at work—that both sides are asking the wrong question, or asking it the wrong way. The nineteenth century economists who thought of the unemployment problem as a problem of “overpopulation” proposed various remedies, but the economic experts of today do not feel obliged to opt for one or other of these.

If it is true that the concepts, attitudes, and a priori's (philosophical, anthropological, cosmological, etc.) of twentieth century man are not and cannot be those of St. Augustine, St. Anselm, or even St. Thomas, then a historical theology is clearly necessary. Its defining quality will be consciousness of history—of what makes one era or culture different from another—as opposed to mere knowledge of the past. Hopefully, the history of Christian thought could gradually broaden in the direction of a *history of Christian culture*. The art, the liturgy, the spirituality of a given period are all relevant to

its way of posing and answering theological questions—more relevant, often, than the institutional history of the Church. (A beginning might be made by offering courses in the history of spirituality or of Christian art, for example.)

The emphasis placed on historical relativity in this interpretation is not meant to imply that the theology of the past is without contemporary relevance. On the contrary, the chief reason for studying historical theology is the illumination it brings to our own problems. But the past will only prove illuminating if we go to it with questions of our own—questions which are our own precisely because Augustine, Aquinas, or Suarez did not ask them. In separating ourselves from the past, we become related to it in a new way; in a sense, we come to possess it for the first time. This I take to be the purpose of historical theology. Besides the advantage accruing to historical theology itself, the program of studying theological development in its temporal and cultural context simultaneously liberates systematic theology to pursue its own goals. Instead of being forced to discuss problems in the form in which they historically arose, it is freed to approach the Church's teaching in terms of the questions asked about it by the man of today.

Systematic theology

From the preceding discussion of the area of historical theology, it is apparent that the interpretation here proposed of its companion area, systematic theology, lays emphasis on the second word rather than the first. It is to be understood, in other words, rather as "theology done in a systematic way" than as "the study of theological systems." The latter is still an important part of the whole area—but only a part (as church history is only a part of historical theology). "Systematic," then, is taken to mean primarily "thematic," "theoretical," or "speculative" (if one can strip the last word of its up-in-the-clouds connotation). In contrast to historical theology, its aim is not to discover what was said in the past about a particular issue—where, when, by whom, with what understanding—but to discover what an intelligent Christian believer might say today. It is an attempt to articulate the questions people really have today about the teachings of the faith, and to provide some kind of "working solution" for those questions. It is an ongoing reflection on the meaning of the Christian message, a reflection for which the works

of the best contemporary theologians will prove especially relevant.

The primary function of systematic theology, then, is not simply to *inform* the student about the opinions of certain theologians, whether ancient or modern. That would be a valuable project, but by itself it would hardly justify the place given to systematic theology in the Rockhurst curriculum. It should be the aim of this department to do "actual" theology, rather than just to present objectively what other theologians (past or present) have said. Systematic theology is ordered in the first place to the present and the future, drawing on historical and biblical sources only in so far as these are helpful to its purpose, which is to lead the student to a personally integrated and communicable understanding of the faith. As the area where "theologizing" is done, it can profit from the assured results of biblical exegesis and historical theology, without entering into these areas for their own sake.

A syllabus of major twentieth century topics and problems can be used to determine the matter for the comprehensive examination. The topics—i.e., general headings like "Christ," "sin," "redemption," "the Trinity"—will be largely those of traditional dogmatic theology; the questions raised regarding these topics may not be. The first questions raised by the contemporary Christian as he confronts the doctrine of the Incarnate Word, for example, are not likely to be about the modes of predication of divine and human attributes with respect to the person of Christ, nor about whether Christ has a human *esse* or possessed sanctifying grace in addition to "substantial sanctity." His questions are more likely to concern the meaning and credibility of the Incarnation, the place of Christ in man's history and evolution, the relation between Christ and human culture, etc. Some traditional problems, to be sure, will also be found relevant—for example, the relation between Christ's divine and human consciousness—but many of the traditional answers to these problems may perhaps not be.

Other typically modern problems might center around the so-called "silence of God," his "death" or apparent absence from the world and from contemporary culture in particular; about the relation between the Christian doctrine of providence and the scientific view of the world, an impersonal world of law, chance, and statistical probability; about the relation between salvation-history

and man's secular history, or between the immanent finality of evolution and man's supernatural end; about the special problems of faith faced by the contemporary believer, especially those arising out of the apparent ineffectiveness of Christianity, its failure to transform the world, the rejection of Christ and his message by the great majority of mankind and by the modern intellectual in particular; about the problem of salvation "outside" the Church and its relation to salvation "within" the Church; about the connection between faith as personal commitment and faith as intellectual assent to propositions; about the general relationship between faith and such important matters as love and death, secular knowledge and human history, morality, authority, freedom, personality; between faith and the experience of the Holy, faith and theology, faith and apologetics, faith and heresy, Christian faith and other contemporary forms of "faith" (agnostic, humanist, secularist, Marxist). These are only a handful of countless "existential questions" which are often genuinely troubling problems to the modern Catholic, but which considerations of time and other priorities cause to be left undiscussed—sometimes unmentioned—in the average theology tract. No doubt, the answers which have been proposed (when any have been) in these areas are less clear and certain than many other things now taken up at some length in courses. But it is at least conceivable that tentative solutions to vital problems might in the long run prove more valuable than "certain" answers to questions nobody cares about.

Karl Rahner has repeatedly called for a reform of seminary theology based on precisely this insight. Today's seminarian, he believes, justifiably expects more of his theology than did the seminarian of days gone by. In former generations, the seminarian usually began his study of theology with a "firm and unproblematic" faith. The structure of that faith was molded by his early catechetical training, and by his religious-ascetical formation in the seminary or novitiate. Theology could confirm and deepen, elaborate and refine, his Catholic understanding, but not significantly affect its basic structure. Theology was thus for him a superstructure erected over a firm foundation; his personal piety, moreover, was left largely unaffected by his theological studies. But the theologian of today, raised in a pluralistic environment,

intensely aware of the relativity of ideas and institutions, approaches theology with a challenged and often troubled faith. He has much more basic needs than his predecessor of earlier times; above all, he needs a viable understanding of the essential truths of Christianity, one which answers *his* problems, and fits in with his knowledge of the world and modern life. Theology for him must be not a superstructure but a foundation, a personally appropriated understanding which he needs—sometimes desperately needs—simply to make sense out of his personal religious life and his apostolic vocation.

These are the reasons Rahner gives for a seminary theology which would address itself to distinctively contemporary questions about the meaning of Christianity. Is it possible that the reason why some profess to be unable to see the point of the historical-systematic distinction—and even of the Rockhurst report as a whole—is a lack of the experience in question? They cannot see what is inadequate about the traditional theology curriculum, or indeed about traditional theology itself—because for them, in truth, it *was* adequate. But a different experience gives rise to different needs, and Rockhurst's recognition of those needs is embodied in the department of systematic theology.

In justification of the contention that the systematic area cannot consist *primarily* in the study of contemporary theological systems, it seems sufficient to raise the question: how many contemporary Catholic theologians can really be said to have a "personal" system or synthesis? After Karl Rahner, where does one go? (Fr. Lonergan, it is true, has developed a systematic theological method, but his published works are confined to a few areas—chiefly Christology, the Trinity, and Grace.) One might add, of course, the major Protestant theologians of recent times, especially Barth and Tillich. But the results hardly seem large enough to justify a distinct area called "systematic theology." Valuable as a seminar or two in the works of these theologians might be for some students, it is difficult to see why one should make *all* students take a minimum of five such courses and pass a comprehensive examination in the area. The further question might also be raised, whether systematic theology so conceived would really be in any way different from "modern" historical theology. It appears rather as the

“contemporary” phase of the history of theology, not as a special area.

In that case, the distinction cannot be primarily a mere matter of chronology—historical theology studying past theologians and systematic studying contemporary ones—but must be one of problematic, that is, of the frameworks within which questions are raised and discussed. The separation of the areas simply implies that as the early Church had a distinctive way of approaching the data of revelation, and the middle ages had another way, so modern man has his own way. Each era has its *a priori*, its tacit presuppositions and interests, its criteria of intellectual satisfaction. Historical theology affirms that the past is permanently valuable and has something to contribute to the present. Systematic theology attempts to define the “theological present” by articulating the questions asked by the contemporary mind when confronted with the Christian message. The study of modern theological “systems” is subsidiary to this.

Conclusion

The present article has attempted to interpret Rockhurst as the movement towards a new and more relevant theology. Relevance is a notoriously facile word, but its basic meaning is simply “relatedness.” The most consistent complaint about past theology curricula and courses is that they are isolated, unrelated to anything else the seminarian might ever study or do; an intellectual isolation of which the physical isolation of the seminary is often an eloquent symbol. If theology is to become relevant, it must relate itself more evidently to modern intellectual disciplines, to life in the world, to the apostolate. Remaining in the academic sphere, its goal still the pursuit of understanding, it will nevertheless “address itself to those questions which have influence at the present time.” The sign of relevance in theology can only be this power to anticipate real questions, existential questions, questions that already exist (though perhaps unformulated as yet). The Rockhurst report has taken giant strides in the direction of this more related theology. Its program seems based on the recognition that some questions are genuinely more important than others—“more important,” not necessarily in some absolute sense, but simply because they are *ours*.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

The Rockhurst report raises many further problems which this commentary has not attempted to discuss. Among these certainly must be included the nature and extent of the comprehensives, and the graduate theology program in the final year. There are serious difficulties to be ironed out here before the whole program can begin to operate effectively. Nevertheless, I believe the interpretation of the report here proposed gives solid ground for hoping that Rockhurst genuinely marks the beginning of a revolution in the theology curriculum.

APPENDIX

The author of this commentary offers the following appendix as an effort towards a modernized theologate curriculum. As will perhaps be evident to the reader, it was devised after a week or so of intensive curriculum discussions, in a moment of hilarious frustration.

WOODSTOCK PLAN Q

The 37th annual meeting of the Congress on Curriculum Revision, held January 12, 1999, proposes the following experimental curriculum to replace Woodstock Plan P, adopted by the 36th session of the Congress last year. As will be apparent, the new experimental curriculum will have a more scientific orientation than earlier plans.¹

Introductory Courses:

- T101 Basic Theometrics
- T104 Major and Minor Theologic
- T110 Vital Relevancy I
- T119 Introductory Hominization
- T122 Comparative Divinities
- T125 Dogmatic Mythology
- T129 Sermoneutics
- T140 Fundamental Midrash
- T145 Up-to-the-Minute Angelology
- T150 Introductory Christanalytics

¹ Woodstock Plan Q, like Plans A-P, is a strictly speculative program for the academic year 1999-2000. Woodstock Catalogue 1960-63 remains in force.

- T175 Significant Meaningfulness II (S.M. I not offered)
- T182 Theopolitics
- T200 Encounterology

Advanced Courses and Seminars:

- T221 Soterioscopy
- T240 Nuclear Theistics
- T243 Omegaology (Eschatological Christogenetics)
- T255 Statistical Ethics
- T271 Unrealized Eschatology
- T305 Studies in Urban Diabolism (Field Work)
- T306 Practical Wizardry (Lab Periods Extra)
- T314 Heidegger and Canon Law (Conference Course)
- T317 Love in Canon Law (Seminar)
- T319 Personalized Censures and Interdicts (Tutorial)
- T397 Applied Josephology
- T399 Contemporary Zoroastrianism
- T402 Dead Sea Scrollery*
- T411 Photo-Electric Bibliology (Slides of Holy Land)
- T414 Exorcism Made Easy (Prayer I, Fasting I & II prerequisites)
- T499 Spiritual Scrabble
- T500 Applied Curriculum Revision (Presupposed: Basic Curriculum Revision, Advanced Curriculum Revision, More Cur. Rev.)

* N.B.: Student is expected to provide his own scrolls, wedges, and glue-pots; we provide the Dead Sea.

THE JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL "SYSTEM"

ambiguity in a key area

ROBERT R. NEWTON, S.J.

THE CONCEPT OF A "SYSTEM" of Jesuit high schools evokes a variety of reactions in the Jesuit classroom teacher. Many focus on a high school's connection with other schools of its province and on their common relationship to the central province authority; others view the idea of a Jesuit high school system as a relationship existing among a national network of fifty similar secondary schools. The ambiguity which surrounds the term "system" when it is applied to Jesuit high schools is not surprising; nor is it without value. For such uncertainty points to an area of our high school apostolate which demands careful re-examination, an area which may be one of the keys in the Jesuit response to the challenges of contemporary secondary education.

New concept of administration

When school administration was selected as one of the major topics of discussion at the Workshop on the Christian Formation of the Jesuit High School Student, the implicit presupposition was that the effectiveness of this formation rested on the vitality of our schools and that this vitality depended in large part on an enlightened and smoothly operating administration. In the discussions held at the individual schools in preparation for the workshop it was perhaps

inevitable that the topic would be considered almost exclusively in terms of the local school situation. No one would deny that such discussions were important. Even brief experience in a Jesuit high school is sufficient to persuade the observer that well-defined relationships among rector, principal, community, and faculty are essential to the efficient functioning of a Jesuit school. Yet this preoccupation with internal structure, which also dominated the deliberations at Santa Clara in 1964,¹ is unfortunate, for it tends to divert attention from broader and more significant administrative relationships. It likewise obscures the fact that the vitality we seek will not be achieved by any individual school working in isolation, but only through realistic and creative relationships and cooperation with other Jesuit schools and educators.

But this is not to suggest that the individual school's administrative problems differ essentially from those encountered on higher levels. On all levels—local, provincial, interprovincial—the new concept of school administration as “facilitating process” is gradually supplanting the decision-making function we have traditionally and almost exclusively associated with administration. Increasingly, the administrator will be called upon to provide a framework in which others more skilled than himself in a particular area will have freedom for experimentation, evaluation and decision. The ramifications of this shift in the individual school are obvious: the classroom teacher or groups of teachers working in departments or similar structures will exercise initiative and responsibility in areas that were formerly regarded as the prerogative of the principal or higher authority. The changes this new concept of administration will bring in relationships beyond the local situation are not so easy to discern; the possibilities on this level, however, seem to be the more challenging.

Present structures

The vagueness with which the average Jesuit conceives his relationship to a nationwide system of schools is based primarily on the fact that whatever organization does exist on the national level is in the practical order subordinate to provincial structures. Seldom,

¹ See the summary presented in the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* 27 (1965) 125–26.

if ever, does the Jesuit teacher have direct or personal contact with the national organization. And within the province the relationship of the individual's school to the province secondary education system is generally not in terms of direct contacts with other schools. Rather, the primary relationship, founded on a certain legal structure, is with the provincial administration and only indirectly, through this authority, with the other schools of the province. The new Constitution of the Jesuit Educational Association concentrates almost exclusively on establishing relationships among administrators and makes little provision for interchange or cooperation among the teachers of the various provinces.² Frequently, the outside influences experienced by the majority of the faculty do not extend beyond provincial boundaries.

It is not surprising that this type of relationship (individual school to central province authority) has tended to restrict the power of change and redirection to one source. Innovation and initiative have similarly been exercised mainly by the same centralized administration, not because the vast numbers in the schools were deliberately excluded from contributing new ideas, but because the structure was such that there was little opportunity for exchange of ideas and little hope that such ideas would prove effective. The occasional conference with the province prefect of studies was not enough to convince the great majority of teachers that they were being called upon to participate creatively in the decision-making process. As a result, most were content to assume an attitude of passivity rather than participation, the attitude which the structure seemed to demand. The defects of such a system are clear when we consider the talent, and many times the exceptional talent, of the men who staff our schools; we must also recognize that their creative activity, the key to the renewal of the system as well as their own self-renewal, was effectively, if unintentionally, allowed to lie dormant.

An administrative framework where the power to innovate is held outside the individual school has also given a strange direction to the relationship of our schools with the educational enterprises which surround them. Jesuit schools, though frequently located in

² "Constitution of the Jesuit Educational Association," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* 27 (1965) 87-98.

large urban areas, often operate in virtual isolation from the local network of school systems. Satisfied to accept changes and direction from a source outside their locale, there appears to be little reason to venture into or explore public, diocesan, or private educational systems. Yet we must ask how much the individual Jesuit school has forfeited by not participating in and responding to the extensive and varied programs of these rapidly improving school systems. Likewise, in areas where we ourselves had little to gain from other schools, we must consider how much has been lost to the educational level of the community and to the Society's educational apostolate by our failure to share the experience and values of the Jesuit tradition.

In his letter to the fathers of the French schools,³ Father General remarks that the first condition for renewal in our schools is openness to the forces which are developing around us. Father General also proposes that we view our schools as cultural centers which radiate the ideals of the Society beyond the limits of the individual school. Such suggestions voice a realization of our need to search out what is valuable in the communities we serve, as well as a desire to extend the impact of our educational apostolate beyond the relatively small numbers who attend our schools. But such suggestions also demand a school which can maintain close and dynamic interaction with its community and spontaneously adapt itself to local needs and opportunities.

Effective decentralization

The situation just described is, in many ways, a thing of the past. Alert administrators have in many instances evolved new structures, e.g., permanent province committees in subject areas, to take advantage of the training and experience of their men. But the danger still exists that this type of change will prove unsuccessful if all effective power to initiate or experiment with new programs remains centralized, and if a desire for uniformity continues to restrict a school's more spontaneous response to its needs and capabilities. Recently the superintendent of a large Eastern city commented that four new public schools in his system would not be tightly controlled by the central office, but would be encouraged to experiment and

³ "Reverend Father General to the Fathers of the French Schools," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* 28 (1966) 71-72.

develop programs and courses independently with only a general guidance by the superintendent and his staff. The objective was not uniformity but the best program a school could devise by adapting itself to the needs of its students and the abilities of its faculty.

It is not suggested that each Jesuit high school be allowed to develop in isolation, a procedure which would be disastrous. But it is suggested that the situation in which there is only one source capable of initiating change be changed so that each school becomes a source of creative experimentation and innovation. Our failure to do this in the past betrays a basic, if unconscious, lack of trust in the personnel of the individual school, a lack of confidence which has denied many capable people the opportunity to rise responsibly to a challenge which should be theirs.

In a report of the National Study of High School English Programs entitled "A School for All Seasons," James R. Squire, one of the directors of the nationwide English study, observed that the project's research team seldom found the quality of instruction or intellectual tone of a school in a multiple-school arrangement even approaching the quality of the single high school program. Dr. Squire condemned administrative decisions which become detached from the classroom and yet are decisions which directly and seriously affect classroom teaching. The team of researchers concluded that the progress and vigor of a school's English program would be maintained only if the real decisions were made in each school, by each English faculty, involving every English teacher. It seems legitimate to suggest that the findings of this committee bear parallel application to Jesuit high schools and that the effects of decisions detached from the classroom are as detrimental in other subjects as they are in English. With Dr. Squire, Jesuit schools must question whether uniformity and system-wide efficiency are to be awarded priority over the smooth and creative operation of the individual classroom teacher. John W. Gardner has remarked that we frequently have a mistaken notion of efficiency, which sees pluralistic approaches as wasteful. Though he readily admits that organizations must function efficiently to survive, Gardner also argues that "some tolerance for inconsistencies, for profusion of purposes and strategies, and for conflict is the price of freedom

and vitality."⁴ In the long run the administrative structure which keeps the school and its faculty vigorous and creative is bound to be the most efficient and productive.

New relationships among Jesuit schools

If steps were taken to grant increased autonomy to the individual school, a new relationship could be developed among Jesuit schools of a particular province as well as with the other schools of our national system. Lines of communication within a province, which serve a limited purpose when all look to a centralized authority for specific direction, would have to be expanded and made more effective. Schools would be able and expected to share the results of their successes and failures as well as to learn from experimentation taking place in other schools. The role of province-wide administration in this situation would be to provide the "facilitating process," to encourage and actively aid the individual school to develop as effectively and imaginatively as possible. The general administrative authority could operate in much the same manner as the central office of a school system—supplying general guidance, acting as a source of information and coordination, providing a range of special services which are beyond the resources of any individual school.

The same approach could be taken to share the ideas and experiences of Jesuit schools on a national or regional basis.⁵ The failure of the Jesuit classroom teacher to profit from or even to be aware of what is happening in the schools of other provinces and sometimes even the schools of his own province) is perhaps something that would most astound the outside observer. And with the exception of administrators' participation in the JEA or an occasional institute, it would be difficult to point to serious efforts on our part to explore the magnitude and variety of our Jesuit high school "system." The joint announcement last fall⁶ by a Jesuit university

⁴ John W. Gardner, *Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964) p. 69.

⁵ An imaginative and concrete proposal on how ideas can be shared and lines of communication established on a national level is presented elsewhere in this review: William J. Kerr, S.J., "A Proposal for a National Consultative Association for Jesuit Secondary Schools."

⁶ *New York Times*, October 19, 1965.

and a Jesuit high school of a program to combine and accelerate the normal high school-college course is only one example of the wealth of educational opportunities our system holds for those who have the courage and imagination to explore it. And who can deny that the possibilities and advantages of a national system of fifty secondary schools working together with our twenty-eight colleges and universities is not open to more creative exploitation than has been attempted in the past?

New structure for new demands

New and pressing challenges are placing heavy demands upon the Jesuit high school apostolate. The rapidly increasing complexity of every aspect of secondary education is forcing abandonment of the outmoded concept of the authoritarian administrator who is an expert in every field. Initiative and freedom for experimentation, together with the power for decisive action, must be shifted to the classroom teacher or groups of teachers working together. Outside the individual school, administrative structures which have sufficed in the past are now being strained by pressures and situations they were never intended to handle. The effective updating of non-Jesuit education does not permit Jesuit schools the luxury of squandering any of their resources. New procedures must be evolved to discover and stimulate the creative potential of each teacher. Individual schools must be encouraged to take advantage of as well as contribute to the educational environment of their communities. The operation of provincial administrative offices must be re-examined and perhaps modified; redistribution of areas of authority must be considered and the services and coordination supplied to province schools by the central office must be revitalized and extended. Effective lines of communication must be established to place the classroom teacher in contact with the imaginative ideas of other Jesuit schools and educators. The concept of Jesuit high schools as a national body must be sharpened and this powerful instrument, placed uniquely in the hands of the American Society, must be exploited to full advantage. In a word, the meaning of a Jesuit high school system, its relationships and structures, must be re-evaluated and redefined.

Yet it would be foolish to imagine that changing a few patterns of authority will have an immediate or decisive effect. Modification

of the present structure to focus on and give full play to our extensive and varied resources must be a step in the right direction; ultimate change, however, will come only through the slow evolution of new attitudes, attitudes which will come with greater difficulty to the classroom teacher than to the administrator. Whatever the process, new challenges in American secondary education must not find us unaware of the demands placed upon us or unwilling to evolve new structures to meet these demands.

REPORT: THE CHANGING CHURCH AND THE CHANGING STRUCTURE OF AMERICAN SOCIETY

ON MARCH 11-13TH WOODSTOCK COLLEGE held an institute on The Changing Church and the Changing Structure of American Society. A panel of thirteen experts in the related fields of sociology, economics, city planning, journalism, history, philosophy, and theology discussed the topic in a historical perspective. The three main papers were: "The Church and American Society: the Present," by Joseph H. Fichter, S.J.; "The Church and the American Past," by James J. Hennesey, S.J.; "The Church and the Future American Society," by Sister Claire Marie Sawyer, O.S.F. The institute closed with a summarizing talk by Donald R. Campion, S.J., "Schema XIII and the American Church: Unresolved Questions."

Rev. William J. Byron, S.J., of the University of Maryland, Dr. Robert V. Remini of the University of Illinois, Mr. Stephen W. McNierney of Loyola College, Rev. Donald J. Curran, S.J., of Canisius College, Rev. Geno C. Baroni of Washington, D.C., Rev. Robert G. Howes of Catholic University, and Revs. Avery R. Dulles, S.J., Thomas E. Ambrogi, S.J., and Robert H. Springer, S.J., of the Woodstock faculty served as commentators.

This article will not give any formal summaries of the papers presented, but will present, under a few general headings, some of the significant ideas from the papers and general discussion.

The Church and the American past

We cannot apply yesterday's solutions to today's problems, but we can learn from the past what styles of action, what attitudes are most viable in confronting contemporary problems. There was in the American Church 150 years ago a spirit that we can make ours today: a

vitality and rawness, an adaptability and sense of reality, a pastoral pragmatism. There was a genuine interaction between nation and church that was reflected in the Church's structure and apostolate. We had episcopal collegiality with over ten national councils, a theory and practice of church and state, two traditions of parochial and diocesan organization—one stemming from Trusteeism and the other more republican in form, a unique approach to the problem of religious education.

Two very important conditioning agents were the arrival of ten million Catholic immigrants (who had to be educated and cared for) and the rise of Protestant fundamentalism. Protestantism, in its extreme social-reform groups—the Nativists and Know-Nothings—was anti-immigrant and anti-Catholic; memories of this period would keep many Catholics from later reform movements. The period of great immigration coincided with the process of industrialization and 75% of the immigrants remained in the cities. This gave an urban nature to the American Church and led to its involvement in politics, labor movements, and social welfare work. This involvement, which did not become social reform until the early twentieth century, kept the working class Catholic, just as the Catholic educational system preserved the Catholic community.

Some factors which caused this pastoral pragmatism to die in the early twentieth century, at a time when the immigrant problems were pretty well solved and the pastoral perspectives of the American Church should have broadened from the ghetto-like view, were the excessive conservatism of the now prosperous Catholics, a defensive mentality and a lingering obsession with being accepted as fully American, and the papal condemnations of Americanism and Modernism that introduced a reign of fear into the American hierarchy. A secret society (the Sodalitium Pianum) was formed to delate people to Rome. Bishops, priests, seminarians, and the laity reached the conclusion that thought and innovation were dangerous. Many of those priests and seminarians are today's bishops or their immediate predecessors. Vatican II, however, has opened the doors to more freedom and initiative.

The American post-Vatican II Church

At present everything is changing so fast that any lack of change needs some explanation. Vatican II has rejected the self-concept of the Church as a static society and has called for reform and renewal, humbly admitting to the world the Church's past mistakes. Through the Council the Church has presented itself to the world in a posture of listening as a servant of the People of God, desirous of collaborating

with others in common association for the betterment of mankind. The Council Fathers achieved a new evolutionary historical awareness, a new notion of the common good, and the conciliar documents manifest this new awareness. These documents did not attempt to be too particular or too contemporary lest they appear already out of date and inadequate. Today the Church sees more clearly her social role as a large secondary association to serve as savior and sanctifier of society, to be a prophetic reformer of the culture.

The bishops, in their unique roles as policy makers as well as policy implementers, were forced to some important new insights by their council experience, particularly a realization that the great variety of cultural patterns and social structures in the Church demand individual adaptation. The idea of a monolithic solution is finished. The bishops realize that the apostolic activities and the freedom of the Church are limited by what society generally thinks and expects the Church should do and be.

How these insights will be acted upon and implemented is the problem facing the Church today. Success depends upon the extent and the complete openness of the dialogue between the clergy and the laity in a spirit of mutual trust and co-operation. There must be a spirit of freedom in the Church that will enable the clergy and laity to experiment, to begin new apostolates—unconventional apostolates to the outcast and downtrodden of society. There must be freedom to criticize maturely already existing apostolates and commitments of the “establishment” of the Church. There must be an effort to achieve an image of the Church that is contemporary and to muster all her influence and resources for meeting the needs of the People of God.

The Church must consider her role and involvement in the emergence of new nations, aid to underdeveloped nations, disarmament, peace, cybernation, increased leisure, surperfluous income, family stability, civil rights, permanent urban ghettos, care for the aged, materialism and atheistic humanism, middle-class affluence. Special teams of priests, nuns, laity should be professionally trained to help those alienated from society. Extravagant building programs should be stopped and unnecessary church property should be sold and the money invested as capital for forming co-operatives and for providing low-interest loans in slum areas. Church structures should be reorganized in functional terms rather than in geographic or territorial terms; and committees and organizations should be on a trans-parochial and sub-diocesan level. Trans-parochial pastoral centers should be established specializing in marriage problems, alcoholism and drug addiction, teenage counseling. Diocesan planning committees made up of bishops,

clergy, and laity should be formed and these committees should work together with city, state, and other denominational and secular committees, using the findings of research centers. Schools, colleges, and universities should be made effective instruments of social reform in their communities. Administrative positions, such as boards of trustees in large Catholic colleges and universities, should be handled by lay men and women.

Seminary formation and theological dimensions

Priests and religious do not have a corner on the present market of identity crisis. This is a much more widespread phenomenon and is the result of the new spirit of freedom and a searching reappraisal of all roles and functions. The conflicts arising between those demanding reformation and those in positions of authority who are seemingly holding on to the status quo must be resolved in a spirit of mutual understanding. This is a time of loose-endedness which demands both an attitude of readiness for change and steady nerves.

Seminary formation must change drastically. One cannot be prepared for meeting a real situation by being trained in total isolation. There can be no terminal point to a period of formation because the areas of concern are constantly in process. We need emphasis on pastoral training rather than on speculative systematics—although these also should be available for some. We need more inter-personal rapport between faculty and student body, more confidence in the working of the Spirit that expresses itself in the courage of superiors to allow subjects to be free to experiment and innovate.

A new theological understanding has been achieved. The medieval mentality of mutually exclusive concepts, of absolute, eternally, and universally valid categories has given way to a realization of the real dialectic of things, a realization of the presence of conflicting but not totally exclusive spheres that must be kept in dynamic tension: institutional-charismatic, priest-prophet, clergy-laity, corporate-individual, church-state, temporal-eternal, natural-supernatural. The new theology must attempt to perceive and communicate again the presence of mystery and to restore to contemporary man a sense of the transcendent, the eternal, the divine, and to offer to him a hope in the meaningfulness of life here and hereafter that is based on God's paternal love for him as revealed in the unique salvific deed of the Incarnation of his divine Son.

LOUIS LAMBERT, S.J.

READERS' FORUM

Borgia and Prayer

Fr. Anthony Ruhan's recent article, "The Origins of the Jesuit Tertianship" (*WL* 94 [1965]), calls for a few comments on St. Francis Borgia and prayer in the early Society. On page 421 of his article, Fr. Ruhan says: "It is interesting to see, then, that the same Bustamente was appointed by St. Francis Borgia, on his accession to the post of General of the Society of Jesus, as Provincial of Andalusia . . ." Fr. Ruhan apparently did not notice that Bustamente was named Provincial of Andalusia in 1555, exactly ten years before St. Francis Borgia was named General in 1565. When Francis Borgia became General, Bustamente had already been out of office for several years, having been relieved of his charge in 1562. Meanwhile, beginning as far back as 1560, the rector of the college at Seville, the General of the Society (Layne), and Francis Borgia himself were trying to correct all the mistakes made by Bustamente.¹

I refer to these historical details in order to call attention to the difficulties that impede arriving at a just estimate of the real Francis Borgia. It is surprising that for many Jesuits, even in 1966, there is almost only one book written about St. Francis, *Der heilige Franz von Borja*, by Otto Karrer (Freiburg, 1921).

Otto Karrer was unacquainted with

¹ Antonio Astráin, S.J., *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España II* (Madrid) 448-51.

many of the writings of Francis Borgia, works either published after his book or else as yet unpublished. Fr. Dalmases and Fr. Gilmont have classified all the Borgia writings according to chronological order in *AHSJ* 30 (1961) 125-79. The same Fr. Dalmases has divulged much new material from these hitherto unknown documents in the edition *Tratados Espirituales* (Barcelona, 1964). In the solid introduction to this edition Fr. Dalmases traces the spiritual evolution of Francis Borgia, his personal effort to assimilate and follow the mind of St. Ignatius, his radical opposition to the aberrations and the stubbornness of Fr. Bustamente.

After Fr. Leturia brought out his studies on prayer in the Society of Jesus, with his illuminating contributions about the kind of prayer and the time allotted for it in the early Society, another specialist, Fr. Dudon, made this remark: "It is an inexact simplification to say, as many do commonly, that Borgia introduced the custom of daily meditation for an hour in the Society of Jesus."² The study of all the acts and the documents (*postulata*) of the provincial and general congregations from 1573

² Paul Dudon, S.J., "Saint Ignace et l'oraison dans la Compagnie de Jésus," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 15 (1934) 245-57. To this article Fr. Leturia responded indirectly in "De Constitutionibus Collegiorum P. Ioannis A. de Polanco ac de earum influxu in Constitutiones Societatis Iesu," *AHSJ* 7 (1938) 1-30.

until 1590 make clear that Borgia and Mercurian were implementing the opinion of the majority in the Society of Jesus.

Fr. Robert McNally says: "It can be freely granted that both Francis Borgia and Claude Aquaviva, as well as the Second and the Fourth (1581) General Congregations, had serious religious problems to face which could only be solved, or at least mitigated, by the ascetical prescriptions which they provided. The facts of history seem to incline to this conclusion."³ For further support for this opinion, one could read the article of Father Iparraguirre, "La oración en la Compañía naciente," *AHSJ* 25 (1956) 445-87. In this study, more than in Fr. McNally's article, there is a clear account of the various currents of spirituality which were coursing through the Jesuit colleges in Spain. Among other things, it appears that Gandía was almost an exceptional case, completely different from Alcalá and Salamanca.

Fr. Robert McNally continues his line of thought with this query: "But a further question can be posed apropos of the *Constitutions* of St. Ignatius and their historical development. In view of the modern problems which confront the Society, does its prayer life require new thinking, evaluating, and adjusting?" This is a good point. But in the discussion of this problem it is by no means necessary to agree with a position taken by Fr. James M. Demske (*WL* 94 [1965] 137) that consciousness of the obligation to a full hour of mental prayer tends to distort the true ideal

of Jesuit life as conceived by St. Ignatius finding God in all things, not just during formal prayer. All would agree that the spiritual life cannot be reduced to the simple terms of an hour of meditation. Nor can a life of prayer be insured by legislation or an external precept. Nevertheless, some particular norms can usefully be established. It was not until the third edition of the *Constitutions* that St. Ignatius, apparently learning from his experience in governing the Society, included the following paragraph: "If it be judged wise that a definite time be prescribed for certain ones to prevent their being either excessive or deficient in spiritual exercises, the superior will have power to do this" [583]. St. Ignatius shows here a remarkable broadness of judgment and at the same time an awareness that individual decision in regard to the time given to prayer must be in the context of direction and obedience.

It is encouraging to know that the General Congregation is studying the problem of prayer in the Society. The question of time is, of course, secondary. In framing the larger perspective we could well ask: What kind of spiritual panorama do Jesuits have today? Have we forgotten the apostolic efficacy of prayer? Are some of our external activities lacking in apostolic meaning? With the increasing role of laymen in the Church should there be a shift of emphasis in the Society by leaving to laymen more of the external activities and by engaging ourselves more in their spiritual renewal?

³ Robert McNally, S.J., "St. Ignatius, Prayer, and the Early Society," *WOODSTOCK LETTERS* 94 (1965) 131.

RAFAEL CARBONELL, S.J.
Manresa Hall
Port Townsend, Wash.

KARL RAHNER

Spiritual Exercises. By Karl Rahner, S.J. Translated by Kenneth Baker, S.J. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965. Pp. 287. \$5.50

IN HIS STUDY, *THE DYNAMIC ELEMENT IN THE CHURCH*, the author of the book under review introduces his discussion of the Ignatian Exercises with the following remark: "It remains true that every age must rethink standard works such as the *Exercises* afresh from its own point of view." And Rahner gives us one example of such rethinking in the present work.

All will know and will surely have used with some profit Karl Rahner's books of prayer, such as *Encounters With Silence*, *Happiness Through Prayer*, and (with his brother Hugo) *Prayers for Meditation*. These books are not studies or even, strictly speaking, meditations. They are simple dialogues (colloquies) with God, profitable to simple believers and theologians alike. But the presentation in his book, *Spiritual Exercises*, can be followed only by those proficient in theological reflection. And this for two reasons. First, this is the text of a retreat given to priests and clerics. It supposes that the retreatants are already versed in theology and that they have made the Exercises before. And secondly, Rahner here presents us with the results of his own rethinking of the Exercises based on his own studies in depth of the present-day life and teaching of the Church.

It should be noted, however, that Rahner is most faithful to the text of the *Exercises*. He follows the order of the book and regularly refers to the numbered sections as they are found in the modern texts.

Election is essential

Rahner makes it clear throughout that a proper retreat can not be made without an election, or—as he frequently calls it—"decision." Thus in the second consideration of the preparatory meditation (pp. 11-13), which he entitles significantly "The Essence of the Spiritual Exercises,"

he tells us that we could give the retreat time to reflection, silence, increasing fervor and recollection, or to learn how to pray again, or to pray more intensely—"but this is not what Ignatius had in mind." While he admits that generally there must be some finality about basic decisions, especially such as the choice of a life's vocation, he insists: "Our finite decisions can never embrace the totality of our life in one act. Thus, every decision that we make leaves room for further decisions. . . . Hence in our yearly retreat we find ourselves in an election-situation. And we can see it, if we will only move aside the debris of everyday life." And Rahner ends this passage with the challenge: "If I have the courage and vitality to believe (something that I can never accomplish with my own powers) that God will say something to me during this retreat that I will never be able to disregard in the future, then my retreat could really be Ignatian." One is, in fact, surprised that this early in the retreat Rahner urges, "We must be patient and try to make an election with constantly renewed effort" (p. 13). And again on page 14 he is equally strong: "Each one of us should try to discover what question he should put to God in his own regard."

At the beginning of the consideration of the Foundation we find Rahner again asserting: "A personal election is the most important thing in an Ignatian retreat," and he adds that this election must take its beginning in the Foundation. Hence throughout Rahner's development of the Foundation meditation (pp. 15-27) we find such statements as, "We must make a choice and we must decide." "The true essence of indifference," he says, "is its 'elevation' into the decision to do 'more'."

This theme of decision is much more constantly conspicuous in Rahner's presentation than it is in the text of Ignatius. But it is clear from the same text that Ignatius does intend the retreatant to move constantly towards the Yes that God expects him to give to the invitation to deeper sharing in the divine life that is found in every retreat exercise. For instance, the idea of choice, past and present, runs through the meditations on sin in Rahner's presentation. Since we are sinners—and hence perhaps do not possess that degree of freedom in which ultimate choices concerning our lives should be made—we must try to come to a true knowledge of sin as it affects us. We can see the sinfulness and the "Godforsakenness" of the world and from this sight we may make some progress. But we must realize that sin does exist, and we must realize that it is not totally true that the more one understands, the more one forgives. God does not forgive everything. He *can* forgive it, but He will not allow it to be talked away. As for myself, sin is within me. I must understand this well and not try to give back to God my personal human existence and responsibility, "renouncing all claim to myself."

If I face the truth in these meditations, I am on my way toward absolute decision. We must act in the realization of a death that has been imposed upon us—and our attitude in this can lead us to perfection by the use of our own freedom. We can accept this fact of death *by free choice* along with the implication that this choice challenges to a life of opposition to our own sinfulness. For, in an existential way, we can look upon our past actions and always find ourselves to be sinners. “Sin is not a trick of God who shows how poor we are so that He can then show us His mercy. Sin does not—can not—demand grace.” And again: “Christian existence is not a dialectical unity of sin and grace; rather it is a road of decision from darkness to light.” Nor can sin be pushed off onto God. God Himself reveals our personal guilt. He has told us that sin does exist and our conscience comes to its full meaning under the cross of Christ. The “cry of wonder,” the praise of God’s mercy, and other prayers of the First Week have their culmination in the questions asked at the foot of the cross and the prayers of the Triple Colloquy. Surely these are not otiose exercises. What we say there must be translated into immediate decision which will be deepened and sharpened in the later key meditations. Rahner gives proper consideration to the mystery of the Finding in the Temple, following Ignatius carefully here. But throughout, the idea of choice—and of choice of that which more conduces to God’s service and love—is expanded. What I have said here is merely to underline the importance Rahner gives to the idea of the election. I have chosen the beginning of the retreat as the source of my examples to show how early and how persistently Rahner brings the retreatant face to face with what he feels is the central act of the Exercises.

Decision and the *magis*

While Rahner sees the Exercises as calling for a basic total response, he realizes our self-giving must ever be repeated and ever increased. The idea of “spiritual growth” is here, but it is not vague. It consists in being constantly more possessed by God and in possessing Him more. It is a closer and ever deeper sharing in the incarnational life of the Word. Briefly, it is the realization of the *magis* that Rahner (along with others) has expounded so tellingly as basic to the Exercises and to Ignatian spirituality. The idea of the *magis* and of decision are closely linked. The former recurs explicitly in all key meditations and colloquies—and here also there is preparation for or call to decisions that lead us to commitment to Christ’s salvific work, to a surrender of earthly service to a divine plan.

Constantly throughout the Second Week Rahner underlines the com-

ing election in the spirit of the *magis*. After a (heavily speculative) presentation of the mystery of the Incarnation, Rahner introduces the Second Week with a consideration, the Following of Christ, in which he insists again on decision. For example, on page 119: "The discovery of the right way to follow Christ is always the result of individual personal decision. And the personal responsibility of this decision, which cannot be pushed off on a moral book or a spiritual director, is an essential element in the imitation of Christ. Therefore we should risk the loneliness of this kind of existential decision." And Rahner ends the exercises of the Second Week with a consideration on the priesthood which harks back to the consideration of priestly asceticism which he inserts after the meditation on sin in the First Week. The first sentence of this latter presentation (p. 203) reads: "After each of the programmatic decision-meditations, St. Ignatius puts the weight of the Exercises, as far as solving problems is concerned, right on the shoulders of the exercitant." He has already introduced the meditation on the Kingdom of Christ (p. 126) with the remark that this meditation "clearly shows that the Ignatian retreat is supposed to be orientated towards a decision." And a few lines later he asserts: "St. Ignatius wants the exercitant to stir up in himself the courage to make a *binding choice* that will truly affect his life, even if it is in a very small matter." And the purpose of the present meditation is to achieve "unconditioned readiness to make the choice God is asking." It is notable that in the decision-meditations "in the strict sense" (the Two Standards, the Three Classes—and, for the *magis*, the Three Degrees) Rahner's respect for the Ignatian presentation leads him to quote the text directly and fully.

A disappointment

Rahner rightly attaches primary importance to the idea of decision and election. To attempt to find the centrality of the Exercises elsewhere is to falsify the text. Juan Santiago's study of this matter in the Spring issue of the 1965 WOODSTOCK LETTERS would make this abundantly clear. But there is a disappointment in Rahner's presentation. After such a masterly development leading up to the election, Rahner does not give us a discussion of the "times" of election, and, except in the Two Standards, very little on the correlated matter of the discernment of spirits. True, Rahner makes it clear that the election is the exercitant's own task; but if the exercitant needs help in the exercises that lead up to the election, surely he needs help in the delicate balancing of the election—to understand and properly use the spiritual balances found in the directives for election. Or, again, Rahner does say of the "second time" that many simple Christians use the "self-validating"

method without realizing it; but it is clear that Ignatius wanted these "times" and manners of election explained to the exercitants. It is particularly hard to understand Rahner's reticence here in view of his fine study of the subject in his essay, *The Dynamic Element in the Church*. Perhaps the areas of vagueness in Rahner's presentation (which Fr. Avery Dulles points out in his essay in the Spring 1965 issue of WOODSTOCK LETTERS) made Rahner hesitate here. But we can hardly urge the election-type retreat without trying to glean some specific light from the process of election as presented by Ignatius.

I had meant to point out the constantly recurring theme of death in Rahner's presentation of the Exercises. Again, this topic has been treated in a special study by Rahner (*The Theology of Death*), and the Christian existentialism of his approach gives a new view of the ascetical value of meditation on death, particularly during the retreat. I recommend, however, that those who use this book be alert to the impact of Rahner's presentation of this oft-mishandled aspect of Christian existence.

I would have liked to comment also on Rahner's view of the place of devotion to our Lady and to the Sacred Heart in the Exercises. His presentation is that of a mature modern theologian who has both depth and breadth of vision.

I cannot but recommend Rahner's added meditations on the Holy Spirit and the Church. Surely these meditations have their place in the Exercises in the spirit of the present-day Church, particularly in meditations presented to clerics and priests.

Perhaps not all would agree with Rahner's making the last meditation on the grace of perseverance. But there is much strengthening Christian theology for the retreatant here. And here also in the very last point (Retreat Resolutions—old-fashioned words!) he assures the retreatant that if we do lovingly right now what we can do, "then love can drive out fear, and we can go forward to meet God with an open heart, thankfully and joyously, calmly and also without a detailed knowledge of our future. Then it will be clear that 'He who began the good work in you is faithful, and will bring His work to completion.'"

JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.

Life and Light: A Guide to the Theology of Karl Rahner. By Donald L. Gelpi, S.J. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966. Pp. 301. \$6.00.

Karl Rahner: His Life, Thought and Works. By Herbert Vorgrimler. Translated by Edward Quinn. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press (Deus Books), 1966. Pp. 96. \$.75.

Father Gelpi has written his book for a "beginner in theology" to provide him "with some sort of overall frame of reference within which to situate any further reading and studying that he may do in Rahner himself." He describes his approach as more "thematic than systematic," and he groups Rahner's theological reflections "according to a vaguely trinitarian scheme." In the opinion of the author this approach is justified because it is in accord with Rahner's own method and with the practical orientation of his book.

The author's description of his approach is quite accurate, if properly understood, but the choice of this approach places some serious limitations on the usefulness of the book, especially in light of the purpose and audience which the author has chosen. For this reason we must examine carefully the sense in which the author's approach is "thematic."

All of Rahner's theological writings are in the form of essays or brief monographs. Even his books in the area of theology are only collections of essays written at different times and for various audiences. Gelpi has summarized almost every important essay and monograph in the course of this book, and these summaries are quite accurate and clear. He has grouped the summaries under general headings (Salvation History, The Sacramental Word, The Mother of the Lord, etc.) which form the eleven chapters of the book. The chapters are then arranged according to the vaguely trinitarian scheme mentioned above.

What has Father Gelpi *not* done? Admittedly he does not attempt to systematize Rahner's theology. But neither does he attempt (and apparently deliberately so) to *synthesize* his theology or even to center his exposition around the key insights or basic presuppositions which have distinguished Rahner's approach to the basic topics of Christian theology. For this reason the description of his approach as "thematic" could be misleading. What the author apparently means by this is nothing more than a grouping of Rahner's numerous essays according to their general subject matter. Even the arrangement of the chapters "according to a vaguely trinitarian scheme" is recognizable only after a careful reflection on the book by one who is familiar with Rahner's theology. Moreover, this trinitarian outline is quite extrinsic to the arrangement of the chapters; each chapter stands on its own. The result, then, is little more than a summary of most of Rahner's individual

essays and monographs. The question is how helpful this type of approach is for a beginner or even for a theologian who is not familiar with the general theological and philosophical framework within which Rahner works.

This limitation has been made even more problematic by the author's decision *not* to include any chapter on Rahner's philosophy. Certainly one of the most serious difficulties for English-speaking theologians in understanding Rahner is an ignorance of his philosophy, and as yet there is no adequate introduction to it in English.¹ True, the author does explain briefly some of Rahner's philosophical ideas, but he does so only insofar as these are pertinent to the particular theological essay which he is exposing. Though it would have been impossible to summarize Rahner's two key philosophical works within in the limits of this book, an introduction into Rahner's philosophy, in one or two introductory chapters, would have been most valuable.²

In pointing out certain limitations of his book, it is not my desire to question Father Gelpi's competence. He is clearly well acquainted with the whole corpus of Rahner (which comprises hundreds of untranslated essays written in unusually difficult German); this is no mean accomplishment in itself. His book shows that he has quite adequately grasped the content of Rahner's theological essays, and we can only hope that he will soon give us a more synthetic study. Meanwhile, the well-executed summaries which he has provided will be of great value to anyone who wishes a quick preview of one of Rahner's articles or a review of previous readings. They will also be quite useful to one who already has a fairly good general knowledge of Rahner, and now wants

¹ Rahner's philosophy is basically contained in two works: *Geist in Welt* (München: 1. Aufl., 1939; 2. Aufl., 1957), which presents his metaphysics of man and of human knowing, and *Hörer des Wortes* (München: 1. Aufl., 1941; 2. Aufl., 1963), which is concerned with the foundations for a philosophy of religion. Herder and Herder will be publishing English translations of these works soon.

² There are a number of articles which can serve as limited introductions to Rahner's philosophy. Gelpi refers (p. 14) to G. McCool, "The Philosophy of the Human Person in Karl Rahner's Theology," *Theological Studies* 22 (1961) 537-62. Other studies are: K. Baker, "Rahner: The Transcendental Method," *Continuum* 2 (1964) 51-59; G. Lindbeck, "The Thought of Karl Rahner," *Christianity and Crisis* 25 (1965) 211-15; G. McCool, "The Primacy of Intuition," *Thought* 37 (1962) 57-73. The present writer hopes to publish soon an essay, "The Concept of Mystery in the Philosophical Theology of Karl Rahner," which discusses at some length Rahner's definition of man.

to find out what he has to say on a particular topic not yet studied. But this book presupposes a good acquaintance with that philosophical tradition which takes its inspiration from the Belgian Jesuit, Joseph Maréchal, and is in live dialog with current phenomenology and existentialism (especially that of the early Heidegger).

Finally, if the author or the publisher envisage this book as a text for college course work in theology, they are, from the viewpoint of this reviewer's experience, quite out of touch with the college students of today. The questions which the college student asks arise out of his American experience of the world in which we live. Their formulation has not yet been clarified in his own mind and is quite far from full maturation. Rahner, on the other hand, speaks in heavy Germanic tones; he also presupposes a high degree of philosophical and theological sophistication. Hence, there are few essays by Rahner which are suitable for most college students, and one wonders about the advisability of a college course centered on Rahner. (This does not mean, of course, that a knowledge of Rahner will not greatly help the professor to give relevant clarifications to the questions of his students. Quite the contrary!)

The author has added at the end of each chapter a useful bibliography of Rahner's pertinent essays in English translation. The book also contains a helpful index.

What the author has done, he has done well. For this reason criticism may seem unfair and irrelevant. I have registered it only because of certain statements of the publisher on the dusk jacket, and even of the author in his own introduction. These statements could mislead the potential reader to expect something from the book which it does not offer.

Father Herbert Vorgrimler, the author of the second book, is a devoted student of Karl Rahner and has co-authored with him at least two theological works (*Diaconia in Christo*, 1962, and *A Concise Dictionary of Theology*, English translation, 1965). This present brief and interesting monograph is just what its title says it is. Divided into two parts, it discusses first, and at greater length, Rahner's life, and, secondly, his basic theological concerns.

Some of the most interesting pages are devoted to a summary of a document issued in 1943 by the then Archbishop of Freiburg, Conrad Grober, and addressed to the bishops of Germany and Austria. This document describes seventeen innovations in Catholic theology and liturgy. When Cardinal Innitzer of Vienna commissioned his pastoral institute to draw up a full refutation, the task fell to Rahner, and he produced a fifty-three-page essay which highlights some important characteristics of his work.

The fact that over one-third of this document is concerned with

philosophy indicates its importance for Rahner's theological thought. In it Rahner stresses that philosophy must be in live contact with modern and contemporary thought. Vorgrimler, however, warns us not to overstate the originality of Rahner's philosophy; he stands squarely within the European movement of Christian philosophy begun by Father Maréchal. This movement, though strongly rooted in the scholastic tradition, cannot be characterized as neo-scholastic. Though it highly respects this tradition both in philosophy and theology, and even keeps it alive, it does so only because it is engaged in a "direct, unprejudiced and frank discussion with the philosophy of Kant, the German Idealists and contemporary Existentialism." This document also shows how Rahner and the intellectual circles in which he moved were anticipating over twenty-five years ago the theological and liturgical developments which are now commonplace. Finally, it brings out the deep pastoral concern which is characteristic of all of Rahner's work and which is the moving force behind even his most abstruse essays.

In the second part of the monograph the author enumerates the many diverse theological problems which Rahner has discussed, and indicates how he has illumined them. In this way he easily refutes the charge sometimes made that Rahner raises many questions but provides few answers. By stressing the implications which Rahner's thinking in one area of theology has for many others, Vorgrimler gives us a more synthetic view of his theology than does Gelpi. But this second part of Vorgrimler's work is only thirty-seven pages long; it hardly fulfills the need we have for a synthetic and critical introduction to Rahner's theology.

The numerous footnotes provide precise references to the particular essays where Rahner discusses the point in question. In addition to references to the German, there are also references to the English translation, where these exist. Because of the prolific number of new essays which Rahner is constantly producing, an up-to-date bibliography is, of course, impossible. Moreover, new translations are regularly appearing and sometimes can be found in rather unexpected publications.

JOHN J. MAWHINNEY, S.J.

LIFE AND CONSCIENCE

They Call Us Dead Men. By Daniel Berrigan, S.J. New York: Macmillan, 1966. Pp. 192. \$4.50.

ANYONE FAMILIAR with Fr. Daniel Berrigan's work will expect in his new book style, power of thought, reverence for life and the person—these grown from a priestly heart, a courageous man. Such a reader will not be disappointed; this latest prose work is matter for prayer,

discussion, consideration. It is strongly recommended for anyone interested in meeting the varied challenges of a modern world torn into directions difficult to understand.

William Stringfellow, in his short introduction, calls this book a "testament of the Sacramental integrity of human life in this world." Mr. Stringfellow hopes that the book will not become lost among library shelves under the listing "religious books" since "few if any religious books are about what it means to be a mature human being in the world." I pray this judgment is false but respect the ardor of the dissent and admit Fr. Berrigan's book is truly about life and about a Christianity which is as deeply religious as the sacraments which have formed the author as an apostle to our world.

The opening chapter deals with poverty and the life of the Church. The reader will sense at once the urgency of these words, all of them painfully close to the heart of the author. The analogy of biological life and the Church is trenchant. How true that the youthful Bride of Christ must always take risks and not allow herself to age with those who hide from reality and dwell among the dead. Mummified "holy rules" leap to mind. As religious in a world of the poor it is disturbingly true that we rarely have known actual poverty and the tensions it produces. Priestly, religious vocations arise from middle-class security. A marvelous use of statistics in this chapter reveals some open sores. Pack the world's population into a town of 1000: 60 of these would be Americans; 940, the bulk of the world. Yet the vast majority of the goods of the town would be in the hands of those privileged 60. Such should alarm us; its truth should painfully free us.

The book is subtitled "Reflections on Life and Conscience." As such it represents a series of essays, and as such it may seem uneven. I thought the chapter on marriage exceptional. Incarnational theology appeals to many of us today, and this treatment of Christian marriage is magnificent. Throughout the book the style is born of a poet; words pounce upon the reader with unusual strength. "Such work is taxidermic rather than creative" is an example of word usage which forces reflection.

The chapter on St. Paul attempts to show how crisis forged the liturgy of the Western Church and how this in turn forged men of crisis, endowed with a world-view and acute social consciousness. Since reading this, I am forced each day at Mass to recall the uses made here of our liturgical prayer, intensifying personal awareness of the world-view built into our worship. Later on in the book the pain of our world causes empathy within Fr. Berrigan as he writes of world evils. He does not bemoan our outcast state but reminds us

that "God threatens the Christian belief in the goodness of their world by allowing evil to try it." The world remains good and holy; grace did not come into the world merely to tidy it up. Such realization can help to free the Christian from illusion.

Father Berrigan does not despair of our world nor of the Church Christ has sent to serve it. He sings of today's prophets within the Church: of Mounier, Murray, Roberts, Lynch, Mauriac, Suhard. Such a listing gives an index to the thought of the author. He fears that theology has been robbed of its capital letter and that science has had one conferred upon it. With the awesome dread of nuclear destruction a present tense with us, it is health-giving to ponder a book like this. Then decide honestly if this type of "Religious book" is not a demanding need for our times and for all of us.

EUGENE J. LINEHAN, S.J.