

CONFERENCE SERIES

Thomas P. Rausch SJ, Markus Schmidt SJ (Eds.)

Reconciliation

**Proceedings of the 25th International Conference of Jesuit Ecumenists
Clongowes Wood, Ireland, July 8–13, 2019**

innsbruck university press

CONFERENCE SERIES

Thomas P. Rausch SJ, Markus Schmidt SJ (Eds.)

Reconciliation

**Proceedings of the 25th International Conference of Jesuit Ecumenists
Clongowes Wood, Ireland, July 8–13, 2019**

Thomas P. Rausch SJ

Emeritus T. Marie Chilton Professor of Catholic Theology, Loyola Marymount University (Los Angeles)

Markus Schmidt SJ

Department of Systematic Theology, Universität Innsbruck

© *innsbruck* university press, 2021

Universität Innsbruck

1st edition

All rights reserved.

www.uibk.ac.at/iup

ISBN 978-3-99106-044-4

Contents

Introduction	
<i>Thomas P. Rausch, S.J.</i>	7
Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity	
<i>Markus Schmidt, S.J.</i>	13
Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative	
<i>Edward G. Farrugia, S.J.</i>	29
Reconciliation from a Sociological Perspective	
<i>John D. Brewer</i>	59
Receptive Ecumenism and ARCIC III	
<i>Anthony T. Curren</i>	67
Ecumenism in Ireland Now: Some Observations	
<i>Thomas Layden, S.J.</i>	85
Jesuits, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals	
<i>Thomas P. Rausch, S.J.</i>	93
List of Participants	111

Introduction

The 25th International Ecumenists Congress of Jesuit Ecumenists met at Clongowes Wood in County Kildare, Ireland, from July 8–13, 2019, a return to the Emerald Isle after the 18th Congress met there in 2005. This last Congress drew some 15 Jesuits from around the world to focus on the topic of reconciliation. The formal papers are presented in these *Proceedings*. Much more difficult to capture is the personal interaction, the exchanges or brief reports to the full assembly, the marvelous hospitality of the Jesuit Community at Clongowes, let alone the conviviality enjoyed by our late evening gatherings or at the banquet graciously hosted in the castle by the Jesuit Community.

We were welcomed by local organizer Tom Layden and by Michael Sheil, rector of the Clongowes Jesuit community who gave us a tour and brief history of the school from its founding in 1814. The next morning Markus Schmidt opened the congress with his presidential address, “Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity.” He stressed holiness as a foundation for Christian unity, calling us to a relationship with God, to conversation or change of heart, and to a focus on the person of Jesus who says “I am the way, the truth, and the life.” In his conclusion he suggested that Paul Murray’s “Receptive ecumenism,” with its emphasis on learning from each other made possible by the conversion he had been describing and what it might suggest as a new paradigm for ecumenical encounter.

He was followed by from Professor John Brewer from Queen’s University Belfast who spoke on reconciliation from a sociological perspective in the context of Northern Ireland; he argued that it lacks the broader values and transformation needed to support reconciliation in the civil laws, parliament, and police in a country where people live side by side but too often still divided along sectarian lines. So a cold peace. That afternoon Menino Gonzales, Goa province,



Menino Gonzales, “swami apostolate”

shared his experience of working for unity in India. In spite of considerable intolerance from India’s Hindu nationalists, Jesuits there work with peoples of all faiths in what he described as a “swami apostolate,” adopting Hindu dress which he wore for his talk in order to evangelize by their Indian lifestyles. Ecumenically, they meet several times a year with the leaders of different churches to build bridges and plan joint celebrations of the Week of Prayer for Christian unity and Christmas.

Ed Farrugia’s paper, “Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative,” was read by Tom Layden as Fr. Farrugia was not able to attend. In it he described reconciliation as a gift from heaven; it is never fully attained but begins by meeting our neighbors half-way. We must allow them to speak their truth. Even amidst

Introduction

struggle and the conflict that will persist, Jesuits should strive for a universal vision rather than exhibit a parochial mentality. He concludes by reviewing Eric Przywara's dialogue with Karl Barth and by showing how the spirituality of the Spiritual Exercises is shaped by the theologies of both the Eastern and the Western Church. He was followed by Norman Tanner's slide presentation on the history of the Eucharist.

That afternoon Fr. Anthony Curren from the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity spoke on "Receptive Ecumenism and ARCIC III." He sketched two ecumenical models, differentiated consensus and receptive ecumenism, again calling attention to Paul Murray's work. The 1999 Lutheran/Roman Catholic Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification which sought to find a basic doctrinal consensus between the two traditions is a classic example of the consensus approach. This was also the approach of ARCIC I and II, though the Catholic response to *The Final Report*, coming from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, was criticized for being overly negative. The consensus approach remains a static model. He suggested moving towards a differentiated consensus, learning to walk together on the way, a "receptive ecumenism" in which each community seeks to learn from the other to deepen its own faith.

Thursday was a break day. The group travelled to Glendalough, a sixth century monastic site founded by St. Kevin.

On Friday morning Tom Rausch spoke on "Jesuits and Evangelicals/Pentecostals," an overview of demographic shift of Christianity from Europe and North America to the explosive growth of independent and Neo-Pentecostal churches in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, the Global South. For the most part these are autonomous, non-liturgical communities, with little connection to traditional Christianity; they stress miraculous healings, the immediate presence of the Spirit, and often the Prosperity Gospel. These are the churches that are growing today, though except for some efforts in the United States, there are few noticeable efforts of Jesuits to relate to them.

In the afternoon Tom Layden presented some personal reflections of ecumenical relations in Ireland. On a surface level he recognizes considerable progress, including some wonderful stories of mutual discovery. But on a deeper

level he found little enthusiasm for ecumenism or any sense that lack of a unity is an obstacle to bringing others in a secular society to faith. Needed are places or opportunities for encounter to help heal the wounds of history. He proposed some practical steps towards a more substantive engagement as well as a willingness to learn from each other, including the new arrivals from the European Orthodox and African evangelical traditions.

Other reports and personal exchanges brought us up to date on the participants' personal engagements. Cedric Prakash discussed his article, "India's Murderous Mobs," witnessing the violence directed against those from religious and marginal communities by those aligned with the ruling Hindu nationalist party, the BJP, usually without intervention by either the police or the government.¹ Tom Rausch reported that in January 2019 he attended the inaugural meeting of IOTA, the International Orthodox Theological Association in Iași, Romania, bringing together several hundred participants. This effort to bring Orthodox theologians into conversation with the wider Church might lead to greater unity within Orthodoxy itself and contribute to significant ecumenical progress.² Frank Sammon attributed his own interest in ecumenism to his early involvement in the Student Christian Movement.

Several of the participants expressed concern that ecumenism was no longer a priority for the Society, an issue raised by Dorian Llywelyn in the 2019 issue of *Proceedings*. He noted that in our universities inter-religious dialogue seems to be more urgent. Tom Layden pointed to a dearth of energy on the subject, the sense that in an increasingly secular society, ecumenism is seen as an internal issue, not particularly important, rarely addressed in homilies. The diminishing number of those attending our biennial Congress may be another indication. For example, at Oxford in 1985 there were almost 100 participants. The 14th Congress at Naples in 1997 was attended by 47 Jesuits from 21 countries. The

1. Cedric Prakash, *Persecution Relief News*, July 19, 2018; <https://persecutionrelief.org/indias-murderous-mobsfr-cedric-prakash-sj/>; see also his "Lynching: The New Normal," *Indian Currents*, July 8, 2019.

2. See Thomas P. Rausch, "Will a new gathering of Orthodox scholars and leaders push ecumenism forward," *America*, May 14, 2019.

Introduction

24th Congress at Nemi, Italy, brought together 23 Jesuits. This year we had only 15.³

A sad postscript was the death of Patrick Howell on November 28, 2019. Long an active member of our Congress, Pat was professor of theology at Seattle University and former dean of Seattle's School of Theology and Ministry, an ecumenical faculty that prepares ordained ministers for more than ten Christian churches. We will miss his gracious presence.

Thomas P. Rausch, S.J.
Editor

3. For a brief history see *Service of Faith: Spirituality and Dialogue: Ecumenical and Inter-religious Relations*; http://www.sjweb.info/sof/ecuir_sjGroups.cfm.

Thomas P. Rausch, S.J.



JesEcum Congress Participants 2019

Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity

MARKUS SCHMIDT, S.J.

The fundamental vocation for Christians is holiness. They are called to live holy because God is holy. To accept God's call will begin a process of transformation in the believer. This process will make him or her more into God's image. To become more godlike means, to grow in holiness. To live a holy life brings Christians easier into communion with each other and draws them deeper into Christ's mission because they focus on Jesus Christ and recognize each other as followers of him. That eases the growth of unity among Christians.

Holiness is the fundamental vocation Christians have. They are called to live holy because God is holy. To accept God's call will begin a process of transformation in the believer. This process will make him or her more into God's image. To become more godlike means, to grow in holiness. To live a holy life brings Christians easier into communion with each other and draws them deeper into Christ's mission because they focus on Jesus Christ and recognize each other as followers of him. That eases the growth of unity among Christians.

“Holy, holy, holy, the Lord God the Almighty, who was and is and is to come” (Rev 4:8).¹ The four living creatures, according to the Book of Revelation, sing this song without ceasing. They worship God day and night. The proclamation of God's holiness effects the worship of the twenty-four elders. They bow down, cast their crowns and praise God: “You are worthy, our Lord and God, to receive glory and honor and power, for you created all things, and by your will they existed and were created” (Rev 4:11). The holy God draws the living creatures

1. The quotations of the Bible are taken from *The New Revised Standard Version* (Washington DC: Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, 1989).

and the elders into a communion of worshipers of God. God's holiness is what makes them burst into praise and unifies them.

To become a communion is not feasible without being reconciled to each other. Reconciliation, therefore, is important to achieve communion. Christians who proclaim the Good News must be in peace with each other. Only then, the world will believe that Jesus Christ has been sent by the Father (see Jn 17:21). Reconciliation, thus, is fundamental also for the Jesuit mission, especially for the work in ecumenism. Our theme of this year's Congress reflects that: "Reconciliation and our Jesuit Mission in Ecumenism."

Reconciliation, at least sometimes, is not easy to achieve. We need support to grow as persons who forgive. To offer forgiveness brings us closer to God. In Jesus Christ, God has become evident as forgiving God. God still reveals that God is a forgiving God. A person who offers forgiveness radiates something we would tend to link to the divine. I suggest calling this something holiness. Reconciliation and holiness, thus, belong together, with holiness as the heart of reconciliation and reconciliation as the precondition of unity. Hence, the theme of my paper is "Holiness as a catalyst for Christian unity."

My aim in what follows is to highlight holiness as a foundation for Christian unity. That is justified because in holiness "we have a designation of what is fullest and most complete, not only in human awareness and conviction but also in reality, and not only relatively full but completely so."² Holiness is a power that draws Christians into communion with each other because we touch the triune God's holiness in living holy. Susan Parsons finds striking words: "To speak of holiness is not only to ascribe to the divine a peculiar awe-inspiring quality, but also to implicate human beings as ones who may be touched and transformed by holiness in their lives. For the Christian, this mutuality of God and humanity is taken to the limit in the suggestion that we too may become holy, and thus that in our human being, the holiness which is divine, may come to be manifested."³ Parsons is talking of holiness as a quality, but modern life

2. Daniel W. Hardy, "Worship and the Formation of a Holy People," in *Holiness Past and Present*, ed. Stephen C. Barton (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 479.

3. Susan F. Parsons, "Holiness Ungendered," in *Holiness Past and Present*, ed. Stephen C. Barton (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 402. See also 1 Jn 3,2-3: "Beloved, we are God's children

Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity

and understanding seem to have lost qualitative thinking. Modern society favors quantitative understanding. Daniel Hardy argues that the reason for that is “its self-justifying unwillingness to contemplate the very holiness of God.”⁴ My starting point in this paper is the very holiness of God, and I shall approach the theme in four sections: (1) The call to holiness, (2) The effects of holiness, (3) Holiness as a catalyst for Christian unity, and (4) a brief conclusion.

The call to holiness

“You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy” (Lev 19:2; see also Lev 11:44). God demands from God’s chosen people to be holy. Holiness is Israel’s dignity it receives from God, for the God of Israel is holy. Therefore, God’s people must be holy, too. It is the heart of God’s will for the people who belong to God. God demands holiness from God’s people because in this call to holiness God invites Israel to a covenant with God. The means to fulfill the covenant is holiness.

Another key text of Holy Scripture regarding holiness is Ex 19:4–6. The Lord says to Moses on Sinai: “You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles’ wings and brought you to myself. Now therefore, if you obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my treasured possession out of all the peoples. Indeed, the whole earth is mine, but you shall be for me a priestly kingdom and a holy nation.” Stephen Barton highlights two metaphors here. Firstly, Israel shall be for God “a priestly kingdom” and, secondly, “a holy nation.” These metaphors translate to worship and obedience according to Barton.⁵ The inner structure of the narrative is evident. “The experience of the holy otherness of God is an invitation to become a priestly kingdom who celebrate[!] God’s holiness in worship. But the liturgical or cultic community has to be also the moral community which celebrates God’s holiness in lives devoted to doing

now; what we will be has not yet been revealed. What we do know is this: when he is revealed, we will be like him, for we will see him as he is. And all who have this hope in him purify themselves, just as he is pure.”

4. Hardy, “Worship,” 478.

5. See Stephen C. Barton, “Dislocating and Relocating Holiness: A New Testament Study,” in *Holiness Past and Present*, ed. Stephen C. Barton (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 196.

God's holy will."⁶ 1 Peter 2:9–10 (see also Rev 1:6) quotes this text, but the two metaphors now refer to the Church with predominantly gentiles: "But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, in order that you may proclaim the mighty acts of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light. Once you were not a people, but now you are God's people; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy."

In both contexts, holiness is about a relationship.⁷ It is about the covenant with God. Therefore, it is not enough to perform some rituals to make the divine happy or receive mercy. The God of Israel is not merely a deity among others but the true living God and creator of the universe. God is so in love with Israel, ancient and new, that it is not enough for God to be the addressee of some performed rituals. God longs for much more for Israel, and, finally, for all humanity.⁸ The plan is an everlasting covenant. God, thus, invites Israel to love God, to grow in the likeness of God, that is to say, to become a holy people. Holiness now is interpreted "eschatologically and pneumatologically . . . so that the integrity of a new people of God can be affirmed and celebrated."⁹

Holiness is the means of unity with God. It unites with God and with each other all who strive after holiness in God. Holiness, thus, reveals itself to be the basis of Christian unity. It may not come with a surprise, then, that Pope Francis takes holiness as the very theme of his third apostolic exhortation.

On 19 March 2018, the Solemnity of Saint Joseph, Pope Francis issued the apostolic exhortation *Gaudete et exsultate* (GE).¹⁰ In the text, Francis ponders on the theme of holiness in the modern world. He does not want to offer definitions.

6. Barton, "Dislocating," 196.

7. See also Hardy, "Worship," 485: "The propriety of the Lord, the Lord's holiness, is relational, in establishing a holy relationship with a people called to be holy." A little later on page 488: "The holiness of God is not only relational and complex but also inherently dynamic and performative. The performance of holiness in God has a counterpart anticipated within it; the performance of this holiness by human beings in history."

8. See the section "Holiness and the Unity of Humankind" in Barton, "Dislocating," 208–212.

9. Barton, "Dislocating," 200.

10. Francis, *Gaudete et Exsultate*; the texts of all Vatican documents referenced herein can be found by searching their titles on the Internet.

Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity

Neither does Francis present discussions on the topic. He approaches holiness in a rather practical way. The Pope states: “My modest goal is to repropose the call to holiness in a practical way for our own time, with all its risks, challenges and opportunities” (GE 2). He reminds us that the call to holiness is God’s call. Francis refers here to Eph 1:4: God “chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before him in love.”

The first chapter deals with the call to holiness. Francis emphasizes the remarkable number of saints. He highlights that we are surrounded by “so great a cloud of witnesses” (Heb 12:1). The Pope also mentions that being canonized does not exclude having faults.¹¹ The beatified and canonized people surely had them, but “[w]hat we need to contemplate is the totality of their life, their entire journey of growth in holiness, the reflection of Jesus Christ that emerges when we grasp their overall meaning as a person” (GE 22). The attitude of the saints was, as Francis emphasizes, that “yet even amid their faults and failings they kept moving forward and proved pleasing to the Lord” (GE 3).

When Francis talks about the saints, he does not refer only to the beatified and canonized people. He wants to draw our attention also to the holiness very often found “in our next-door neighbours, those who, living in our midst, reflect God’s presence” (GE 7). It is they who shape the face of every Church because it is holiness that shapes the Church’s face most attractively. John Paul II whom Francis quotes highlights that “[t]he witness to Christ borne even to the shedding of blood has become a common inheritance of Catholics, Orthodox, Anglicans and Protestants.”¹² This common inheritance is now known as “ecumenism of martyrdom.”

The Pope points out that holiness is not just for other people but for each one of us. It is the Lord who calls each person to become holy. Each person has to find his, or her, own way to live in holiness. Small gestures in daily life will prove to support personal growth in holiness. In baptism, everyone received the call to live holy. The fruit of baptism is holiness. Francis explains that “[a]t its

11. See on this issue also Sheridan Gilley, “Holiness in the Roman Catholic Tradition,” in *Holiness Past and Present*, ed. Stephen C. Barton (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 327.

12. John Paul II, *Tertio Millennio Adveniente*, 37.

core, holiness is experiencing, in union with Christ, the mysteries of his life” (GE 20). The Pope urges the believer to let the Holy Spirit renew his or her life and encourages the faithful: “The Lord will bring it to fulfilment despite your mistakes and missteps, provided that you do not abandon the path of love but remain ever open to his supernatural grace, which purifies and enlightens” (GE 24). Rowan Williams sounds similar: “A human being is holy not because he or she triumphs by will-power over chaos and guilt and leads a flawless life, but because that life shows the victory of God’s faithfulness *in the midst* of disorder and imperfection. . . . Humanly speaking, holiness is always like this: God’s endurance in the middle of our refusal of him, his capacity to meet every refusal with the gift of himself.”¹³

Both activity and silence characterize the path of holiness. In Ignatian terms, it is called “*in actione contemplativus*.”¹⁴ Francis argues that both are necessary but must be in balance, for balance will support the growth in holiness. “We need a spirit of holiness capable of filling both our solitude and our service, our personal life and our evangelizing efforts, so that every moment can be an expression of self-sacrificing love in the Lord’s eyes. In this way, every minute of our lives can be a step along the path to growth in holiness” (GE 31).

The effects of holiness

To walk the path of holiness is the main effect of holiness. It leads to a longing for sincerer growth in holiness. For that, permanent repentance is necessary. To live repentance is fulfilling Jesus’s demand when he has started his public preaching:

13. Rowan Williams, *Open to Judgement: Sermons and Addresses* (London: Darton, Longman, Todd, 1994) 136 (emphasis in original).

14. Hieronymus Nadal SJ (1507–1580) introduced the phrase in his commentary on the “*Examen generalis*” of the Constitution of the Society of Jesus: Hieronymus Nadal, “In Examen Annotationes (1557),” in *P. Hieronymi Nadal Commentarii de Instituto Societatis Iesu*, ed. Michael Nicolau, Epistolae et Monumenta P. Hieronymi Nadal, V (Roma: Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu, 1962), 162. See Anton Witwer, “Contemplativo En La Acción,” in *Diccionario de Espiritualidad Ignaciana*, ed. Grupo de Espiritualidad Ignaciana (GEI), Colección Manresa 37 (Bilbao: Ediciones Mensajero, 2007), 457–465.

Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity

“repent, and believe in the good news” (Mark 1:15). Repentance makes us aware of God’s presence in daily life and sensitive to our neighbor. The encounter with God and our neighbor will strengthen the desire to live holy. A holy life, of course, is utterly the grace of God given to us. It is, however, our part to welcome God’s grace.

The Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council, *Unitatis redintegratio*, also reminds us of the very importance of personal repentance and the change of heart:

There can be no ecumenism worthy of the name without a change of heart. For it is from newness of attitudes (cf. Eph 4:23), from self-denial and unstinted love, that yearnings for unity take their rise and grow toward maturity. We should therefore pray to the divine Spirit for the grace to be genuinely self-denying, humble, gentle in the service of others, and to have an attitude of brotherly generosity toward them. . . .

Let all Christ’s faithful remember that the more purely they strive to live according to the gospel, the more they are fostering and even practicing Christian unity. For they can achieve depth and ease in strengthening mutual brotherhood to the degree that they enjoy profound communion with the Father, the Word, and the Spirit.

This change of heart and holiness of life, along with public and private prayer for the unity of Christians, should be regarded as the soul of the whole ecumenical movement, and can rightly be called “spiritual ecumenism” (UR 7–8).¹⁵

A holy life is a life that is lived “in the light of the Master,” as Pope Francis writes in his apostolic exhortation *Gaudium et exsultate*. It is the title of chapter three. In this chapter, Francis encourages believers to live “against the flow.” He explains what he means with the Beatitudes (see Matt 5:3–12; Luke 6:20–23). “The Beatitudes are like a Christian’s identity card. . . . In the Beatitudes, we find a portrait of the Master, which we are called to reflect in our daily lives” (GE 63).

Each Beatitude begins with “μακάριοι.” Some English translations render the beginning with “Happy are those,” others with “Blessed are those.” It is not easy to translate the Greek term “μακάριοι” accurately, but Jesus’s intention seems to be apparent. He presents his attitude as an example to gain happiness in one’s

15. Walter M. Abbott, ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Guild, 1966), 351–352.

own life. The Beatitudes are his instructions on how to live a fulfilling life, which is nothing else than a happy life. Francis remarks that happiness becomes here a synonym of holiness (see GE 64). Although the Beatitudes sound idealistic, the Pope is not unrealistic. He is aware that these words are challenging. Therefore, he encourages the faithful: “Let us allow his words to unsettle us, to challenge us and to demand a real change in the way we live. Otherwise, holiness will remain no more than an empty word” (GE 66).

After having reflected on the Beatitudes, Francis searches for the one clear criterion of holiness which pleases God. He recognizes it in Matt 25:31–46, where Matthew presents the Final Judgment. Here, Francis succeeds in his search for the criterion. “I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, I was naked and you gave me clothing, I was sick and you took care of me, I was in prison and you visited me” (Matt 25:35–36. See GE 95).

These verses sound like demands for charity. As true as this is, Francis emphasizes that these verses are also talking about Christology. To strengthen his argument, he refers here to John Paul II who writes in *Novo millennio ineunte*: “[I]t is a page of Christology which sheds a ray of light on the mystery of Christ.”¹⁶ This understanding is rooted in Jesus’s identification with the poor in Matt 25:31–46. Francis quotes John Paul II again to explain the identification of Jesus with the poor: “If we have truly started out anew from the contemplation of Christ, we must learn to see him especially in the faces of those with whom he himself wished to be identified.”¹⁷ It is evident that both mercy and holiness belong together, for a merciful attitude is at the heart of Jesus’s life. Compassion is the embodiment of holiness. Francis draws the conclusion that “[t]hose who really wish to give glory to God by their lives, who truly long to grow in holiness, are called to be single-minded and tenacious in their practice of the works of mercy” (GE 107).

When Francis thinks about the effects of holiness in today’s world, he uses the framework of the Beatitudes and focuses on five expressions of love for

16. John Paul II, *Novo Millennio Ineunte* 49; see Francis, *Gaudete et Exsultate* 96.

17. John Paul II, *Novo Millennio Ineunte* 49; see Francis, *Gaudete et Exsultate* 96.

Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity

God and neighbors (see GE 112–157): (1) perseverance, patience, and meekness, (2) joy and a sense of humor, (3) boldness and passion, (4) community, and (5) constant prayer. Francis considers these effects, which are also signs of holiness, “of particular importance in the light of certain dangers and limitations present in today’s culture” (GE 111).

Since there are certain dangers and limitations in modern culture, Pope Francis highlights the necessity for spiritual discernment which is a supernatural gift. “If we ask with confidence that the Holy Spirit grant us this gift, and then seek to develop it through prayer, reflection, reading and good counsel, then surely we will grow in this spiritual endowment” (GE 166). Francis does not deny that the Christian life is a permanent fight and, therefore, needs strength and encouragement. He makes clear that the battle is not only against the world but also against the human weaknesses, and “[i]t is also a constant struggle against the devil, the prince of evil” (GE 159). Francis also warns about spiritual corruption which “is worse than the fall of a sinner, for it is a comfortable and self-satisfied form of blindness” (GE 165). As Christians have to face a many-fold fight, the Pope is eager to affirm that Jesus rejoices in our victories (see GE 159).

It is conspicuous that Pope Francis is so clear on the discernment of spirits. His emphasis could well originate in his practice of Ignatian spirituality. For him, the discernment of spirits is an approach to the mystery of God. He concludes: “Discernment, then, is not a solipsistic self-analysis or a form of egotistical introspection, but an authentic process of leaving ourselves behind in order to approach the mystery of God, who helps us to carry out the mission to which he has called us, for the good of our brothers and sisters” (GE 175). Discernment is, according to Francis, “a growing understanding of God’s patience and his timetable, which are never our own” (GE 174). It, therefore, is the means which liberates Christians from rigidity. Rigidity is something that “has no place before the perennial ‘today’ of the risen Lord. The Spirit alone can penetrate what is obscure and hidden in every situation, and grasp its every nuance, so that the newness of the Gospel can emerge in another light” (GE 173). Holiness opens the eyes for the ever-newness of the Gospel.

Holiness as a catalyst for Christian unity

While it is true that holiness enables us to grasp the ever-freshness of the Gospel, we still have to face a problem here. If people hear of holiness, many of them “shy away from attention to holiness for fear of the moralising rebuke implied in the tag, ‘holier than thou’.”¹⁸ Although there is a moral dimension to holiness, Stephen Barton emphasizes that “it is more than that. It has to do, at least in the Judeo-Christian tradition, with the fundamental character of the reality we call God, the One who graces us with His presence and enables us to share His life as gift and grace. This is no matter of the ‘holier than thou’.”¹⁹

In other words, people often associate holiness with sacrifice and unhappiness. Francis’s apostolic exhortation *Gaudete et exsultate* does not approve of this opinion. The opening three words, which are a quotation of Matthew 5, verse 12, are witnesses for that: “Rejoice and be glad.” They set the tune of the text and direct the reader to joy and happiness which is “true life” and the “happiness for which we were created” (GE 1). This happiness is nothing superficial but fulfilling happiness appropriate for saints. Francis writes: “He [the Lord] wants us to be saints and not to settle for a bland and mediocre existence” (GE 1). It does not mean, of course, that there cannot be times when it is challenging to live holy, but it reminds us that joy and genuine happiness emerge from holiness. We can conclude with Barton: “To attend to holiness, therefore, is to

18. Stephen C. Barton, “Introduction,” in *Holiness Past and Present*, ed. Stephen C. Barton (London: T&T Clark, 2003), xvi.

19. Barton xvi. An informative discussion of what holiness means offers John Rogerson, “What Is Holiness,” in *Holiness Past and Present*; he concludes, from the viewpoint of the Old Testament, that holiness is “something ultimately grounded in the moral character of the God of Israel, whose chief attributes of unflinching love, mercy and forgiveness mark him off as different from humankind, yet which are intended to transform humanity into what it is unable fully to achieve itself,” 21. See also James D. G. Dunn, “Jesus and Holiness: The Challenge of Purity,” in Barton who maintains “that wherever the concept of ‘holiness’ appears in the biblical material, underlying it is the sense of the mysterious otherness and awful [sic] power of the divine, of God, and that the holiness of people, places and things is essentially derivative from that primary source of holiness, ‘holy’ as related to the divine, to God,” 169.

Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity

attend to a matter that lies at the very heart of what it means to be and become fully human.”²⁰

Holiness as process

There are three key terms, happiness, holiness, and love, which are interrelated. Love is the practicing of holiness, which effects happiness. To recognize this dynamic lets holiness appear as a process and not as anything static. We call this dynamic understanding of holiness sanctification. In other words, sanctification is the dynamic growth in holiness.

Isaiah’s vision of God in the Book of Isaiah, chapter 6, one of the typical theophanies in the Old Testament, affirms that holiness fundamentally is characterized by dynamic growth. Isaiah has to go through a process of purification, that is to say, through a process of growth although very dense, to be able to respond to God’s call positively. In his discussion of Isa 6, Walter Moberly tellingly concludes: “If holiness is to be achieved, so that the people of YHWH become like their God, it will be through a process demanding and problematic beyond normal imagining.”²¹

The view of growth in holiness comes up very early also in Church history. Irenaeus of Lyons (ca. 140–202) already supports the view of sanctification as dynamic growth in holiness in the second century. He understands the call to holiness as an original call which humans received from God when God created them.²² Irenaeus sees Adam and Eve as children on their way to perfection and the likeness of God. Perfection, in the Irenaean view, is the intimate communion with God, which is eternal life for humans. God “made the things of

20. Barton, “Introduction,” xvii.

21. R. Walter L. Moberly, “‘Holy, Holy, Holy’: Isaiah’s Vision of God,” in *Holiness Past and Present*, ed. Stephen C. Barton (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 139.

22. See Markus Schmidt, “Kirchenspaltungen als Möglichkeit zur Reifung: Die Wachstumstheorie bei Irenäus von Lyon im ökumenischen Kontext,” *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 134 (2012): 40–45.

time for man, so that coming to maturity in them, he may produce the fruit of immortality” (*Adversus haereses* IV,5,1).²³

It is evident that the call to grow is there right from the beginning of human beings. To grow is the initial call humans have received. The growth in holiness, therefore, is part of the dynamics of life. Moreover, it is the fundamental dynamics of human beings, particularly of Christians.

Ecumenism of blood

Christians who grow in holiness have an impact not only on secular institutions but also on the Church. People who strive after holiness in daily life affect the different Churches in the world and give them the most attractive face. One witness of holiness that the Church believes to be especially fruitful is martyrdom as a witness to Christ. John Paul II reminds us that “[t]he witness to Christ borne even to the shedding of blood has become a common inheritance of Catholics, Orthodox, Anglicans and Protestants.”²⁴

Christians are persecuted, tortured, and murdered for the simple reason that they are Christians. The persons who commit these crimes are not interested in their denominational belonging. It is sufficient that they are Christians. They shed their blood together as witnesses to Christ. In the 20th century, more Christians were murdered because of their faith in Jesus Christ than the 2000 years before.²⁵ It seems that the trend continues and makes the Christians the most persecuted believers in the 21st century. The witness of blood to Jesus Christ of Christians together, independently of their Church affiliation, appears as unity in martyrdom, often called “ecumenism of blood.”

23. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 1, second reprinting, (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 466. Irénée de Lyon, *Contre Les Hérésies*, ed. Adelin Rousseau, Sources Chrétiennes, 100 (Paris: Cerf, 1965): 424: “qui temporalia fecit propter hominem, uti maturescens in eis fructificet immortalitatem.”

24. John Paul II, *Tertio Millennio Adveniente*, 37.

25. See David B. Barrett and Todd M. Johnson, *World Christian Trends Ad 33–Ad 2200: Interpreting the Annual Christian Megacensus* (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 2001) 229, Table 4–3: In the 20th century, there are 45,400,000 Christian martyrs. From AD 33 to 2000, the total number of Christian martyrs is 69,420,000.

Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity

John Paul II wrote about the ecumenism of blood in his apostolic letter *Tertio millennio adveniente* (no 37) back in 1994. Pope Francis quotes this text in his apostolic exhortation *Gaudete et exsultate* (no 9) in 2018. It is evident that martyrdom is still a current issue for Christians. The personal call from God to holiness may lead to the shedding of blood as a powerful witness to Christ, but, fundamentally, God's call is for all Christians the basis of unity.

Personal holiness

That the call to holiness may become the basis of unity, it must impact the lives of every man and woman. God calls every Christian to strive after holiness in his or her personal life. This call is evident, for instance, in 1 Pet 1:15–16: “Instead, as he who called you is holy, be holy yourselves in all your conduct; for it is written, ‘You shall be holy, for I am holy.’” It is apparent that the author of 1 Pet refers to Lev 11:44 and Lev 19:2.

Personal holiness, therefore, is fundamental. Who longs for holiness and strives after it, does not only answer God's call to holiness but also participates in God's working out unity among Christians. An example—and there are many more—of a person who accepted God's call to holiness is our founder, Ignatius of Loyola. He did not get tired of longing for holiness and practiced it in daily life. Ignatius has been impacting many people since. An example of our time is Mother Teresa of Calcutta. The admiration she has been receiving to date by Christians, and non-Christians alike, illustrates her impact on the lives of many people. These two examples may suffice to see that personal holiness has an impact and affects people and the Christian Churches.

Discipleship

The question arises why holiness is powerful. I think we find the key in Leviticus. God calls God's people to holiness because God is holy (see Lev 11:44; 19:2). The one who defines holiness is God. God is, in other words, the “template” of holiness. To follow God, one must know God. Daniel Hardy emphasizes that “knowing God” is not as simple as a theological conception might be.

So holiness of God—the fire in God by which full holiness is generated and sustained in its relation to all else—eventually refines even that which opposes it, thereby healing the fragmentations introduced by those who resist it. It is a highly dynamic and healing “holiness”, well beyond simple conceptions of relationship through effective “communication”. And by the way, it reveals the deficiencies of forms of theology that bypass the dynamism of God’s holiness by employing bland conceptions of “knowing God” through God’s “self-communication”: they avoid the refining fire of the holiness in God and in the Cross of Christ.²⁶

To know God means to accept God’s refining fire of holiness, to let God’s refining fire touch and transform me. That happens in worship, especially in the Eucharist, which, as Hardy says, “is actually . . . the real anticipation by historical human beings of the eventual holiness of the kingdom of God,”²⁷ and in reading Holy Scripture, the Word of God. In Holy Scripture, we find that God is love. It is, therefore, important that Christians take the Word of God seriously. It means that they focus their lives on the Word of God and let themselves be guided by it. Holy Scripture as Word of God will impact their lives.

To take the Word of God seriously means to accept it as authoritative for one’s life. It is important to be aware of the Word of God not just as a message but as a person, Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ. Heribert Mühlen showed in his research that “[t]he *center* of the New Testament’s revelation is not the *teaching* of Jesus but his *person*. Jesus did not only proclaim, like Buddha, his teaching but proclaimed *himself*. Therefore, faith is firstly not a relationship to his *teachings* but to his *person*.”²⁸ The Word of God, the *logos*, who is God (see Jn 1:1), became flesh and a human being (see Jn 1:14). This human being is the Messiah. To take the Word of God authoritatively, thus, means to focus one’s life on Jesus Christ.

If people follow Jesus Christ, then they center their life on Christ who says, “I am the way, and the truth, and the life” (Jn 14:6). To focus on Jesus means that one centers oneself on “the way, and the truth, and the life.” This orientation

26. Hardy, “Worship,” 490.

27. Hardy, “Worship,” 494.

28. Heribert Mühlen, “Die Lehre des Vaticanum II über die ‘Hierarchia Veritatum’ und ihre Bedeutung für den ökumenischen Dialog,” *Theologie und Glaube* 56 (1966): 390 (page 390 is a print error in ThGl and should be page 309! Emphasis in original).

Holiness as a Catalyst for Christian Unity

is life-giving. It directs all followers of Christ together to the truth. Everyone who centers himself or herself on Jesus encounters other Christians also focusing seriously on Jesus. This encounter encourages Christians to recognize each other as brothers and sisters in the Lord, which will contribute to the growth of unity in Christ.

To see the dedicated life of others with Jesus and to recognize them as brothers and sisters in the Lord will have a further impact. It widens my own view point because it helps to acknowledge the strengths and shortcomings of my life and those of others. It is sometimes difficult to accept them. The honest acknowledgment of them, however, is needed. Pope Francis draws our attention to the impact of refusing to acknowledge them. He says in his exhortation *Gaudete et exsultate*: “Ultimately, the lack of a heartfelt and prayerful acknowledgment of our limitations prevents grace from working more effectively within us, for no room is left for bringing about the potential good that is part of a sincere and genuine journey of growth” (GE 50).²⁹

Francis observes the tragic consequence of the rejection, which makes grace ineffective in one’s life, for a journey of growth cannot happen. This journey, however, is fundamental for the progress of Christian unity and therefore necessary. The good discovered in my life and the life of others will help each to grow. Growth, however, is not possible without grace. If one rejects grace so that it cannot work effectively, one cannot grow. To recognize the good in other Christians’ lives and to learn from them has a transformative impact because it strengthens trust among them. Trust is the basis for strong bonds among Christians, which will also cross denominational boundaries.

To learn from each other as Christians developed into a new paradigm. Paul Murray calls it “receptive ecumenism.”³⁰ The crucial point of this paradigm is that the denomination which engages in ecumenism asks first what it can learn

29. See also Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium*, 44.

30. Paul D. Murray, ed., *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Paul D. Murray, “Families of Receptive Theological Learning: Scriptural Reasoning, Comparative Theology, and Receptive Ecumenism,” *Modern Theology* 29, no. 4 (2013): 76–92, <https://doi.org/10.1111/moth.12063>; Paul D. Murray, “Introducing Receptive Ecumenism,” *The Ecumenist* 51, no. 2 (2014): 1–8.

from other Christian denominations, and maybe only afterward what the others can learn from it. This approach demands humility and brings a precondition to growth to our attention.

Conclusion

A precondition to growth in holiness is honesty in one's own regard, that is to say to recognize one's own strengths and shortcomings. God calls to holiness, and to accept God's call will begin a process of transformation in the believer. This process will make him or her more into God's image. To become more godlike means, to grow in holiness. If holiness is the power to transform someone to better mirror God's love, holiness and love must be linked together. It is not surprising because God, as the triune God, is love (see 1 Jn 4:8, 16). Francis discovers love as the criterion for holiness that pleases God also in the Final Judgment (see Matt 25:35–36; GE 95). To serve Christians belonging to different denominations in love will strengthen holiness and trust between them. Trust is the force to bring the believers closer to each other and in communion and let unity grow.

Unity encourages Christians to support each other in their witness to the triune God. The witness will be convincing, for the fundamental condition for the world to believe is met if Christians are united. Jesus knows this condition and prays to his Father that all may be one, “so that the world may believe that you have sent me” (Jn 17:21). Unity as a condition to effective witness motivates Christians to focus their lives on Jesus Christ and his mission. The focus on Jesus's mission, given to his followers,³¹ could strengthen the endeavor to make Christian unity visible. Holiness is a catalyst for that goal.

31. For a spirituality of mission see Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium*.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

EDWARD G. FARRUGIA, S.J.

The paper studies Ignatius' personality and impact of his idea of reconciliation. "Saving our neighbor's affirmation" could be a leitmotif for ecumenism. The Belgian Jesuits' motto (1540–1640)—"to suffer no restriction, however great, and yet to be contained in the tiniest of things is divine"—shows his outreach to be ever widening, leading us to reflect on the force of a comparative, "Ad maiorem Dei gloriam" which was to find an amplification in Eric Przywara's monumental Deus Semper Maior, which in its concentric ripples roused a discussion on the Ignatian heritage with Karl Barth and Eberhard Jüngel.

Although Ignatius lived in troubled times when polemics was rife, he was above all deeply committed to the Christian cause of saving the world. This meant that the sinner's reconciliation with the Church was for him top priority. The Church here stands in a symbolic but real way for the sinner's reconciliation with God, which in turn implies the urgent necessity of reconciling oneself with one's neighbor and—last but not least!—with oneself, our own first neighbor. These themes hold pride of place in the Spiritual Exercises, though it might not seem so at first blush. Yet to pretend to acquire the greatest unsurpassable love is to condemn oneself to inevitably fail in one's endeavor, however intrepid any daredevil Icarus-type flight skywards may be, however ineluctable the equally rapid fall earthbound is sure to be. This leaves us with no other feasible way-out than to start where we are, because starting afresh from the givens is incarnational and draws us freely but irresistibly to the more of love.

As we shall see, although the better is supposed to be the enemy of the good,¹ for Ignatius, *magis*² is never good enough. Reconciliation, the normal grounds on which love, bereft of sentimentality and therefore more authentic, is asymptotic,³ that is, it is never fully attained. Reconciliation is not of this world, but a gift from heaven. Remember Ithaca. Ithaca, the island home whence Odysseus set out on his wanderings and whither he had to return, is at the same time theme of Cavafy's homonymous poem. The journey is worthwhile, even if the goal is not so attractive, says the Greek poet Constantine Cavafy (d. 1933), nay—we may add—even if the goal is never reached. Or rather, precisely if it is *unreachable*, one feels the urge, like Moses perched on Mount Nebo catching a glimpse of the land of promise he was barred from entering (Deut 34:4), to transmit to future generations at least the craving not to give up, never to be complacent, so that what we could not do they might do better. For Jesuits and non-Jesuits, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, it is somewhere between the *magis*⁴ (the “more”) and the *ad maiorem Dei gloriam* (“to the greater glory of God”) that reconciliation pitches its tent.

1. The phrase is sometimes ascribed to the Italian philosopher Benedetto Croce (1866–1952).

2. Latin for “more,” though, of course, there is much more to it, in Ignatius' diction.

3. Asymptotic, as an adjective, is the opposite of symptomatic (συνπίπτειν *syn-piptein*, literally “fall together”), used when the data of a question “coincide” or “converge,” i. e. when both ends of an equation match. In mathematics, asymptotic, with the negating alpha at the beginning, describes a curve that approaches the straight line ever so closely yet never ever to meet. As a noun, “asymptote is “a straight line that continually approaches a given curve but does not meet it at any finite distance,” *Oxford Dictionary of English*, 2nd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 98.

4. Cf. Willi Lambert, *Aus Liebe zur Wirklichkeit* (Mainz: Topos plus, 1993), 106–108, here 107–108: “Over against the various idols of growth what counts is to spot the true, divine ground for the ‘more.’ He is the ever-greater God (Erich Przywara S.J.) and it is the ‘ever greater human being’ who answers, of whom Blaise Pascal once said: ‘The human infinitely surpasses ‘the human.’ In his growth man reflects symbolically the intangibly greater God. For Anselm of Canterbury God is ‘that than which none greater can be conceived.’ Bishop Hemmerle brings together this idea of God and the ‘magis’ of St Ignatius: ‘Perhaps no other thought from the history of philosophy has had so many repercussions as the thought of the Father in Scholasticism. And the *magis* of St Ignatius is so to speak the practical resonance, normative for the

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

In what follows, we shall first probe, in the context of the Exercises, into (1) the way Ignatius argues with his potential interlocutor, (2) the way Ignatius decides, applying divine principles for human beings, and (3) the way Ignatius conceived the relationship between God and the sinner, certainly not dreaming of a world in which he is great, or even, for the matter of that, in which God is great, but one in which God is—greater, ever greater! (4) Finally, we shall see, as our way unfolds, how Eastern and Western ways crisscross.

1 The way Ignatius argued

Over and above direct spiritual obligations Ignatius develops an approach of how to deal with one's discussion partner. Exposed right at the start of the Exercises, it could of course occupy an important dimension in spiritual life, but the spiritual life need not be the only venue. What then is the "logic" of the Exercises?

1.1 The necessity to save my neighbor's affirmation, in spite of my propensity to the contrary

What might look like a point of etiquette or a tactic of diplomacy actually plays an important role in conflict resolution. Listening, alas! a much-abused word, in end effect is often used to block communication, rather than to follow Max Frisch's (d. 1991) comparison of truth in debate with a jacket held open towards one's discussion partner so that he or she can put it on. Genuine listening depends on the presupposition, interiorly held and outwardly manifested, to seek to meet one's neighbor half-way.

human transposition, of this thought" (all texts in foreign languages translated by EGF, unless otherwise stated).

What was discussed elsewhere⁵ should not be forgotten, at least as far as what Ignatius said is concerned, so as to move ahead with the argument. When one abstracts from the all too concrete details in Ignatius' vision rooted in his times, one cannot help but admire the breadth of his vision.⁶

In the light of this, one cannot help be struck by the universality of the vision, punctured at times, it is true, by what seems to us in the light of our concrete criteria to be unsustainable, but which nonetheless marks Ignatius as being at once a child of his time but also far above it. He could talk of the crusade and the inquisition, but the bottom line was the greater glory of God and service to all.

Closer home to Ignatius' coming to grips with heretics, one ought not to overlook the considerateness he showed with the wayward from the inner group, such as Nicolás Bobadilla (1509–1590).⁷ Indeed, against this background, a statement such as “every good Christian ought to be more ready to give a good sense to the doubtful proposition of another than to condemn it; and if he cannot give a good sense to it, let him enquire how the other understands it, and if he is in error, let him correct him with charity; and if this does not suffice, let him seek all suitable means in order that being brought to a right understanding of it he may save himself from error.”⁸

5. See, to have some quick point of reference, Edward G. Farrugia, “On Saving my Partner's Affirmation: Portrait of the Jesuit Ecumenist,” in *Ecumenism East and West, the 19th International Congress of Jesuit Ecumenists*, ed. Secretariat for Interreligious Dialogue (Rome: n. p., 2007), 15–20.

6. Farrugia, “On Saving my Partner's Affirmation,” 82.

7. See Ignatius' letter of paternal admonition: “Al P. Nicolás Bobadilla, Rome, 1543,” *San Ignacio de Loyola: Obras completas*, ed. Ignacio Iparraguirre and Candido de Dalmasas (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1982), 694–698.

8. The quote is from W. H. Longridge, *The Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius of Loyola* (London: Robert Scott, 1922), 24f. quoted in Farrugia, “On Saving my Partner's Affirmation,” 83.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

The catch-word “universality” appears here under the guise of charity.⁹ Over and above the discussion whether it is the neighbor’s soul or his affirmation that ought to be saved, the ecumenical usefulness is that the spiritual benefit of the doubt may be transferred to the ecclesial doubt of the benefit.¹⁰ Indeed, Ignatius’ hierarchy of possible strategies to save one’s interlocutor’s affirmation is remarkable and may lead an innocent observer to ask whether it is so important after all to save somebody else’s affirmation.¹¹

1.2 And what if the partner’s affirmations seem to go counter to the Church’s teaching?

Ignatius does not really say that we should call white what, contrary to our conviction, is described as black, but rather that we should not assign our personal convictions more worth than that of the whole Church, to put it mildly.¹² We should humbly bow down in front of the Church’s judgment, in spite of our conviction to the contrary. Ignatius’ image is anything but a stark black and white alternative.

This we may describe as the search for equilibrium between interlocutors and what it reveals of Ignatius’ techniques in resolving conflicts. For although the

9. Edward G. Farrugia, “‘L’*éternel féminin*’ in Teilhard de Chardin), *Melita Theologica, Journal of the Faculty of Theology*, 63 no. 2 (2013): 19–37, here 21: “[W]hereas chastity unites the monad, charity unites the monads.” This typical Teilhardian thesis holds eminently true of individuals trying to become persons.

10. Farrugia, “On Saving my Partner’s Affirmation,” 83.

11. For the text, see *The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius*, translation and commentary by George E. Ganss, S.J. (St Louis, MO: Loyola Press, 1992), 31: “Presupposition. That both the giver and the maker of the Spiritual Exercises may be of greater help and benefit to each other, it should be presupposed that every good Christian ought to be more eager to put a good interpretation on a neighbour’s statement than to condemn it. Further, if one cannot interpret it favourably, one should ask how the other means it. If that meaning is wrong, one should correct the person with love; and if this is not enough, one should search out every appropriate means through which, by understanding the statement in a good way, it may be saved.”

12. Ignatius von Loyola, *Geistliche Übungen*, Adolf Haas (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1966), no. 365, 116, Regel 13: “Um das echte Gespür zu erlangen, was wir in der dienenden Kirche zu haben sollen.”

axiom of saving my neighbor's affirmations appears right at the beginning of the Spiritual Exercises—it comes after the first batch of Annotations, twenty in number¹³—and even if the maxim is applied to the one who gives the Exercises and the one who makes them,¹⁴ the reference to the subject of this saving being “every good Christian,” and not the director of the retreat, or the one doing the Exercises, or a Jesuit, one may legitimately see in it the way Ignatius bargained in general. Ignatius therefore foresees, by way of interaction, that one should be more prone to make allowances for the assertions of one's interlocutors, than to be on the lookout, inquisitorially, for possible error. An interesting repartee takes place, not without a touch of humor on the part of Ignatius, between himself and Figueroa,¹⁵ the vicar of Alcalá.¹⁶ When the latter warns Ignatius that they would burn him at the stake if he were to come out with a heresy, Ignatius re-joins: you too would be burnt at the stake if you came out with some heresy!¹⁷

2 The way Ignatius decided

More was to come. On the first centenary anniversary of the Society of Jesus the Belgian Jesuits published a curious work known as *Imago primi saeculi* (1640)

13. Ignacio de Loyola, *Ejercicios Espirituales: Introducción, texto notas y vocabulario por Cándido de Dalmases, S.J.* (Santander: Sal Terrae, 1987), 53.

14. Ignacio de Loyola, *Ejercicios Espirituales: Introducción*, 53: “Para que así el que da los ejercicios espirituales, como el que los recibe, más se ayuden y se aprovechen, se ha de presuponer que todo buen cristiano ha de ser más pronto a salvar la proposición del prójimo que a condenarla.”

15. As Hugo Rahner notes, in this relying on a text first published by Ignacio Iparraguirre, no. 22 was written as an answer to those who accused him of belonging to the heretical group of the Alumbrados; Hugo Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian*, trans. Michael Barry (New York: Herder & Herder, 1968), 157–158.

16. Ignatius, *Der Bericht eines Pilgers*, übersetzt und erläutert von Burkhardt Schneider (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1986), no. 59.

17. San Ignacio de Loyola, “Autobiografía”, cap. 6, *Obras Completas*, ed. Ignacio de Iparraguirre and Cándido de Dalmases, 4th revised edition (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1982), 125; *The Autobiography of St. Ignatius Loyola*, trans. Joseph F. O'Callaghan, ed. John C. Olin (New York: Harper, 1974), 63.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

where we come across this rather quaint description of St. Ignatius of Loyola: “*Non coerceri maximo, contineri tamen a minimo, divinum est.*” Which in turn has been translated as: “To suffer no restriction from anything however great, and yet to be contained in the tiniest of things, that is divine.”¹⁸

This pithy sentence surely says something about the way to relate to oneself and to the divine. But first we must attempt a provisional paraphrase, a makeshift landing. Not to be intimidated by the power or authority or position of the mightiest, however stately their position, as contrasted with our capacity to operate freely in however circumscribed a place or situation or possibilities or time, that is real greatness, one withal that reflects something of the divine. The strength of a chain is that of its weakest link. The beauty of a creed is that it says everything in a few strokes. The power of the word is when people wonder why a homily was so short and ask for more. The charm of a minuet is that it can rival with a two-hour symphony. The greatness of a saint is that he or she can achieve so much in so short a time, the greatness of an office, such as John XXIII’s, that one can make a revolution in a thousand days. The unrivaled healing power of sanctity is that it can attain even at the last moment, in a flash, what a lifetime of endeavor never did, as was the case with the Good Thief.

The *Imago* is like the precious pearl, buried in the field, amid the shifting sands of fashion and bombast, waiting to be discovered (cf. Mt 13:14). Repulsive in the exterior, it opens upon an unfathomable well of human wisdom seasoned by much exercise, abandoning of the field and returning to the race.¹⁹ It is a baroque poem on governance through the prism of the Society of Jesus.²⁰

18. H. Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian*, 23. Hugo Rahner, “Die Grabschrift des Loyola,” *Stimmen der Zeit* 139 (1946/1947): 321–327; Gaston Fessard, *La dialectique des Exercices spirituels* (Paris: Aubier, 1956), 167–177.

19. John O’Malley, “The *Imago*: Context, Contents, and Controversy,” *Art, Controversy, and the Jesuits: The Imago Primi Saeculi* (Philadelphia: Saint Joseph’s University Press, 2015), 11–50.

20. For all the satire which the bombastic *Imago Primi Saeculi* could draw from contemporaries, including Pascal in his *Lettres Provinciales* and the derision of posterity, we have to first approach it objectively, as Paul Begheyn does in “*Imago Primi Saeculi*,” *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Jesuits*, ed. Thomas Worcester (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 385: “The emblematic Latin work *Imago primi saeculi* (952 pages) was composed by faculty and students at the Jesuit college of Antwerp to mark the centenary of the Jesuit order in 1640. In

Produced by the Jesuits of the Flemish Province to celebrate their Order's hundred years of existence, indeed the "centenary's most lasting monument," they almost tainted the memory by an overkill of praise. Though a remarkable work in its own age, it disappeared with the Suppression of the Society of Jesus (1773–1814). The production had as its main author none other than Jean de Bolland (Bollandus, 1596–1665), who continued Herbert Rosweyde's bold bid in ushering in new criteria for creative hagiography with the Bollandists. Moreover, the timeline—1640—is significant, as the mid-seventeenth century is generally considered the high water-mark of Jesuits' worldwide influence, including political success. The scaffolding was thus set for a Baroque "poem" on governance. Fr. Mutio Vitelleschi (1563–1645), the then Superior General of the Order, who had insisted before that the celebration should be marked by a spirit of prayer, upbraided the Flemish provincial for the excesses of the work.²¹

Here is the commentary of Hugo Rahner on the text from the *Imago primi saeculi*:

No description of Ignatius has ever equalled these words. It is divine (and hence "from above") to be contained within the smallest of things (hence within what is "below"), and from this to be rapt into the sublime heights of the Infinite. "The greatest reveals itself in the smallest"; in writing these words Hölderlin himself had an inkling of what Ignatius had experienced, though Ignatius experienced it at greater depth because he was aware that Christ is in the middle.²² The very insignificance of a creature, the *acatamiento* in the very depths of its nature, could lift Ignatius upwards in rapture. He saw the Trinity in an orange-leaf; and wherever, in the turmoil of the Roman streets, his eye rested on three creatures, even just "three of anything", he would see them as a symbol of the divine relations in the Trinity.²³

five chapters of prose and poetry, it describes the foundation of the Society of Jesus, its growth, acts, suffering, and honors. A sixth chapter presents the history of the Flemish-Belgian province, instituted in 1612. Each chapter is followed by a 'poetic exercise' in Latin, Greek, or Hebrew. The Italian art critic Mario Praz (1896–1982) described the *Imago* as 'the celebration of celebrations, the triumphal arch erected by the Jesuits in rich, luxuriant scrolls, in bizarre and pompous cartouches'.

21. O'Malley "The Imago: Context, Contents, and Controversy", 11–18.

22. H. Rahner, "Das Grabschrift des Loyola", 321–322.

23. H. Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian*, 23–24.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

From this we may deduce that the meanest and the most sublime have to be reconciled (extremes are known to meet!)—if you like, by adding a sixth category to the five St. Maximus the Confessor (d. 662) claimed Christ had reconciled by his life, death and Resurrection.²⁴ These five reconciliations read as follows: male and female, paradise and the inhabited world, heaven and earth, the intelligible and the sensible, God and his creation.²⁵ A sixth could be, however, the Ignatian parallels which are at the same time extremes: the maximum and the minimum, the most uplifting and the most demeaning, those who prefer to reign in hell rather than serve in heaven,²⁶ and those who redouble service with ever greater—unrequited—love.²⁷

Moreover, in the lens of the Christocentric interpretation of the *Exercises*,²⁸ Christ turns out to be the most concrete universal,²⁹ in which the upsurge of human desire from below to God, and its crossing swords with human passion finds the resultant in the outstretched arms of the cross. One may even understand the *Suscipe* not just as a prayer of self-offering, but also as a prayer of exoneration by discharging my part in the sin of the world on the most Innocent one.³⁰ Christ brooks no double standards, but, on the contrary, his kingdom is placed *between* two standards, where one has to choose if one wants to continue to count as Christ's follower. Over and above these six mediations we

24. Lars Thunberg, *Man and the Cosmos* (Crestwood NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985). For the main idea of mediation cf. Maximus' *Ambigua* no. 41.

25. Thunberg, *Man and the Cosmos*, 81–91.

26. "Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven," John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, I, line 263.

27. In his instructions (Rome, 1546) to the Fathers sent to the Council of Trent Ignatius enjoins them both to deal prudently with the prelates and experts gathered there, as well as to teach children catechism; "A los Padres enviados a Triento," *San Ignacio de Loyola: Obras completas*, 705–708.

28. H. Rahner, "The Christology of the *Spiritual Exercises*," in *Ignatius the Theologian*, 53–135.

29. K. Rahner, *Grundkurs des Glaubens* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1976), calls Jesus Christ the most concrete universal.

30. H. Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian*, 135.

should nowadays add, though it sounds ecological, rather than ecumenical: the reconciliation of man with nature.³¹

2.1 Non coerceri maximo: “To suffer no restriction from anything however great . . .”

In whatever awes us there is an element of the sublime, but not necessarily of overkill. I. Kant (d. 1804) describes an overpowering storm as bearing the traits of the sublime, more than the terrible;³² even then, man could not last long in the inclement heat and the incessant torrents without the right accoutrement. Yet it is quite different when it comes to the greatness of God. Man is not crushed by God’s grandeur, on the contrary, man may gain dimensions if he accepts and interiorizes God’s grandeur.³³

The world is charged with the grandeur of God,
It will flame out, like shining from shook foil;
It gathers to a greatness, like the ooze of oil
Crushed. Why do men then not reckon his rod?
Generations have trod, have trod, have trod;
And all is seared with trade; bleared, smeared with toil;
And wears man’s smudge and shares man’s smell; the soil
Is bare now, nor can foot feel, being shod.

And for all this, nature is never spent;
There lives the dearest freshness deep down things.
And though the last lights off the black West went
Oh, morning, at the brown link eastward, springs —

31. The Fathers put it as follows: to live “according to nature”: *κατὰ φύσιν*, by which however they meant “a nature purified from sin,” to which we could add “purified from pollution.”

32. Immanuel Kant, “Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen,” hg. Ernst Cassirer, *Immanuel Kants Werke*, 2, hg. Artur Buchenau, (Berlin: Cassirer, 1922), 246, 253.

33. H. Rahner, “Die Grabschrift des Loyola,” 323–324.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

Because the Holy Ghost over the bent
World broods with warm breast and with ah! bright wings.³⁴

In spite of so much abuse of nature, there remains a freshness deep down things, a freshness endearing even for a callous human being, because the Holy Spirit protects the world through his own self and his grace, his warm breast and his bright wings. Hopkins has thus correctly sized up Ignatian spirituality, which, let us say from the start, was heavily beholden to the Fathers in both East and West;³⁵ indeed, much speaks for the fact that Ignatius arrived at his finding God in all things by following the track of the Fathers, “to live according to nature.”³⁶ At the same time the poet rightly appraises man’s being at odds with God because of his having built between himself and nature a filter of insensitivity. One point of certain contact with the East is as follows:

The Fathers of the early Greek Church found their point of departure for this doctrine of the spiritual senses, or ‘pneumatic sense-perception’ (*aesthesis pneumatike*) in two passages of Scripture: Proverbs 5:02 (“I will give you a sense-perception (*aesthesin*) of the lips”) . . . and Hebrews 5:14 (“solid food is for the mature for those who have their faculties trained by practice (*aistheteria gegumnasmena*) to distinguish good from evil”).³⁷

34. Gerald M. Hopkins, “God’s Grandeur,” in *Gerald Manley Hopkins: Poems and Prose*, ed. William H. Gardner (New York: Penguin Classics, 1987), 27. For a commentary, see Hans U. v. Balthasar’s comment in “Hopkins,” *Herrlichkeit: Eine theologische Ästhetik*, II, (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1962), 719–766, here 755, where the Holy Spirit is described as the in-stress in us: “The Holy Spirit is the Paraclete in us, in that he is the in-stress in us . . .” “Der Heilige Geist ist Paraklet in uns, indem er instress in uns ist . . .” (744). For the “the dearest freshness deep down things”, which poetically lends personality to them, see 741, 745, where with John Scotus (d. 1308) v. Balthasar speaks of “*analogia haecceitatis et personalitatis*,” the analogy of the “thisness and personality.”

35. Hugo Rahner, “Ignatius and the ascetic tradition of the Fathers”, in *Ignatius the Theologian*, 32–52. Likewise, Heinrich Bacht, S.J., in his “Die frühmonastischen Grundlagen ignatianischer Frömmigkeit,” in *Ignatius von Loyola: Seine christliche Gestalt und sein Vermächtnis, 1556–1956*, hg. Friedrich Wulf (Würzburg: Echter, 1956), 223–261.

36. Tomáš Špidlík and Guido I. Gargano, *La spiritualità dei Padri greci e orientali* (Rome: Borla, 1981), 46–61.

37. H. Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian*, 198.

Saying I believe in God raises my I to partner-status with the almighty and all-knowing God. At the same time, if “the world is charged with the grandeur of God,” the same Jesuit poet wonders: “Why do then men not reckon his rod!?” It is this insensitivity which slows down, or blocks altogether, our proposals for reconciliation. To de-sensitize ourselves from such prejudices or bad habits could become an integral part of any genuine promotional agenda, let alone an ecumenical program.

2.2 Conteneri tamen a minimo: “and yet to be contained in the tiniest of things . . .”

The problem here is like copying all of Scripture on a single grain—and all the medieval disquisitions on angels dancing on the top of a needle we laughed at come back to torment us.³⁸ It seems that the best description of this portrait of Ignatius finds a confirmation in what he himself says about the Superior General,³⁹ of which here I append a version of the provincial’s portrait.

- i. “The provincial must be first of all a Jesuit as St Ignatius has described the Superior General—a man of spiritual stamina, capable of give and take, that is to say, humanly speaking very mature, capable of listening to all but to turn a deaf ear to the lobbies, pressure groups and domineering confreres. He must be able to resist making of his consultors a Mutual Adulation Club, but must be a provincial for all members and for all seasons, nipping in the bud the temptation to form a clique around him. He must not rule by being strong with the weak (including the docile) and weak with the strong (including his friends).⁴⁰
- ii. For St. Ignatius, the real spiritual father is the superior, the provincial being thus the first among the spiritual fathers. By this is not meant that the provincial should dabble with methods that are beyond him, indeed

38. H. Rahner, “Die Grabschrift des Loyola,” 325–326.

39. Constitutions, Part II, chapter nine.

40. “Being strong with the weak and weak with the strong” goes back to Lord Acton.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

he must know how to delegate to competent spiritual counsellors. What is meant is that he should take as the decisive criterion of his actions not the opportuneness of an action or its convenience or the external prestige of the Society, but Christ, remembering that, as the Rule says, we are ‘crucified to the world.’⁴¹ In this perspective, failures and setbacks become that part of the service which is already included in the price.

- iii. We talk so much of minorities and refugees, and that is wonderful, as Christians, not to say as Jesuits, we should. But how about the internal refugees, members who bear grudges? Of course, the provincial has to be careful not to devote so much time to a single neurotic who can absorb a disproportionate amount of time; but the opposite can also be true: someone may fly before the community because he has been object of too many misunderstandings. Inner refugees, not infrequently—it is the community that makes them.
- iv. The provincial must take into account the particular nature of his province, nowadays likely to be dwindling in numbers and not having many vocations for the foreseeable future. The makeup of a province may be lopsided, for soon most of the available able-bodied Jesuits can be outside of the province and yet hardly involved in it. Is anything being done to draw upon all resources? Asking members to do some service for the province, such as give retreats and give a course, but even such seemingly small matters as common holidays and common retreats can be planned not only for personal relaxation and community building respectively, but also as part of the community’s on-going formation.
- v. Finally, in spite of the obvious sacrifice it entails, the office of provincial offers an enviable platform to do good and to bring home the Gospel without wearing it on one’s handcuffs. It is one of the leadership tasks which can account for much good if done in the spirit of Christ’s washing everybody’s feet, and yet knowing how to rise up to the occasion

41. Gal 2:18–21.

to encourage the group, promote our apostolates, stand up for unjustly treated brethren and speak out against social and other injustices.”⁴²

3 The way Ignatius thought: *Ad maiorem Dei gloriam*

The way Ignatius thought means his *Denkorientierung*,⁴³ the bent of his thought. What was the ultimate criterion of Ignatius’ argumentation? In the Jesuit Constitutions, the words of the acronym AMDG recur 376 times,⁴⁴ going back to the vintage Ignatius who in *The Spiritual Exercises*, no. 185, wrote: “I will consider what I could say in order to bring such a one to act and elect for the greater glory of God our Lord and the greater perfection of his or her soul.”⁴⁵ One could then, with Karl Rahner, object that this is required of every Christian, who, as Vatican II put it is called to holiness (*Lumen Gentium* 39) and that such an interpretation yields ultimately nothing specific for Jesuit identity.⁴⁶

Against Rahner’s point, could not one say exactly the same about Franciscan poverty, since everyone is tempted to have rather than to be? Does not every founder, deep down, want to help us accede to Christ, the whole Christ, and nothing but Christ, by targeting what he or she feels is hindering people from approaching Christ? What is original is that a saint proposes a diagnosis of a spiritual illness at the nick of time—that stich in time that saves nine, and, at the same time, the original recipe to which one will return again and again. And so Ignatius, reacting against the contemporary crave for fame through ex-

42. Edward G. Farrugia, “Provincial’s Portrait.” This was my reply to our provincial’s asking us about the portrait of the provincial.

43. Edward G. Farrugia, “Im Banne des Orients: Werdegang und Zukunftsorientierung des hl. Ignatius von Loyola,” in *Ignatius von Loyola und die Gesellschaft Jesu (1491–1556)*, hg. Andreas Falkner und Paul Imhof (Würzburg: Echter, 1990), 401–404.

44. Karl Rahner, “Vom Offensein für den je größeren Gott. Zur Sinndeutung für den je größeren Gott,” *Schriften zur Theologie*, Band VII (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1971), 32. This is important for us, because we are dealing with a main strain in Ignatius, often considered to be the hallmark of the Jesuit Order. Karl Rahner, *Sämtliche Werke* 13 (= KRSW, 13), (Freiburg i. Br: Herder, 2006), 471–487, here 471.

45. Robert E. Scully, S.J., “AMDG,” *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Jesuits*, 25–26.

46. Rahner, “Vom Offensein für den je größeren Gott,” 33. KRSW 13, 472.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

plot, readily shifted the attention to where glory belongs—to God. Still, Rahner raises another point, a common objection in theodicy: God seems to contradict Leibnitz’s idea that this is the best of all possible worlds, for he does not always seem to care about his own ever greater glory at least in concrete creations—on the contrary, God creates concrete “worlds” in their limitedness.⁴⁷

It was precisely this idea of the best of all possible worlds on which Voltaire in his *Candide*, against the background of the devastating earthquake in Portugal on 1 November 1755, heaped ridicule. One may have the feeling that a maxim such as AMDG is deep down a slogan reflecting the Renaissance penchant for the all-round man, eager to bring the world under his control and then dedicate his efforts to God as if suddenly remembering that God exists after all. Since with Romano Guardini (d. 1968) one talks about “the end of modernity” (“*das Ende der Neuzeit*”),⁴⁸ we might even be constrained to admit, “hopefully, it may have something to do with God.”⁴⁹

While it would be mistaken to imagine Ignatius using this maxim as the standard of his Order, the contrary is not true—it could become such because it came to serve as such given the conditions under which it originated. If we were to characterize it saying it smacks of the modern spirit, one should not forget that Ignatius somehow belonged to the late Middle Ages, had something of the individualistic *devotio moderna* to him, and, at the same time, that modern times have long given way to post-modern times, as at least culture watchers would have it.⁵⁰ This said, one could sum up with K. Rahner that all that the AMDG inculcates is that man should dare measure his desire to do what is good by that unsurpassable model which is God, beyond all measurement, and not simply slide back into the historical conditioning of one’s historical puniness. If you like, man does not resign himself to the service he judges to be feasible, but prays that God may dispose of him so as to serve him and give him glory in a way that goes beyond the human imagination and corresponds ever more to

47. Rahner, “Vom Offensein für den je größeren Gott,” 34. KRSW 13, 472–473.

48. Romano Guardini, *Das Ende der Neuzeit: Ein Versuch zur Orientierung* (Würzburg: Werkbund, 1965); Rahner, “Vom Offensein für den je größeren Gott,” 35.

49. Rahner, “Vom Offensein für den je größeren Gott,” 36. KRSW 13, 474.

50. Rahner, “Vom Offensein für den je größeren Gott,” 36. KRSW 13, 476.

what God really expects from him, and not what he imagines that God wills.⁵¹ At any rate, the ecumenical significance of this motto is such that Calvin, too, Ignatius' contemporary, claimed that the highest motive of God's actions is God's own glory and honor, so that it should also be that of Christian action.⁵² One may add that, in its *factual* use, the AMDG has come to typify the Society's unremitting search of excellence within the various areas of its endeavors.

3.1 Ignatius did not conceive a world in which he himself would be great . . .

Ignatius was other-oriented; both towards his neighbor, whom he wanted to help and to save; and even more so towards his Lord and Savior, by which phrase he meant—given the Christocentric bent of the Exercises—the way Jesus Christ is.⁵³ The last thing Ignatius wanted to foster was any cult personality for himself or others, but his strong personality remained behind his service, as the image St. Paul uses for Moses' radiant face covered by a veil portrays (see 2 Cor 3:4–11).⁵⁴

3.2 Nor a world in which God would be great, but . . .

Ignatius dreamt of a world in which it would not do to consider God to be great, but *greater*. The idea that God is greater than we could imagine may be

51. Rahner, "Vom Offensein für den je größeren Gott," 52–53. KRSW 13, 486–487.

52. Rahner, "Vom Offensein für den je größeren Gott," 32, footnote 3. KRSW 13, 471.

53. Cf. H. Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian*, 23–24. The insignificance of a creature, far from hindering Ignatius from contemplation, lifted him at once to the highest heavens. In his book *Hölderlin* (Nürnberg: Glock & Lutz, 1949), 498, Erich Przywara explains: "Nature, therefore, is the fullness of God in Christ upon earth: a mysterious intermingling of harmonies between the Hellenistic system of divine humanity and the Catholic truth of the God-man in whom all things hold together." H. Rahner sees here a direct link to Chalcedon (451); see *Ignatius the Theologian*, 27–28: "Deus semper maior. God's glory is always greater, and for that reason he can be found even in the midst of the distractions endured in his service." The image of the veil is also used negatively as when Paul affirms that the Jews are unable to grasp the deeper meaning in Moses' writings because that have a veil covering their hearts (2 Cor 3:15).

54. *Commento della Bibbia liturgica* (Roma: Edizioni Paoline, 1982), 1625.

called “asymptotic.” Asymptotic may be said of an ideal that cannot be fully realized, however increasingly close one can approach it. In the Christian, “folly in Christ,” that is, being a fool for Christ’ sake, is like trying to reach out to God by the back door, where, at least, there are no queues. K. Rahner ends his long disquisitions by saying that deep down the prayer that God be best served by me consists in putting myself at God’s disposition and make this personal disposition to serve *ad maiorem Dei gloriam* coincide with a central characteristic of God himself—*Deus semper maior*.⁵⁵

3.3 Ignatius’ reconciliatory form lies between the *magis* and the *Deus semper maior*

If *Deus semper maior* (Augustine, In Ps. 62, 16)⁵⁶ amounts to saying that God eludes our grasp, because he is greater than the confines of our mind and wider than the horizon of our heart, God not wearing a Roman collar, the *magis* inculcates instead that nothing is good enough for God, except that God the Son, in his infinite kenotic—self-effacing—love for us, elevates us to his stature, on the model of the Christological hymn of Phil 2:5–11.

Here a useful commentary: The Latin *magis* (Spanish *más*) serves as shorthand for the dynamism that lies at the heart of Ignatian spirituality. It is characteristic of Ignatius to use the comparative “more” or “greater” in a variety of circumstances. We first encounter it in the First Principle and Foundation in the *Spiritual Exercises*. “Rather, we ought to desire and choose only that which is *more* conducive to the end for which we are created” (no. 23). The one doing

55. Przywara’s name occurs at the end of this article: Rahner, “Vom Offensein für den je größeren Gott,” 53 (KRSW 13, 487). Erich Przywara, *Deus semper maior: Exerzitenkommentar*, I–III (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1938–1940). In the Preface, Przywara explains that God is greater for us, the greater we ourselves become by maturing.

56. Erich Przywara, *Deus semper maior: Theologie der Exerziten*, I (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1938), v: “This Theology of the Exercises bears the name: ‘God is ever greater,’ the more we grow . . .” Przywara understands this work as correlative to his earlier work *Analogia entis* (München: Kösel, 1932).

the retreat is not to be satisfied with whatever may be helpful to the “praise, reverence and service” of God but is to beg for what is more helpful.⁵⁷

And now the point about reconciliation. If, when one speaks of “living according to nature,” one of the major reconciliations we need—that between nature as it emerged from the hands of God and the wreck that not infrequently remains after our use, often abuse, of it—one harks back to the Fathers, let us not forget that Ignatius regularly calls Christ “Creator,” and therefore the linkage is not secondary, but mainline. “Such is the way in which Ignatius of Loyola’s Application of the Senses can assist the doctor and the priest in their search or ways of healing and sanctifying souls.”⁵⁸ And: could this much needed reconciliation serve as a model for reconciliation in ecumenism?

3.4 The ever-receding horizon of permanent peace

Even if we take the Gospel at its own word, but interpret it according to the lines of a human all too human measure, there will never be permanent peace in this world, but only a truce which will inevitably be broken. Christ himself suggests: “Peace be with you, my peace I give you, not as the world gives it!” (John 14:27). Moreover, in some of his eschatological discourses Christ warns that the world will end in strife and cataclysm. True, one must distinguish between the message and the genre, but, deep down, the fact that Christ, even when he refers to it in the context of a marriage invitation, makes the point that it is a final and irreversible decision that has to be taken beforehand.

Even in concocting peace plans Ignatius did draft a plan for a crusade against the Ottomans and did indulge in polemical writings when the occasion called for it,⁵⁹ both in private correspondence as well as in official exchanges at the highest level. Some of his instructions are rigorous to the point of severity, as

57. Brian O’Leary, S.J., “Magis,” ed. Thomas Worcester, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Jesuits*, 495–496. Italics EGF.

58. H. Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian*, 213.

59. As with Caraffa, the future Paul IV, though some experts doubt that Ignatius ever sent the letter; cf. Dominique Bertrand, *La politique de S. Ignace* (Paris: Cerf, 1985), 186, who quotes Georges Bottereau, “La ‘lettre’ d’Ignace de Loyola à Gian Pietro Carafa” (it gives no reference),

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

to the Scholastics in Coimbra, Portugal; others, for example, with the Negus of Ethiopia, very respectfully, but unbending in its demands for religious conformity to the Roman ideal of obedience.⁶⁰

It is, however, on his imperatives that we have to judge Ignatius. Service is service, and as for the thought of compensation his reply would be “service included,”⁶¹ that is, sacrifice is part of the deal, and one must take it in stride, as giving a generous tip after a hearty and well-served meal in a restaurant is part of a challenge well reciprocated. His idea deep down was *suaviter in forma, fortiter in re!* All these endeavors, however, are under-grid by what we may call a restoration (*anakephalaiosis*)⁶² of peace and peaceful relations between everybody, *quo universalius eo divinius!* The more one can recompose a shattered ecclesial configuration, the better served is the Church. Yet even before such drastic situations are envisaged, Ignatius expected Jesuits to promote a universal vision, rather than endorse a parochial mentality, and to aim at excellence rather than settle for mediocrity in the apostolate, to be on the front line, taking the risk, rather than playing it safe.

The comparative has a force of its own, though it can be negative. Many of our faults derive from the fact that we compare ourselves and our means with others and those of others. For example, the problem with coveting is not that we want more, but that we want more *than others*.⁶³ It is this root of evil, a scheming which leads, if unchecked, to sin that the ninth and tenth commandments try

Archivum Historicum Societas Iesus, t.44, 1975, 149–152: all we have is not the letter but a draft, sufficiently elaborated, but by no means ready, even as a draft.

60. Philip Caraman, *The Lost Empire: The Story of the Jesuits in Ethiopia* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985), 131–132, 154–158.

61. See the prayer, ascribed to St. Ignatius, but quite fitting his spirituality: “Lord, teach me to be generous, / to serve you as you deserve, / to give and not to count the cost, / to fight and not to heed the wounds, / to toil and not to seek for rest, / to labor and not to look for any reward / save that of knowing that I do you Holy Will,” The Scout’s Prayer, in *The French Boy Scout Manual* (1910); Jim Manney, “Lord teach me to be generous,” accessed on Internet on December 27, 2019.

62. Eph 1:10: ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, restore everything in Christ.

63. Alfons Deissler, *Ich bin dein Gott, der dich befreit hat: Meditationen über die Zehn Gebote* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2006), 129–134.

to curb. Ignatius goes in the opposite direction, almost as if he wanted to do *agere contra*—to be less in the least Society. We cannot easily reach peace in our world, but at least we can cut in ourselves those roots of evil that threaten the very world in which they sprout.

Yet the force of the comparative can be thoroughly positive. In this world there is no peace—even the poet says it: Reconciliation is found in the midst of the fray (Hölderlin)⁶⁴—but there is reconciliation without end, which we accept here with the Pauline diction of “recapitulation” or restoration of a former state of affairs gone lost and now regained. Remember Heraclitus,⁶⁵ the Greek philosopher of old, who said: “war is the father of all things.” And if the word “war” is unacceptable, we could translate it into a less dramatic and more common phenomenon of everyday life, which need not have deleterious consequences: bloodless conflicts, out of which the dynamics of daily life and even politics at all levels is made.

The force of a comparative! Reconciliation, too, is asymptotic, because love is never merited, and, as a consequence, there remains the never exhausted way of forgiving, asking for forgiveness, and accepting forgiveness. Comparison is not: *nach oben bücken, nach unten drücken*, the image of someone who rides the bicycle, bowing in front of those above and trampling those below. On the contrary, we must put ourselves in line with God. The Catholic here distinguishes himself from the Muslim’s “Allah hu akbar,” by Western positive apophaticism. And yet the Greek word for reconciliation is *apocatastasis*, which tends to be all-inclusive some going so far as supposing that the devil would be such a beneficiary. Apocatastasis has had its story of woe, being condemned in 553, though probably in a *synodos endemousa*, a home synod while waiting for the concil-

64. In his poem, *Hyperion*, Hölderlin says, more exactly: “Wie der Zwist der Liebenden sind die Differenzen der Welt. Versöhnung ist mitten im Streit und alles getrennte findet sich wieder.” It is an echo of the adage of the Roman poet Terence (d. 159 BC), “Amantium irae reintegratio amoris est,” Lovers’ strife is what makes love thrive.

65. Friedrich Copleston, *History of Philosophy*, I (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1946), 39–41.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

iar fathers to arrive, and not in Constantinople II, also in 553. A point which S. Bulgakov likes to make, because it fits in neatly with his idea of *apocatastasis*.⁶⁶

However the case may be, Ignatius certainly knew nothing of this *apocatastasis* in its eschatological implications, but certainly believed that peace can be established within the Catholic Church where there is a place for everyone. His letters to the Negus show that good will could function to gain people to the Church's view.⁶⁷ Unfortunately, the proselytism practiced by Jesuits in this far-off land did indeed lead to gaining Negus Suesenios for the Catholic Church, but the intransigence of the Jesuits by way of insisting on a celibacy for priests foreign to their own tradition, but which they imposed and other Latin means so foreign to this brave people led to the inevitable—a terrible civil war and the chasing of the Jesuits.⁶⁸ Elsewhere, however, Jesuits took Ignatius more on his appeal for adaptation, again: universality, in China with Matteo Ricci (1552–1610)⁶⁹ and in India with Roberto de Nobili (1577–1656)⁷⁰ it did work.

We need not take up here the discernment of spirits and its role in pacifying the soul⁷¹; as for pacifying the Church we have already discussed this in “St. Ignatius of Loyola, Theology of the Heart and Theological Discord.”⁷²

66. Sergius Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God* (Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2008), 151–152; cf. Franz Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert und das 5. allgemeine Konzil* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1899), 90, showed that Origen was indeed condemned again in 553, but not in Constantinople II, but in the home synod which took place *before* this ecumenical council. Many scholars, but not all, have followed Diekamp ever since.

67. Ignatius, “To Claudius, Negus of Ethiopia,” in *Ignatius of Loyola: Letters and Instructions*, ed. John W. Padberg and John L. McCarthy, trans. Martin E. Palmer (St Louis, Mo: Institute for Advanced Jesuit Studies, 2006), 544–549.

68. Caraman, *The Lost Empire*, 115–158.

69. Nicolas Standaert, S.J., “Ricci, Matteo, SJ (1552–1611),” *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Jesuits*, 683–685.

70. Leonardo Fernando, S.J., “Nobili, Roberto de, SJ (1577–1676),” *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Jesuits*, 558–560.

71. Hugo Rahner, “The Application of the Senses,” *Ignatius the Theologian*, 192.

72. In Robert J. Daly and Patrick Howell, eds., *Thinking and Feeling with the Churches: Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Jesuit Ecumenists, Vienna, Austria, 13–19 July 2015* (Chestnut Hill: Institute for Advanced Jesuit Studies, 2017), 9–32.

4 Ignatius' idea of reconciliation—parochial ripples or ecumenical tidal waves?

At this point, one may have the sneaking suspicion: is this not all something specific to one religious Order but that deep down has nothing to do with the ecumenical chessboard at large? Is what is good for the Jesuits also good for the Church as a whole? What has this got to do with reconciliation in practice? In what follows, we shall try to fathom what possible windows are opened by the Exercises towards the West and the East.

4.1 Przywara's point

At the end of the explanation of the 20 Annotations of Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises, the saint's instructions of how to do or give the Exercises, Erich Przywara, leaves no doubt about the concrete meaning of the More: "The More, which characterizes the style of the Exercises, is the more of the 'ever greater love' (1 Cor 13:13): 'And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love'" (NRSV).⁷³ Describing the More in terms of love means inflecting to the maximum at the highest level, without overextending, the universal import of this comparative. Still, at the level of the concrete, a further dimension merits attention. An earlier work by Przywara, to which *Deus Semper maior* was simply meant to be the follow-up and, indeed, create a twin composition, was in the ensuing debate to shed light not only on the Exercises, but also on their basic drive on reconciliation with God, with one's neighbor and with oneself, by widening the horizon to a new dimension—the philosophical.

a.) In effect, when Przywara published his *Analogia entis*,⁷⁴ he presented it as the basic Catholic form (*Grundform*) of God-talk. Meant to be an answer to Karl Barth's dialectical theology and his idea of God as utterly different from the human, *totaliter aliter*,⁷⁵ it did not leave Barth indifferent, who was quick to

73. Przywara, *Deus semper maior*, I, 43.

74. First published in München in 1932.

75. Joseph Palakeel, *The Use of Analogy in Theological Discourse: An Investigation in Ecumenical Perspective* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1995), 126.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

condemn the *analogia entis* as the work of Antichrist.⁷⁶ Barth's point was that theology has to present exclusively God's Word, and not man's word. While Przywara's own idea of analogy, read through the lens of Francisco Suarez, S.J., (1548–1617) was philosophical in import and Thomistic in orientation rather than the more theological orientation as in the original Thomasian analogy,⁷⁷ his publishing *Deus Semper Maior* in three volumes a few years later accounted for balance in his system. Yet Przywara's overstressing the dissimilarity—"the greater the similarity, still greater the dissimilarity"—was due to that unfortunate Latin word *tanta* in the translation of the corresponding constitution of Lateran IV (1215).⁷⁸ As the discussion between Barth and Przywara wore on, it found its solution thanks to the dialogue between Barth and von Balthasar.⁷⁹

It was Przywara who had introduced H. U. v. Balthasar to analogy; for the latter, analogy came to occupy the mid-point between absolute transcendence and a thoroughgoing immanence. From Przywara's *analogia entis* versus Barth's dialectical theology ("God above us" and "God within us") we reach a more harmonious relation between the *analogia entis* as the hallmark of Catholic thinking, and the *analogia fidei* as the hallmark of Protestant thought.⁸⁰ While calling Barth's analogy of faith an "analogy of advent,"⁸¹ and expressing great criti-

76. Karl Barth, *Nein! Antwort an Emil Brunner*, *Theologische Existenz heute* 14 (München: Kaiser, 1934). In *Die Sache mit Gott* (München: Piper, 1966), 80–81, Heinz Zahrnt describes this work as "maßlos in ihrer Polemik, maßlos in ihrem Nichtverstehenwollen und – in ihrer Christlichkeit." See Palakal, *The Use of Analogy*, 9, 34, which describes this work not only a condemnation of *analogia entis* as the work of the Antichrist, but also of the recourse to philosophy in both Catholicism and Protestantism.

77. Palakal, *The Use of Analogy*, 100. Thomasian refers to Thomas' own writings, as distinguished from Thomistic, Thomists' interpretations.

78. Palakal, *The Use of Analogy*, 105.

79. Hans U. v. Balthasar, "Analogie und Dialektik: Zur Erklärung der theologischen Prinzipienlehre Karl Barths," *Divus Thomas* 22 (1944): 171–216; von Balthasar, "Analogie und Natur: Zur Erklärung der theologischen Prinzipienlehre Karl Barths," *Divus Thomas* 23 (1945): 3–56; Palakal, *The Use of Analogy*, 124–125.

80. Palakal, *The Use of Analogy*, 103–129.

81. Palakal, *The Use of Analogy*, 163.

cal admiration for Przywara,⁸² Eberhard Jüngel,⁸³ one of the best known Barth scholars, sought to clarify matters in two ways. On the one hand, analogy as interpreted by Przywara does *not* amount to an aspect of natural theology, as if it were an attempt to force one's way to God, for God eludes our grasp the closer we draw to him.⁸⁴ On the other hand, Jüngel wants to establish an ever-increasing *similarity* in spite of greater dissimilarity.⁸⁵

b.) *Przywara's understanding of analogy.* Przywara takes as his axiom what Lateran IV has to say on analogy: "*inter creatorem et creaturam non potest tanta similitudo notari, quin inter eos sit dissimilitudo notanda*" (D 432).⁸⁶ The adjective *tanta*, however, had surreptitiously crept into the original Lateran text and was later dropped, for example, in DH 806, whereas it is the text with the *tanta*, that Przywara employs in his 1957 text.⁸⁷

c.) *Przywara's Deus semper maior, a spiritual correlative to his Analogia entis.* Przywara sets out by explaining the twofold fruit of the Exercises the exercitants may expect: the augmenting of inner freedom by learning to perceive and savour the mysteries of God from within, that is, a sort of congenital resounding of the mysteries they are meditating and contemplating, resulting in insight and affection. The second inner freedom of the exercitant accrues from this cognitive and affective abundance, thereby attaining freedom in the distance con-

82. Palakal, *The Use of Analogy*, 196f.

83. Eberhard Jüngel, *Gottes Sein ist im Werden: Verantwortliche Rede vom Sein Gottes bei Karl Barth. Eine Paraphrase* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986).

84. Eberhard Jüngel, *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1977), 356–357: "Borrowing an expression from Karl Barth and taking up an expression from the New Testament, . . . we understand the analogia of faith, with Erich Przywara, as reduction, or better, as introduction to mystery, as a return to mystery." See also Martha Zechmeister, "Przywara, Erich," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 8 (1999), 688–689.

85. Palakal, *The Use of Analogy*, 197.

86. *Heinrich Denzinger: The Sources of Catholic Dogma*, from the Thirtieth Edition of Henry Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, trans. by Roy J. Deferrari, from the 30th ed. revised by Karl Rahner (Fitzwilliam, NH: Loreto Publications, 1955). The full context clearly distinguishes between the union of nature (John 17:22) prevailing between the three divine Persons and the union of grace (Matt 5:48) obtaining between God and the deified creature. . . ."

87. Erich Przywara, "Analogia entis. III. Die lateranische Formel," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 1 (1957), 470–473, here 471.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

fronted with the “ever greater God.” Having to do with the *Deus semper maior*, our inner freedom increases in proportion to our *perception* of God’s hitherto unnoticed greatness, now the more tangible the more the soul comes to breathe the air of his infinity.⁸⁸ Once assimilated by the exercitants, this *magis* comes to influence the decisions when they have to make the discernment of spirits.⁸⁹ In the Rules for thinking in and with the Church talk is of seeking to perform “the greater service” for the glory of God (no. 98). In the Contemplation to Attain Love, the circle comes full round and the contemplation of the Foundation meets half-way the Contemplation on Acquiring Love. In both cases one may form the impression that the supernatural, and indeed, all that is specifically Christian and ecclesial are absorbed by the terms Creator and creation. Both, however, speak rather the language of Lateran IV that however great the union with the Creator, the greater is the dissimilarity between both.⁹⁰

d.) Przywara handsomely belies this. His *Deus semper maior* came to shed a new light on *Analogia entis*. At a time when ecumenism was a forbidden theme, Przywara afforded a parallel to his major work, *Analogia entis*, in such a way that the two works complement one another; or, in Eastern theological terms, he used the method of the union of dogma and spirituality, not in the same work, but in two works, which nonetheless form a unison. This is however a no mean achievement, especially for the times in which he was writing. Then, in his *Laudatio*, K. Rahner says that Przywara put a Scholastic subtlety (“Spitzfindigkeit”) on the front of theology.⁹¹ Eventually K. Barth came around to think better of Przywara’s *analogia entis*, and Barth’s renowned disciple Eberhard Jüngel redeemed from it its initial controversial ignominy, calling Przywara’s work one that cannot be admired enough.⁹² The later Barth changed his position, only

88. Przywara, *Deus semper maior*, I, 25–26.

89. Przywara, *Deus semper maior*, II, 142, 146–148.

90. Przywara, *Deus semper maior*, III, 338–367.

91. Karl Rahner, “Laudatio auf Erich Przywara,” in KRSW 22, bearbeitet von Albert Raffalt (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2008), 670: “Durch ihn wurde [...] die ‚analogia entis‘ aus einer kleinen scholastischen Spitzfindigkeit zur ‚Grundstruktur‘ des Katholischen”.

92. Jüngel, *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt*, 357. Jüngel further notes that K. Rahner re-interpreted Thomas’ “Analogie der Seinhabe” in the sense that man necessarily is a hearer of

he now feared that “the analogia entis would not do justice to the difference between God and man by overlooking the nearness of God.”⁹³ Jüngel is trying to build upon this insight of the late Barth, combining it with the concerns of the late Przywara. He wants to build a system where the ever-greater dissimilarity within greater similarity is substituted by the opposite principle of ever greater similarity within all dissimilarity.⁹⁴

e.) *Przywara’s impact.* Admittedly, Przywara is no longer a household word even in theological circles, but certainly not because his day is over. According to v. Balthasar, theology at large has chosen the easier way to ignore him.⁹⁵ But Rahner felt that theologians in the future will start listening to him again and more. That he still counts may be seen by the fact that when John Paul II visited Munich in 1980, he mentioned Przywara among the great German Catholic theologians that had made a difference.⁹⁶

Ignatius’s reconciliation has having a universal dimension in the ever-widening embrace of love between the exercitant and the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The debate about *Deus semper maior* shows us that, over and above, the Ignatian dynamic has led to an unsuspected and positive contact to the evangelical West.

4.2 How much does Ignatius’ universality fit in line with Eastern theology?

Ignatius’ interest in the Christian East to begin with was a sort of existential that conditioned his whole life after conversion and his initial plan to go and settle

the Word, for he is inevitably referred to a possible Word of God. For the Lutheran Jüngel, it is the decision of faith that makes analogy the analogy of faith, 384, 385–398. For the answer to K. Barth’s misunderstanding of *analogia entis* Hans U. v. Balthasar has given an answer in his work: *Karl Barth: Darstellung und Deutung seiner Theologie* (Köln: Hegner, 1962), 175ff.

93. Jüngel, *Gott als Geheimnis der Welt*, 385.

94. Palakal, *The Use of Analogy*, 198.

95. Hans U. v. Balthasar, “Erich Przywara,” in *Tendenzen der Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert*, hg. Hans-Jürgen Schulz (Stuttgart: Kreuz-Verlag, 1966), 354–359, here 359.

96. Friedrich Wulf, “Przywara, Erich,” *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* XII.2 (1986), 2493–2501, here 2500.

Reconciliation in Ignatius: Force of a Comparative

in Jerusalem, settling instead for Rome as the second-best thing after Jerusalem and a symbol for it.⁹⁷

(a) *Ignatius' interest in the Fathers.* Equally strong, and as a concomitant of his life orientation, is Ignatius' ductus to the Fathers of the Church, so thick that their influence on the genesis of the *Spiritual Exercises* has been object of various studies. Hear we mention two in particular: Hugo Rahner, "Ignatius and the Ascetic Tradition of the Fathers," and H. Bacht, "The early monastic foundations of Ignatian Spirituality."⁹⁸ The founder had a great love of the Fathers, and that not from any antiquarian interest, but from his great desire to set his burgeoning Society in tune with the primitive Church. The love for the Church of the Fathers is manifest already in some writings of the young Ignatius⁹⁹ and the latter's source Origen.¹⁰⁰ Yet from the start we must say that Ignatius was particularly interested in finding patristic support for his religious ideal of monasticism in general, Ignatius refers to be sure to Athanasius' *Life of St. Antony*, for many the Magna Carta of Christian Monasticism, even if, as Bacht affirms, the word pneumatikos appears there only once, unlike in Evagrius, so revered in Syriac monastic obedience. As Hugo Rahner aptly puts it, "The great Fathers of the Church, Greek and Latin alike, were for him [Ignatius] a shining light in the development of his philosophy of using human means for divine ends."

Of course, once Ignatius gained Juan Polanco as secretary, scholar and manager at one and the same time, there is a marked difference in the professional manner in which Ignatius refers to the Fathers, but the latter's being well-versed in the Fathers would not have prevailed were it not for Ignatius' overriding in-

97. Farrugia, "Im Banne des Orients," 397–408.

98. H. Rahner, "Ignatius and the ascetic tradition of the Fathers," 32–52, and Heinrich Bacht, "Die frühmonastischen Grundlagen ignatianischer Frömmigkeit: Zu einigen Grundbegriffen der Exerzitien," in *Ignatius von Loyola: seine geistliche Gestalt und sein Vermächtnis, 1556–1956*, hg. Friedrich Wulf (Würzburg: Echter, 1956), 225–261. Bacht tells us the difference between the two studies, 229: H. Rahner wants to establish which patristic authors Ignatius used and which expressions did he take from them, whereas H. Bacht asks about the motives which led Ignatius took from the Fathers, their original meaning and their function in Ignatius' way of thinking.

99. Robert Beulay, *La lumière sans forme : Introduction à l'étude de la mystique chrétienne syro-orientale*, L'Esprit et le Feu (Chevetogne, Belgique: s. e., 1987), 16–34.

100. Bacht, "Die frühmonastischen Grundlagen ignatianischer Frömmigkeit," 235.

terests. This point can be proven by what Ignatius wrote without any help from Polanco, as when in 1540 the founder writes to his fellow townsmen in Azpeitia referring to a passage ascribed to St. Augustine.¹⁰¹ Bacht furnishes another example, namely that the title of “Spiritual Exercises” does not come from the Bible immediately, but from the progress the concept had made from the time of John Cassian (d. ca. 360–425). But although, as is evident from the first Annotation, the *Exercises* proceed by harnessing the will to ascetical training, this is meant only as a tool in the hands of the Spirit, which goes to show how profound the roots of the *Exercises* shoot down into the spirituality of the East, as the very name betrays: *Spiritual Exercises*.¹⁰² This is once more underlined by the rules of the discernment of the Spirit, which hark back to Evagrius, Origen and Diadochus of Photice, and, furthermore, through the roll of the director of the Exercises,¹⁰³ better known in the East as spiritual father or mother in general, the Desert Fathers, indicated by Daniel, Moses and the *Via Patrum*.¹⁰⁴ Bacht rounds up by saying that his point was not to add another attempt to derive the *Spiritual Exercises* from the Fathers, but rather to show how deeply rooted they are in the Fathers. Our investigation has clearly shown how essential element of that spirituality which developed in early Eastern monasticism become tangible in the spirituality of the *Exercises*.¹⁰⁵

While in his early period Ignatius was still bound by the immediately available medieval spirituality, his reading especially of the Carthusian monk, Ludolf of Saxony’s *Vita Christi*, and the *Flos sanctorum*, roused in him a thirst for the patristic literature as medieval understood it, and this already in the period of convalescence at Loyola.¹⁰⁶

101. H. Rahner, “Ascetic Tradition of the Fathers,” 35–38, here 36.

102. Bacht, “Die frühmonastischen Grundlagen,” 238–239.

103. Bacht, “Die frühmonastischen Grundlagen,” 246–258.

104. H. Rahner, “Ascetic Tradition of the Fathers,” 40.

105. Bacht, “Die frühmonastischen Grundlagen,” 59.

106. H. Rahner, “Ascetic Tradition of the Fathers,” 57.

Conclusion

After so much harping on the more, there is yet another more to balance the equation of love and that is: less is more!

(1) Our conclusions seem to be minute, making for almost imperceptible changes, and practically irrelevant to ecumenical progress. This is not, however, the way Ignatius would have tackled the problem. If one really wants to do something at all, one has to start with oneself, listen to his throbbing heart in the examination of conscience. This so much underestimated form of prayer, underestimated because often completely misunderstood, is, for Ignatius, the first prayer¹⁰⁷ in importance for change. But as in most great enterprises, *c'est le premier pas qui compte*, it's the first step that matters, as with the Chinese proverb that a journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step. Love, covering as it does all aspects of human endeavor, insists on learning rather than on teaching—that learning from others can be in the long run more profitable for ecumenism, for it is the straw that breaks the camel's back—we are thrown back to the origins of Ignatius' own conversion and his later more refined “conversion from his earlier conversion” by abandoning his ascetic eccentricities and returning to the common dress.¹⁰⁸ The *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius and his other resources may indeed serve, as we saw in the other Congress on *Thinking and Feeling with the Churches*, even on a conciliar level to promote peace through reconciliation.¹⁰⁹

An analogy may help. Just as medicine came long ways when it discovered micro-biology, so, too, more and direct group dynamics may profit for the cause of Christian unity by devoting more attention to micro-spirituality and micro-

107. Already in the second Annotation (2) he mentions examination of conscience first in enumerating the types of prayer that compound the *Spiritual Exercises*.

108. Hugo Rahner, “Ignatius of Loyola and Philip Neri”, in *Ignatius of Loyola: His personality and Spiritual Heritage (1556-1956)*, hg. F. Wulf (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1956), 45–68, here 48: “It was a long way from the pilgrim's sackcloth to the ‘devotion to ordinary dress’ which, in his mature years, he called a characteristic of genuine spiritualization.”

109. Farrugia, “St. Ignatius of Loyola, Theology of the Heart and Theological Discord,” 9–32; see, in particular, “*Concordia dissonantium*,” 26–31.

ecumenism, on the adage that ecumenism begins at home! All this receives a poignancy when we turn to Przywara's interpretation of Ignatius in his *Exercises*, where we discern a double movement expressed in the universality implicit in the title "*Deus semper maior*." In regards to fellow human beings, love expands to include the *coincidentia oppositorum*;¹¹⁰ in regards to God, love seeks to become perfect like God (Mt 5:48, repeated in 19:21) follows an inverse course: the closer to God, the greater the mystery, so that God inevitably exceeds our horizons. This closeness to God is underlined in Eastern theology by using *prepodobnyj* (similar to God) for saints, and for the Mother of God is called *vsjaprepodobnaja* (the most similar to God). Moreover, the East inculcates this lesson on one and all; deification being the name of the game. The bottom line is, however, that a man can survive in the coincidence of opposites through his greater closer and increasing similarity to God.

(2) Ignatius' idea of reconciliation, with God, with man, and with oneself, is best charted in his *Spiritual Exercises*, right from the word "go!" Trying to save our neighbor's affirmation can take us long ways, and Ignatius' suggestion of how to deal with such saving operations is elaborate, but it is not infinite, for it knows of two exits, even when dealing with the divine. Not to let ourselves be covered by anything, however imposing, and not to give up doing good even under the most restrictive circumstances, is divine. This can render us open to God's gifts—an opening which is itself a divine gift—if we follow the dynamics of the *Spiritual Exercises*, which we here have tried to exemplify, always within the context of the *Exercises*, in terms of how Ignatius argued, decided and considered to be the ideal to be striven after ("thought").

(3) The implications are several. In the case of Societal dynamics, it is the research of universality in terms of excellence, symbolized by the AMDG, that should be our goal in avoiding all too parochial solutions. Finally, an attempt was made to show that, in point of fact, this more is open both to the evangelical wing of Christianity and to the Eastern presence in the Church.

110. If the always greater God leads our theological to mystery, *reductio ad mysterium*, the ecclesial common striving for the common goal leads us to the *coincidentia oppositorum*, Przywara, "*Analogia entis*," etc., 472, which, if it does not vie with the depths of the *reductio*, may make the way to peace inaccessible.

Reconciliation from a Sociological Perspective

PROFESSOR JOHN D. BREWER

This address explores the meaning of reconciliation from a sociological perspective. It first makes the case for why a sociological perspective on reconciliation is useful and then proceeds to outline a sociological approach and to apply it to the problem of reconciliation in Northern Ireland. The Northern Irish situation is unusual in that it is left with the problem of how to develop moral sensibility that reproduces the idea of society again after conflict, when there is no overarching moral framework or sacred canopy. This address proffered one solution to this problem.

There are many things about reconciliation that are sociological. Sociology helps us understand, for example, the kinds of people who practice it and who refuse to do so, the kinds of social relationships through which it is practiced, the social structural conditions that help sustain it or which undermine it, and the consequences for people in society when it is present or absent.

I want to take a different direction and ask how sociology helps us understand the *meaning* of reconciliation. When having done this, I then want to use this conceptual mapping to understand the strengths and weaknesses of Northern Ireland's practice of reconciliation since 1998 and the signing of the Good Friday or Belfast Agreement.

However, let me first ask why sociology is necessary for understanding the meaning of reconciliation. Reconciliation is one of the "ordinary virtues," as Michael Ignatieff terms them, part of a moral sensibility or moral compass in which sociability is embedded. By sociability I mean the capacity to live with others in society; sociability is what makes social life possible, turning us away from being islands unto ourselves, and towards us living as social animals. Thus, sociability reproduces the very idea of society itself.

There are many ordinary virtues that comprise this moral sensibility and on which sociability depends—ordinary virtues like forgiveness, compassion, emotional empathy, tolerance, compromise, respect, and mercy. Reconciliation takes its place amongst them, no greater or less in my opinion than any of the other ordinary virtues.

As a sociologist I recognize that moral sensibility, and the sociability it facilitates, can be rooted in individual personality traits—what Victorians once called character—but my primary emphasis as a sociologist is on the cultural values that make moral sensibility as much social and cultural as individual and personal. It is these broader cultural values that function like a “sacred canopy,” to use the late Peter Berger’s famous phrase, enveloping and encompassing the moral sensibility of the people living underneath.

There are some societies emerging out of conflict, where moral sensibility, and thus sociability, is grounded in the continuance of traditional value systems that survived the conflict. These traditional, pre-modern, value systems helped furnish the modern meaning to reconciliation and sustained its practice. The role of the traditional value systems known as *gacaca* in Rwanda, *Ubuntu* in South Africa and *wan bel* (“one belly”) in Melanesian cultures, for example, assisted in expanding the understanding of transitional justice practices like forgiveness, reconciliation and emotional repair. Reconciliation and healing in these societies benefited from the survival of these pre-modern moral sensibilities.

The problem for Northern Ireland is that there is no equivalent value system to give meaning to moral sensibility and to sustain sociability. Christianity does not do this because religion is perceived as part of the problem, not as part of the solution, and there is growing secularization and non-belief across the Island of Ireland.

This leaves Northern Ireland with a profound sociological problem: how to develop moral sensibility that reproduces the idea of society again after conflict, when there is no overarching moral framework or sacred canopy?

I suggest that by better understanding what reconciliation means sociologically, we can at least begin to practice it better.

Reconciliation from a Sociological Perspective

Let me move, then, to the conceptual remapping of reconciliation. I want to make five distinctions or antinomies that deconstruct the meaning of reconciliation and show its layers:

1. Reconciliation as passive or active
2. Reconciliation as negative or positive
3. Reconciliation as conflict transformation or social transformation
4. Reconciliation as state building or peacebuilding, and
5. Reconciliation as a political process or a social process

Let me expand briefly on these. Everybody likes the idea of reconciliation; it is like mothers and apple pie, as the Americans say. Reconciliation, however, needs to be more than a good idea; it needs to become a life's vocation, something practiced as part of everyday life. If it is to be active, reconciliation as fine-sounding words needs to become reconciliation as a daily commitment.

Reconciliation as an active rather than passive moral sensibility can be negative or positive. It is negative when the moral sensibility seeks merely an ending to the killings; it is positive when reconciliation further addresses the social injustices, inequalities and unfairness that provoked the conflict in the first place. Reconciliation as a form of conflict transformation that brings a truce in the war is quite different from the reconciliation that seeks social transformation to eliminate social injustice. Stopping present killings is important but eliminating the causes of war is a greater ambition for reconciliation. Conflict transformation leave violence dormant; social transformation eliminates it.

Active reconciliation oriented to social transformation, however, can be focused on institutional reform to improve the governance structures of the state or it can address healing in society to restore broken relationships, rebuild trust and rebuild resilient communities. Reconciliation as state building or reconciliation as peacebuilding is an important distinction. The former focuses on institutional reform to eliminate problematic politics to improve the effectiveness of

governance structures—reforming parliament, voting systems, key social institutions like the police, civil service and the like, and creating new institutions to monitor the effectiveness of new governance structures, like a human rights commission or an equality commission.

State building is premised on the assumption that once problematic politics is eliminated, society suddenly heals, and formerly warring communities reconcile by beginning to love and trust one another. This is naïve. Social trust needs to be rebuilt, broken social relationships need to be repaired, and resilience in communities restored. This does not emerge spontaneously; it has to be worked at over a very long time. This requires peacebuilding as much as state building. Reconciliation can thus be understood as a moral sensibility that is oriented to politics or oriented to society, focused on institutional reform to build a strong state or on societal healing to build strong communities.

The following diagram summarizes the polar extremes that distinguish the different meanings and layers to reconciliation:

Reconciliation in Northern Ireland

Passive	Active
Negative	Positive
Conflict transformation	Social transformation
State building	Peacebuilding
Political	Social

With this conceptual mapping, what can we say about Northern Ireland's achievements in reconciliation since 1998 and the signing of the Good Friday or Belfast Agreement? It must be said that disagreement over what to call it did not bode well for its accomplishments. I suggest that reconciliation has largely been accomplished at the left-hand pole of the continuum. It has been primarily passive, keen to stop killings but not engage in social transformation, focused politically on state building to the neglect of peacebuilding, such that there has been little progress in societal healing.

Reconciliation from a Sociological Perspective

We should not devalue the gains. If truth is the first casualty of war, perspective is the first casualty of peace, as we lose sight of how much has been achieved. A great deal has been achieved at the left-hand pole of the continuum. Most people are committed to the idea of reconciliation; just not yet as many to its daily practice. Most people want change; it is just that, at the moment, they expect everyone else to do all the changing. The killings have largely stopped, and conflict transformation has been successful. There have been 154 conflict-related deaths since the signing of the Agreement; this is 154 too many but at the height of the conflict there could be 154 in a month. State building has been effective—new power sharing arrangements, new voting systems, the reform of the police, and the release of prisoners; and the new institutions created under the Agreement are working effectively and with wide legitimacy, most notably, for example, the Human Rights Commission, the Equality Commission, the Policing Board, and the Office of the Police Ombudsman.

There has been abject failure, however, to focus on peacebuilding. Healing in society has not been the emphasis. There is no focus on helping us learn to live together; no debate about the moral vision of a shared future. There is an absence of social trust, no respect for diversity, and little forgiveness. Reconciliation on the right-hand side of the poles has not failed; it has not even been attempted. The power-sharing arrangements that form a key part of the state building are suspended, precisely because of disagreements over the extent of the social transformation Northern Ireland requires, as some parties try to resist the parity of esteem and equality agenda that were part of the 1998 Agreement.

This is not only the failure of the politicians. It is everyone's fault. We have churches evading their responsibility in the public sphere to debate moral sensibilities like the meaning of forgiveness, mercy and compassion; we have a media obsessed with conflict journalism that re-fights the morality of the war rather than helps us to learn to live together; and we have a civil society still largely divided along sectarian lines. We have communities with walls keeping them apart and media broadcasters providing daily platforms where people look for opportunities to be offended rather than be encouraged to respect diversity.

Meanwhile the need for societal healing as part of a peacebuilding process is nowhere better reflected than in the fact that there have been more deaths by suicide since 1998 than during the whole of the conflict we colloquially know as “the Troubles.” There are more peace walls now than during the war, reflecting the high levels of mistrust and fear in neighboring communities.

This form of reconciliation has delivered a cold peace: there has been a reduction in violence and a transformation in its nature, but, while people live side-by-side without killing one another, people still live in separate social worlds. Separateness is effortlessly reproduced, generation after generation, through the normal workings of society. Social institutions reproduce separateness through segregated housing, segregated schooling, segregated friendship patterns, segregated marriages, and segregated cultural and leisure lives. This separation is not total like a legally enforced apartheid in South Africa, nor imposed by physical force as in the West Bank, but cultural separation is reproduced far too much, far too successfully for reconciliation at the right-hand pole to have occurred.

What then of sociology? Let me conclude by saying that sociology enables us to see that reconciliation in post-1998 Northern Ireland confronts a type of social structure that discourages its practice. Reconciliation comes up against a type of society that discourages it. Sociology points to the layers and forms of reconciliation that we need to prioritize more if people are to have a warmer peace: the need to make reconciliation an active process as part of our daily lives, to prioritize social transformation in order to eliminate injustice, to focus on societal healing as much as institutional reform so that peacebuilding not state building is the priority, in order to rebuild social trust, repair broken relationships and rebuild resilient communities.

Let me suggest that sociology also points to the future. Sociology teaches us that reconciliation is too important to be left to politicians; it is everyone’s responsibility. Reconcilers need to take back control of the reconciliation process and encourage a new way of thinking about reconciliation. Sociology proffers this new approach by seeing reconciliation as an everyday skill to be practiced as part of everyone’s daily lives: in school, in the workplace; in the supermar-

Reconciliation from a Sociological Perspective

ket; over the garden fence; at leisure, at home, at work. It is not a professional skill that requires years of training and a formal qualification; it is not to be delegated to so-called “experts.” Reconciliation is an everyday life skill we all possess as part of our moral sensibility when we seek, in ordinary, daily ways, to restore sociability after conflict, and when we are motivated by a moral ethic that seeks to ensure that our children and our grandchildren do not have to live through what we lived through.

Receptive Ecumenism and ARCIC III

ANTHONY T. CURREN

Focusing on the ARCIC documents, this essay compares two ecumenical methods, differentiated consensus and receptive ecumenism. It notes that Catholic authorities always find issues viewed in the earlier ARCIC statements as secondary, using the differentiated ecumenism method, to be essential elements of Catholic doctrine. This model tends to be static. The receptive ecumenism model, found in ARCIC's 2018 report, "Walking Together on the Way," challenges both traditions to address deficiencies and weaknesses in their own positions by examining what they might learn from each other.

It seems that there are currently two ecumenical models in vogue: Differentiated Consensus and Receptive Ecumenism. The argument in this chapter is that ARCIC I, and ARCIC II's first document, *Salvation and the Church*, were essentially differentiated consensus documents. However, the responses to ARCIC's work, particularly those from the CDF in the 1980s and 1990s, posed a significant challenge to both ARCIC and differentiated consensus. This prompted both a return to the ecumenical vision of the Second Vatican Council and recognition of the need for a new method which the Commission found in Receptive Ecumenism, the governing method of *Walking Together on the Way (WTW)*.¹

In focusing on those sections of the Catholic responses to ARCIC I and II where I think the documents successfully identify limits with ARCIC's use of differentiated consensus, this chapter is not intended as an uncritical endorsement of the responses. Rather, it is concerned to show how ARCIC has engaged with and responded to those official responses, and to highlight the new possibilities presented by the use of Receptive Ecumenism in ARCIC III.

1. ARCIC, *Walking Together on the Way: Learning to Be Church—Local, Regional, Universal* (London: SPCK, 2018).

Announcing a new method

The communique from ARCIC III's first plenary meeting in 2011 declared the Commission's intent to use the method of Receptive Ecumenism which it described as seeking "to make ecumenical progress by learning from our partner, rather than simply asking our partner to learn from us." The statement went on:

Receptive ecumenism is more about self-examination and inner conversion than convincing the other; Anglicans and Roman Catholics can help each other grow in faith, life and witness to Christ if they are open to being transformed by God's grace mediated through each other.²

No further mention is made of method or Receptive Ecumenism in communiqués until that issued from the 2014 Durban plenary three years later.³ That document stated, "At this meeting, ARCIC III discussed its method and agreed that it would build on that of ARCIC I and II, integrated with the method of Receptive Ecumenism. In the light of this work, the Schema prepared at the first meeting of ARCIC III in 2011 was revised." Another two meetings passed without comment on method. Then the Erfurt 2017 plenary triumphantly announced the first ARCIC agreed statement since 2005, *Walking Together on the Way*, and its use of the method of Receptive Ecumenism. "This method," the communique states, "invites both traditions to repentance and conversion, by looking at what is underdeveloped or wounded in themselves. It is also predicated on the belief that in our dialogue partner we meet a community in which the Holy Spirit is alive and active."⁴

Communiqués are more or less the only word issued from behind the closed doors of bilateral dialogues. A keen eye will notice, however, that the Durban communique rows back on the Bose's more enthusiastic embrace of Receptive Ecumenism, setting it alongside the other methods. This indicates that within ARCIC, as in the ecumenical world more generally, an important discussion has

2. ARCIC, Communique (27 May 2011), <https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=39>. See also Paul D. Murray, "ARCIC III: Recognising the Need for an Ecumenical Gear-Change," *One in Christ* 45 (2011): 200–211.

3. ARCIC, Communique (20 May 2014), <https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=95>.

4. ARCIC, Communique (20 May 2017), <https://iarccum.org/doc/?d=1295>.

Receptive Ecumenism and ARCIC III

been taking place about method and about how dialogue can most effectively contribute to the unity of the churches.

One reason for the intermittent mention of method in the communiques is that ARCIC III was busy with other things. As well as its mandate to examine “the Church as Communion, local and universal, and how in communion the local and universal Church come to discern right ethical teaching” the commission was also asked to present ARCIC’s work as a corpus. Thus, *Looking Towards a Church Fully Reconciled* presented ARCIC II’s five documents, with introductions, responses, bibliographies, plus nine essays on their method, theological themes, and history.⁵

The essential context to ARCIC III’s discussion of method and the launch-pad to the methodological choices ultimately made in *Walking Together on the Way*, therefore, is ARCIC’s backstory, particularly the reception of the documents of ARCIC I and II. While ARCIC may be described as a bilateral dialogue, it is in significant ways a multi-layered dialogue. It is never only two traditions talking to one another but is also a Commission responding to its past, and to the official and unofficial responses to its earlier work. Before looking at *Walking Together on the Way* in detail, therefore it is necessary to examine the influence of ARCIC and ARCIC II on the most recent dialogue.

ARCIC I & II as differentiated consensus

Differentiated consensus is less a programmatic strategy for ecumenical dialogue and more a descriptive account—developed mainly in the German-speaking world—of the method towards which the majority of bilateral dialogues naturally gravitated.⁶ Through the experience of bilateral dialogue it quickly

5. Adelbert Denaux, Nicholas Sagovsky, and Charles Sherlock, eds., *Looking towards a Church Fully Reconciled: The Final Report of the Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission 1983–2005 (ARCIC II)* (London: SPCK, 2016).

6. This presentation of differentiated consensus closely follows Chapter 7 of William G. Rusch, *Ecumenical Reception: Its Challenge and Opportunity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 117–134. For a detailed analysis of the issues, see Minna Hietamäki, *Agreeable Agreement: An Examination of the Quest for Consensus in Ecumenical Dialogue* (London: T&T Clark, 2010).

became evident that both sides came with confessional commitments and therefore it was unrealistic to imagine that one side would be persuaded to abandon its historic positions. Nor was it likely that both sides would attempt to reach a synthesis as this would again demand abandoning a historical theological stance. There could be no genuine unity that came about simply through one side's theological capitulation.

Instead the bilaterals constructed accounts of historically divisive theological issues that put front and center the degree of fundamental agreement between the dialogue partners. Then the dialogues noted a secondary level of remaining disagreement. As William Rusch explains, "Differentiated consensus is characterized by a double structure" in which there are two levels. The first and fundamental level is the level of consensus where there is "real and essential agreement." But alongside this first level consensus exists a second level where there are remaining differences "as real and essential as the agreements of the first level." However, these significant differences are "evaluated as tolerable or bearable in regard to the consensus on the first level."⁷ The ecumenical documents which can be identified as following a model of differentiated consensus give witness to the words of John XXIII cited in *Ut Unum Sint* 20 that, "What unites us is much greater than what divides us."

The most famous example and the greatest success of this method in Western Dialogue is the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* which claimed "a consensus in basic truths of the doctrine of justification."⁸ "In light of this consensus the remaining differences of language, theological elaboration, and emphasis" it went on to claim "do not destroy the consensus regarding the basic truths" (40).

ARCIC I fits this descriptive analysis. Already in the *Malta Report* (1968) we can identify the early indications of the method it would later adopt. The Preparatory Commission recognized convergences,

7. Rusch, *Ecumenical Reception*, 120–121.

8. Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church, *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* (1999), 1, <http://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/en/dialoghi/sezione-occidentale/luterani/dialogo/documenti-di-dialogo/1999-dichi-arazione-congiunta-sulla-dottrina-della-giustificazione/en.html>.

Receptive Ecumenism and ARCIC III

between the Anglican distinction of fundamentals from non-fundamentals and the distinction implied by the Vatican Council's references to a "hierarchy of truths" (Decree on Ecumenism, 11), to the difference between "revealed truths" and "the manner in which they are formulated" (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, 62), and to diversities in theological tradition being often "complementary rather than conflicting" (Decree on Ecumenism, 17).⁹

Each of these convergences has its place within differentiated consensus. However, it is in ARCIC I's agreed statements that we can most clearly identify the method. These claimed to have achieved a high level of consensus on both Eucharist and ministry, which in its first agreed statement, *Eucharistic Doctrine*,¹⁰ was described as "substantial agreement" (12), while acknowledging that in both areas secondary level differences remained that were unresolved.

ARCIC I's consensus statements were couched in language that could accommodate the historically adopted theological positions of both traditions. They deliberately avoided the vocabulary associated with the mutual condemnations of the sixteenth century, while taking care to be compatible with these same statements. Ordination, for example, is referred to as "this sacramental act":¹¹ a language that could accommodate statements of both the Council of Trent and the Thirty-nine Articles. This proved to be one of ARCIC's less successful statements. The 1979 *Elucidation of Ministry and Ordination* noted that its chosen terminology had not escaped criticism from both sides: those who regarded

9. Anglican-Roman Catholic Joint Preparatory Commission, "The Malta Report (1968)," in ARCIC, *The Final Report* (London: CTS/SPCK, 1982), 108–116, no. 6.

10. ARCIC, "Eucharistic Doctrine," in *The Final Report*, 11–16. Francis Sullivan claimed that ARCIC I claimed to have reached "substantial agreement" with regard to both Eucharist and ministry. See Francis A. Sullivan, "The Vatican Response to ARCIC I," *Gregorianum* 73 (1992): 489–498, here 491. However, ARCIC never described its agreements on ministry as "substantial agreement." This was in part due to the reaction to the use of the phrase in *Eucharistic Doctrine*, and Sullivan is right to say that ARCIC considered its agreement on Eucharist and ministry as greater and of more consequence than that achieved on authority. See, for example, "The Commission believes that its agreements have demonstrated a consensus in faith on eucharist and ministry which has brought closer the possibility of such acceptance [of the apostolicity of each other's orders]": ARCIC, "Ministry and Ordination: Elucidation" (1979), in *The Final Report*, 40–45, no. 6.

11. ARCIC, "Ministry and Ordination," in *The Final Report*, 29–39, no. 15.

it as demeaning the significance of the two “dominical sacraments”; and those who felt it did not adequately express the sacramentality of orders (3). However, even if it is an unflattering example and unrepresentative of the quality of ARCIC’s work, it remains a useful example in helping us understand its method.

ARCIC’s consensus statements sat alongside its acknowledgment of remaining differences. In regard to the Eucharist, the *Elucidation on Eucharistic Doctrine*¹² claimed, “That there can be a divergence in matters of practice and in theological judgments relating to them, without destroying a common eucharistic faith, illustrates what we mean by substantial agreement.” (9). Note that the Commission is using the phrase “substantial agreement” exactly as “differentiated consensus” is used in the JDDJ. Indeed the Commission shifts to the language of consensus as the text continues: “Differences of theology and practice may well coexist with a real consensus on the essentials of eucharistic faith—as in fact they do within each of our communions.”

The same method is again clearly in evidence in the first document of ARCIC’s second phase, *Salvation and the Church*. The Commission there claimed, “our two Communion are agreed on the essential aspects of the doctrine of salvation and on the Church’s role within it.” This did not mean, however, that differences of emphasis and expression did not remain, but rather that such differences were not of sufficient weight to obscure the consensus: “We are agreed that this is not an area where any remaining differences of theological interpre-

12. ARCIC, “Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidation,” in *The Final Report*, 17–25. Another example of ARCIC claiming remaining differences that do not damage their consensus statement can be found in the ARCIC statements on ministry. Between the publication of *Ministry and Ordination* in 1973 and its *Elucidation* in 1979 certain provinces of the Anglican Communion began to ordain women. This fact was noted in the *Elucidation* but the Commission nonetheless maintained “that the principles upon which its doctrinal agreement rests are not affected by such ordinations; for it was concerned with the origin and nature of the ordained ministry and not with the question who can or cannot be ordained” (*EM* 5). The Catholic authorities would take issue with this judgment. *The Official Response* 25: “The view of the Catholic Church in this matter has been expressed in an exchange of correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which it is made clear that the question of the subject of ordination is linked with the nature of the sacrament of Holy Orders. Differences in this connection must therefore affect the agreement reached on Ministry and Ordination.”

tation or ecclesiological emphasis, either within or between our Communion, can justify our continuing separation” (32).

Catholic responses as a challenge to differentiated consensus

The Catholic Church’s response to *The Final Report* came in two documents: *Observations on the Final Report of ARCIC* (henceforth *Observations*)¹³ issued by the CDF in 1982, and *The Catholic Church’s Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I* (henceforth *The Official Response*)¹⁴ issued jointly by the CDF and the PCPCU nine years later. Less formal criticism came also in a 1983 article penned then Prefect of the CDF, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, in which he defends the publication of *Observations*.¹⁵

These responses have been criticized as overly-negative on the basis of being insufficiently attentive to ecumenical method.¹⁶ An alternative reading is that the Catholic authorities not so much failed to understand what ARCIC was doing, as understood it and did not like it. They are critical of the method; they draw attention to its limits; and that is why their critique is important. I want to focus on the two fundamental parts of the differentiated consensus method and the challenge to each that the Catholic responses make. First, is the consensus a real consensus? Second, are the remaining differences truly secondary? A third challenge that comes from the Catholic responses concerns the practical difference that the agreed statements make to our ecclesial lives.

13. CDF, *Observations on the Final Report of ARCIC* (27 March 1982), https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19820327_animadversiones_en.html.

14. CDF and PCPCU, “The Catholic Church’s Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I” (1991), <http://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/en/dialoghi/sezione-occidentale/comunione-anglicana/dialogo/arcic-i/risposte-ai-lavori-di-arcic-i/testo-in-inglese2.html>.

15. Joseph Ratzinger, “Anglican-Catholic Dialogue: Its Problems and Hopes” [1983] in *Church, Ecumenism and Politics*, trans. Robert Nowell (Slough: St Paul’s, 1988), 65–98.

16. *The Official Response* notes this charge of being insensitive to ecumenical method.

Real consensus? The question of vocabularies and formulations

The CDF's 1982 *Observations* laid out a key difficulty that it had with the differentiated consensus claimed by ARCIC. In doing so it posed a challenge to the method of differentiated consensus itself. It is worth citing in full:

Certain formulations in the Report are not sufficiently explicit and hence can lend themselves to a twofold interpretation, in which both parties can find unchanged the expression of their own position.

This possibility of contrasting and ultimately incompatible readings of formulations which are apparently satisfactory to both sides gives rise to a question about the real consensus of the two Communions, . . . In effect, if a formulation which has received the agreement of the experts can be diversely interpreted, how could it serve as a basis for reconciliation on the level of Church life and practice? (A.2.III)

In a number of different contexts, *The Official Response* reiterates the same basic challenge. Regarding ARCIC's claim that the Eucharist is "the Lord's real gift of himself to his Church" and that the Eucharistic species "become" the body and blood of Christ, *The Official Response* admits that these "can certainly be interpreted in conformity with Catholic faith" but complains that "They are insufficient . . . to remove all ambiguity regarding the mode of the real presence which is due to a substantial change in the elements." Accordingly, ARCIC's account of both Eucharist and ministry would require further work in order for the text "to correspond fully to Catholic doctrine." Defenders of ARCIC pointed out that its method was precisely to avoid the problematic vocabulary and formulations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries through which Anglicans and Catholics defined their doctrine in contradistinction to the other. Speaking to ARCIC at Castelgandolfo in 1980, Pope John Paul II had praised this very method, and Sullivan's excoriating article on *The Official Report* concluded that "the Vatican document seems to know no other way to exclude . . . ambiguity except to use the precise formulas by which the Catholic Church is accustomed to express its faith."¹⁷

We seem to have returned to a model of unity by capitulation. However, Ratzinger explicitly excludes this model in his 1983 article. After reflecting on

17. Sullivan, "Vatican Response," 494.

Receptive Ecumenism and ARCIC III

the question of authority he writes that this “must on no account lead to [a] one sided assertion of the ‘Roman’ point of view.”¹⁸ Ratzinger envisages instead an ecumenical model which rereads the historical doctrinal statements of the Church of England—and implicitly also Trent—through a hermeneutic of unity involving the whole tradition and a deeper scriptural understanding. By such means these formularies might be “transcended without doing violence to the content of the statements. For hermeneutics are not a skillful device for escaping from burdensome authorities by a change of verbal function (though this abuse has often occurred), but rather apprehending the word with an understanding which at the same time discovers in it new possibilities.”¹⁹

The charge, then, is that differentiated consensus at its weakest seems to be a merely linguistic solution to division which demands nothing more of the dialogue partners than the hard thinking of the small group of dialoguing theologians. If differentiated consensus aims at simply constructing new formulations in language capable of being interpreted to include both the theological positions of the dialoguing Christian communities, has anything really been achieved? Is differentiated consensus anything more than re-clothing the confessional *status quo* in new language? If both parties can find their own theological positions within this new formulation then both remain, as *Observations* says, “unchanged.” Paul Murray also makes this criticism, arguing that the methods of ARCIC I and II

work, effectively, not by changing the substance of either party’s belief but by clearing-up misunderstandings. As such, they are really strategies of clarification and explication rather than of growth, change and conversion proper. In substantive terms they effectively leave things as they are and therein lies their limitation for a tradition can change its appreciation of what another tradition maintains on a given point without being required to go the extra step of expanding and re-thinking its own position and practice.²⁰

18. Ratzinger, “Anglican-Catholic Dialogue,” 77.

19. Ratzinger, “Anglican-Catholic Dialogue,” 82.

20. Paul D. Murray, “In Search of a Way” in *The Oxford Handbook of Ecumenical Studies*, ed. Geoffrey Wainwright and Paul McPartlan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199600847.013.45>.

Differentiated consensus, seen in this light, is a static model. The only change is that each communion agrees to say that the position of the other is not beyond the pale.

Are the remaining differences truly secondary?

In claiming “substantial agreement” ARCIC was asking the churches’ authorities if they agreed that remaining differences could be considered of secondary importance rather than essential and church-dividing. This is always the differentiated consensus question. In *Observations* the CDF responds with its own question: “whether, in the eyes of the members of ARCIC, the differences which remain or the things which are missing from the document only deal with secondary points (for example, the structure of liturgical rites, theological opinion, ecclesiastical discipline, spirituality), or whether these are points which truly pertain to the faith?” Here, even if not focused solely on remaining differences relating to Eucharist and ministry, the CDF gives an indication as to that which it considers secondary. *Observations* continues, “the Congregation is obliged to observe that sometimes it is the second hypothesis which is verified (for example, Eucharistic adoration, papal primacy, the Marian dogmas), and that it would not be possible here to appeal to the ‘hierarchy of truths’.” Of these three examples only Eucharistic adoration pertains to doctrine in which ARCIC I claimed to have achieved “substantial agreement.”²¹ The question it legitimately asked was whether or not the substantial agreement it claimed in *Eucharistic Doctrine* was damaged by the unresolved question of Eucharistic reservation and adoration noted in *EE* 8–9. Regarding this question *The Official Response* says that “real consensus” has eluded the Commission implying that the remaining differences cannot be considered secondary.

In fact, the Catholic authorities (whether the CDF writing alone, or together with the PCPCU) have consistently given this answer to the differentiated consensus question about what might be considered secondary. *Observations on ARCIC II’s Salvation and the Church* and the *Response of the Catholic Church to*

21. ARCIC I claimed only to have achieved “convergence” on the question of papal primacy and acknowledged it had yet properly to address the Marian dogmas.

the *JDDJ*, both speak of a lack of agreement on what they regard as “essential aspects” or “all the fundamental truths” of the doctrine of salvation. What is proposed as secondary in these ecumenical differentiated consensus statements, is always judged to be essential elements of Catholic doctrine.²²

While both Catholic and non-Catholic theologians may dispute this judgment in particular cases, it remains a challenge in respect of the adequacy of ecumenical method. It must surely be an unreasonable hope to imagine that all remaining theological differences between divided Christian communities will transpire to be truly secondary and non-essential in nature. What, then, is to be done when we discover real and essential differences between our communities?

Living into the dialogue

A third challenge is the question: what can be done on the basis of the agreements made? Rusch writes, “Even the proponents of this concept acknowledge that in itself differentiated consensus will not lead the churches to full visible unity.”²³ Both he and Harding Meyer have therefore been working to develop a methodology to supplement differentiated consensus. Their solution is what they call “differentiated participation” which is a living into a deeper ecclesial relationship on the basis of the differentiated consensus reached in theological dialogue.²⁴

Just as *The Final Report* is an example of differentiated consensus so its conclusion can be read as calling for such “differentiated participation.” On the basis of “substantial agreement” in their statements on Eucharist and ministry, ARCIC expressed the hope that “significant initiatives will be boldly undertaken to deepen our reconciliation and lead us forward in the quest for the full communion to which we have been committed.” Official Catholic responses remained

22. The *Response of the Catholic Church to the JDDJ* states: “The Catholic Church is, however, of the opinion that we cannot yet speak of a consensus such as would eliminate every difference between Catholics and Lutherans in the understanding of justification.”

23. Rusch, *Ecumenical Reception*, 130.

24. See Rusch, *Ecumenical Reception*, 130–134.

silent regarding these initiatives, but repeated references to the lack of a “real” or “complete” consensus and of “essential” remaining differences can only be interpreted as a negative reply to this request. Rightly or wrongly, the authorities did not see ARCIC I’s work as something that could be “lived into.”

***Walking together on the Way* and the promise of receptive learning**

The Catholic Church’s responses to *The Final Report* and *Salvation and the Church*, and their implicit critique of its method of differentiated consensus effectively set the Commission two tasks. Firstly, it would have to demonstrate the dynamism that lies behind its existing statements. This can be justified because our two communions have not been standing still for the last four hundred years but have evolved in theological understanding. Secondly, the Commission was being challenged to develop a less static and more dynamic ecumenical method.

Pope John Paul II pointed out that central to the Council’s teaching was the call to conversion, to renewal, and to reform.²⁵ This conversion is both personal and communal. Ecclesial reform is the dynamic route to unity; dynamic because it demands of the churches genuine change and growth: “Christ summons the Church to continual reformation as she sojourns here on earth.” (*UR* 6) The church is always in need of this reform which is a conversion and a re-commitment to following her calling. The same paragraph, speaking of ecclesial renewal, states: “Undoubtedly this is the basis of the movement toward unity.” Receptive Ecumenism gives central place to this transformative ecclesial renewal and reform as the basis of the movement toward unity. It envisages dialogue as a process by which, “all are led to examine their own faithfulness to Christ’s will for the Church and accordingly to undertake with vigour the task of renewal and reform” (*UR* 4). However, Receptive Ecumenism adds to this understanding that in dialogue we not only come to recognize our own ecclesial shortcomings, but we are also given the remedy, the balm to heal our wounds,

25. *UUS* 15–16.

Receptive Ecumenism and ARCIC III

which is the grace already received by our dialogue partner, as the various ARCIC III communiques cited earlier recognize.

In adopting Receptive Ecumenism as its method in *Walking Together on the Way*, ARCIC III envisages its dialogue as such a process of renewal by receptive learning from one's dialogue partner. Three chapters address in turn the respective instruments of communion operating at the local, regional, and universal levels of church life. These chapters use columns to differentiate text written in an Anglican voice (left-hand side) and that in a Catholic voice (right-hand side). Each chapter follows the same tripartite structure: i) a description of the instruments of communion that currently operate; ii) an account of what stresses, strains, and difficulties are experienced in these structures; and iii) identification of what can be learned from the experience of our dialogue partner that can be appropriated with dynamic integrity into our own practices.

There is an important difference between differentiated consensus documents and receptive ecumenical documents. The key statements of differentiated consensus documents are those first-level statements of fundamental agreement; the formula of words that enables two Christian communions to say something in unison about a particular Christian doctrine. The key statements in Receptive Ecumenism documents are not the things that the dialogue partners find to say *together*, but the things that each communion finds that it needs to say to itself, both about its own needs and difficulties, and about what it might fruitfully learn in these regards from the other tradition.

Chapter IV: the local level

Putting Anglican and Catholic parish and diocesan structures side-by-side highlights the limited role of the laity in Catholic polity. A number of Vatican II texts emphasize that whereas the ministry of the ordained is directed towards the faithful and spiritual realities, that of the universal priesthood is directed towards the world.²⁶ This line of interpretation and apparent sacral/temporal divi-

26. LG 31, but note also the qualification in *Apostolicam Actuositatem* 5 on how closely linked these domains are, not least in the mission and conscience of the layperson. See also CCC 898–913.

sion of labor was consolidated in the 1983 Code of Canon Law.²⁷ The laity are restricted to bodies that are consultative and can be dispensed with or disbanded, and therefore we must acknowledge the exclusion of the laity in this level of church governance and decision-making. Catholic commission members saw that we could learn from Anglicans concerning the inclusion of “voices and concerns of the whole parish or diocesan community in the decision-making of the Church” particularly when it comes to appointments (100). There is a Catholic wariness of frank and open discussion, and we lack the relevant structures and procedures for such consultation. The Commission saw that Catholics could learn “from the Anglican experience of open and sometimes painful debate” in the “process of coming to a common mind” (101). Regarding ministry, the Commission thought that we could learn from the experience of Anglicans as we consider possibilities such as the female diaconate, the ordination of married men in certain circumstances, or the licensing of lay ministers of the word (102).

Chapter V: the regional level

ARCIC’s mandate spoke only of the local and universal church. Orthodox-Catholic dialogue statements from Ravenna (2007) and Chieti (2016) encouraged the Commission also to include the regional level. Indeed, while for the Catholic Church this intermediate level has low ecclesial density, in almost every other Christian community it has far greater significance. Anglican provinces, whose synods have great independence and authority in matters of doctrine and discipline, map on to, at least geographically, Catholic episcopal conferences, whose competence and teaching authority is unclear and limited.²⁸ Catholic members identified the need for a stronger “pastoral magisterium” operating especially at this national level to respond to the challenges presented by the local culture (120). This would demand a clearer identification of the competency of episcopal conferences and their interaction with Rome (121). Lastly the Commission

27. CIC 225.2.

28. See Pope Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium* 32. See also Francis A. Sullivan, “The Teaching Authority of Episcopal Conferences,” *Theological Studies* 63 (2002), 472–293.

asked whether Catholics could learn from Anglicans in establishing national synodal bodies (122).

Chapter VI: the universal/worldwide level

There are four “instruments of communion” whose task is to preserve the unity of the Anglican Communion. These are: the Archbishop of Canterbury; the Lambeth Conference; the Anglican Consultative Council; and the Primates’ Meeting. ARCIC identified four roughly parallel Catholic instruments (at Catholic insistence we began with the conciliar rather than the primatial): a General Council; the Bishop of Rome; the Roman Curia; and the Synod of Bishops. For both Catholics and Anglicans this section produced the highest number of examples of potential receptive learning. Catholics thought their church could learn from the primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose role is to “articulate consensus” in the process of debate and decision-making (145). Catholics further asked if they could learn from Anglicans: to be more transparent in the processes of decision-making (145); to improve the quality of synodal conversation (with reference to *indaba*) (146); and to make the Synod of Bishops a deliberative rather than a consultative body (146). Lastly, the Commission asked if Catholics could learn something from Anglicans who make more modest and less definitive claims for the authority of their teaching:

Christians are confronted with new situations in evolving history. They have to discern whether new ways of life are in agreement with the Gospel. The *sensus fidelium* plays an indispensable role in this process of discernment. It takes time before the Church comes to a final judgement. The faithful at large, theologians, and bishops all have their respective roles to play. This requires that Catholics live with provisionality, and give latitude to those instruments which cannot give judgements of the highest authority. By their learning to live with teaching that is improvable, space would be given to the testing and discernment of a proposed teaching (148).

Concluding remarks

The receptive learning that *WTW* proposes for the Catholic Church may seem limited, or merely a repetition of familiar calls for ecclesial reform. They may

not seem capable of bringing about the unity of our two communions, and in themselves this is true. However, every renewal of the church which is a faithful response to Christ moves the churches towards unity. This is the path to unity proposed by *Unitatis Redintegratio*. Moreover, *WTW* provides proposals that Anglicans and Catholics can live into, in the knowledge that they are both living their ecclesial lives in greater fidelity to Christ and moving towards the unity that he wills for his Church.

WTW deals with very concrete issues. Some may complain that it is not theological enough. Cardinal Ratzinger's 1983 article, which concentrated on the subject of authority, repeatedly stressed that any treatment of this question which could lead to unity "would have to take into account in a much more concrete way the actual form of authority in order to do justice to the question. For it is of the essence of authority to be concrete, consequently one can only do justice to the theme by naming the actual authorities and clarifying their relative position on both sides instead of just theorising about authority."²⁹ *WTW* has done precisely this.

This raises a final question: is the method of Receptive Ecumenism a method suited only to dealing with structures and the exercise of authority in Christian communities? Speaking at a recent service to mark the 20th anniversary of the JDDJ held in Rome, the General Secretary of the Lutheran World Federation, Dr. Martin Junge, said that the declaration was an example of both differentiated consensus and Receptive Ecumenism. He explained that the text was the product of the method of differentiated consensus which established an agreed consensus statement on the theology of justification, while acknowledging remaining differences. Junge then proposed that by employing the method of Receptive Ecumenism, these very differences could be received by Christian communities as both a challenge and a gift.

This suggests that the utility of Receptive Ecumenism is not spent once we move beyond the spheres of authority and ecclesial structures. For example, it could be used to address some of the remaining differences identified in the documents of ARCIC I and II. We can ask what are the deficiencies and weaknesses

29. Ratzinger, "Anglican-Catholic Dialogue," 252-253.

Receptive Ecumenism and ARCIC III

in our own theological positions and what could we receive from the theology of a partner that could attend to or augment this deficit. As ARCIC III now turns its attention towards the question of the ecclesial discernment of ethical teaching the Commission is already examining how Receptive Ecumenism can help the churches move towards unity in this challenging area through respective internal renewal borne of receptive ecclesial learning.

Ecumenism in Ireland Now: Some Observations

THOMAS LAYDEN, S.J.

The paper begins by giving instances of good practice including joint pastoral letters and clergy cooperating in shared funeral ceremonies. More difficult issues include a lack of urgency concerning ecumenism. There is more apathy than opposition. The importance of presence through ecumenical tithing is emphasized. Churches need to create fora where people can tell their story to begin healing the wounds of history. No longer are we in the heady heydays of ecumenism, but the arrival of European Orthodox and of African evangelicals presents an opportunity for ecumenical gift exchange. Could Pope Francis maybe write an encouraging letter to give some fresh impetus?

When one looks at ecumenical and inter-church relations on the island of Ireland in 2019, there are aspects which are indeed encouraging and ones that give cause for serious concern.

What is encouraging is the way in which the churches do actually relate well to each other at local level in so many ways. Some examples: joint pastoral letters at Christmas from the Anglican and Catholic archbishops of Armagh and their counterparts in Clogher. These began at the height of the Troubles and are expected to happen each year now as part of the normal way of doing things. It means that each of the bishops has to work with their counterpart in deciding what to say in a way which will be helpful to both traditions.

There is now greater ease in responding to couples preparing for inter-church marriages. The churches have learned how to accompany the couples and their families. A big change from an earlier time when clergy would often have discouraged members of their congregations from marrying outside their own denomination.

Pastoral sensitivity on the occasion of funerals is another encouraging practice. The funeral service for the journalist Lyra McKee, fatally wounded in a riot in Derry last April, took place in an Anglican Cathedral led by its Dean and with a Catholic priest as the preacher. Both ministers clearly worked easily together. It would have been difficult to imagine something like this happening forty or fifty years ago. It comes as the fruit of experience reflected upon giving rise to good practice that witnesses to faith and seeks to respond with compassion and respect to the bereaved.

The Unity Pilgrims group in Belfast's Redemptorist Monastery, gathering first attend Mass there each Sunday and then head out to attend worship in a church of the reformed tradition, is another instance of practical ecumenism. Protestant congregations have become accustomed to seeing this little band of pilgrims turning up in their churches on a regular basis.

The Way of the Cross through the streets of Dublin on Good Friday which is led by the two Archbishops of Dublin is a public event in the life of the city which has its own impact. So are the sunrise Easter morning services with participation from the clergy from all the churches in the area which are a feature of life in so many places now. Another example is the joint bible study groups where people from different denominations gather to study the scripture. I was involved in one of these groups along with an Anglican priest for many years.

There has been a new interest in spirituality among Protestants over the past twenty years. A Presbyterian congregation on the southern outskirts of Belfast had a series of sessions in which the attendees were introduced to the examen, now often called the consciousness examen, Ignatian contemplation and *lectio divina* both in theory and in practice. In 2009, a series of talks was given in a library in a Protestant area of Belfast to congregation members and clergy of a number of local Protestant churches. The aim of the talks was to clarify what Catholics really believe about the Bible, grace, the Eucharist, Mary, the Pope and other potentially contentious issues between Catholics and Protestants. The Protestants had asked for this themselves fearing that some of the interpretations of Catholic doctrine which had been passed on to them were not quite accurate.

Clergy from different denominations work together in chaplaincies in universities, hospitals, and prisons where there is an emphasis on working together to respond to the spiritual and other needs of the entire population of the place as well as looking after the needs of their own people. And there are of course other examples.

More difficult issues

But what of the issues that would give rise to concern? A lack of urgency about the ecumenical enterprise. It is not really a priority in the life of the churches. There is a dearth of energy in this regard. While there is much less opposition to ecumenism now than there was in an earlier time, one does not encounter particular enthusiasm or zeal for it in too many quarters. The challenge now can be more in dealing with the apathy towards ecumenism in church life. In earlier days there would often be a protest outside an ecumenical event with men in dark suits carrying placards complaining of sell out and compromise. But the protest indicated that such a meeting was important enough to be picketed.

There is not the same passion for unity because of a conviction that disunity is a scandal that could block others from coming to faith. The desire for unity in an earlier time stemmed from a desire to remove this scandal to help people come to belief. The removal of this obstacle to persons coming to faith was a major motivating factor for involvement in ecumenical activity. This does not seem to have the same attraction for people nowadays.

In an increasingly secular society, ecumenism is often seen as irrelevant and is perceived as no more than the churches doing their own internal housekeeping. In a more religious era, there was a concern with matters of salvation which meant that the matters being discussed by ecumenists were of interest (and often vital interest) to people. This is not the case nowadays.

The lack of awareness and knowledge about the important bilateral ecumenical theological agreements of the past fifty years among the people is troubling. They are rarely if ever the subject of a homily. The work of ARCIC and other dialogues has not been well communicated to the persons in the pews. There is

not always the will to create the space and the time for inter-church activities. I recall a minister saying to me that his church had different activities organized for their people on each night of the week. It would not be possible for him or for them to get involved in an inter-church initiative. There was simply no room in the calendar for it.

Then there is the phenomenon that I call pastoral thoughtlessness. I knew a congregation where the pastor wanted to address issues of finance. Consequently, he invited a local accountant to speak to the people about their financial situation. All of this was just fine but to ask the accountant to give his report from the pulpit on the Sunday in the Week of Prayer for the Unity of Christians was not leaving too much space for discussing ecumenical concerns!

Moving forward

I would not claim that the list I have given is exhaustive, and inevitably it reflects the perspective of just one person. But where to from here? I would suggest a few ways of moving forward.

Presence to our sisters and brothers from other parts of the Christian family has to be strongly emphasized. There is a call for Christians to be present to each other in one another's territory. One way of doing this is to attend a service in a Protestant church on a regular basis. It is a way of coming to know how each church conducts its worship. It is also a way of getting to know the members of the congregation. In many ways it is an exercise in being just one of the people ourselves. We are there to hear the word and to join with the congregation in giving thanks and praise to God. It is good for those of us who are priests to simply attend. We just don't go when we are asked to preach. Theologically we are affirming that the congregation we are visiting is part of the Body of Christ, of the People of God on pilgrimage through history.

The late Michael Hurley encouraged what he called ecumenical tithing, giving a tenth of our church time to participating in the church life of a denomination other than one's own. He was right in urging the dedication of a particular amount of time. But maybe more important than the time is the contacts made,

Ecumenism in Ireland Now

the relationships established, and the grace experienced in entering into the somewhat different prayer patterns of another community. As well as attending service, one could also get involved in a church's social outreach.

One of the greatest challenges for those of us who live on this island is coming to terms with our difficult history and the legacy it has created. Terrible deeds have been done over this time and many if not all of us carry the wounds of what we perceive was done to us or our ancestors. We are currently living through this decade of centenaries where we have been remembering the Easter Rising, the Battle of the Somme, and in the next few years the War of Independence and the Civil War. In Northern Ireland there is the further legacy of the Troubles.

In a church I regularly attend, there is a quiet older man who has been greeting me and chatting with me for many years. One morning two years ago, we were conversing after the service. I knew he was retired and I asked him what he had worked at. Telling me he had been a police officer, I said that he must have seen many distressing sights in the years of violence. Suddenly he became visibly moved and upset, saying that the hardest thing for him having been a senior officer was the large number of young officers for whom he was responsible who had lost their lives. He often thought of those young men and women and it made him very sad. What struck me was that I had known him for many years but had not been aware of his own history and of the burden he was carrying. This is just one particular instance. There are so many others in all parts of the community.

There is a real role for the churches to encourage the creation of *fora* in which people can tell their story, be heard and enabled in some way to integrate this painful part of their life's journey. Some of this can be provided by state and civic services. But the churches have their own part to play and especially in terms of the offer of healing and forgiveness which is at the heart of the Gospel.

The Methodist theologian Johnston McMaster has spoken of the need for healing of memories and of ethical remembering of the past in a way in which the history is not simplified or glorified. The churches because in some ways they represent the broader community and its traditions need to be part of this process, and they will do it more effectively if they participate together on an

inter-church basis. All of this is part of that ministry of reconciliation to which Christians are called wherever there is conflict and strife in society.

The churches will continue to have a role in the broader civic society. In terms of the optics of different parts of the community working together, the churches have been doing this certainly from the 1970s. Church leaders appeared together in public long before political party leaders did. I well recall the four church leaders (Anglican, Catholic, Methodist, Presbyterian) leading us all in prayer at a peace rally in Armagh in December 1977. In a situation where the assembly (regional parliament) has not met in over two years and in which the executive (the regional government) has not functioned in the same period, the churches together can help to encourage the citizens and their elected representatives to make political structures work so that the common good might be served.

Demographic changes in the Republic in the past twenty years mean that we now have Orthodox congregations in the country. The Irish Republic went from having 400 Orthodox Christians in 1991 to having 10,400 in 2002 and 20,800 in 2006. Many of these are from Eastern Europe. Their presence changes our ecumenical reality and opens up new possibilities for inter-church contacts and for the celebration of the Liturgy in the Orthodox way. This is surely an enhancement for us. The challenge now is to engage with it.

Other changes in population have seen a large number of Africans coming into the Republic. Many of them have found a spiritual home in various Protestant churches. Their presence has brought a change to the worship style of some of these churches as well as a significant increase in the numbers regularly attending church. Many of these African Christians are evangelical in their worship style. Their lively style is indeed in contrast with the more sedate approach of the other members of the congregation. Our ecumenical partners over the years have been mostly Anglicans, Methodists and Presbyterians. The presence of African evangelicals creates the possibility of a new style of worship and living of the Gospel with others with whom we can be in conversation.

In all of these conversations and personal encounters we can enter into what the late Dr. Margaret O’Gara calls the ecumenical gift exchange in which Christians from other traditions bring gifts to us which we don’t have and we do the

Ecumenism in Ireland Now

same for them. I expect that the Orthodox will bring (and indeed are already bringing) an emphasis on reverence for the transcendent in worship and that the evangelicals will bring us the gift of lively worship, and they will stress authentic gospel-based discipleship.

One of the most festering issues over the years has been religious and political bigotry which has been at the heart of the problem in Northern Ireland. This form of bigotry is sectarianism, where the person from the other part of the community is seen as a threat rather than a gift and is to be excluded, controlled, belittled and kept in their place. In their “Moving Beyond Sectarianism,” Joe Liechty and Cecilia Clegg point out that as well as malicious bigotry, there can be decisions made that do not intend to be sectarian but the consequences of what is done can have a sectarian result.

One instance of this was where a very good secondary school put its open night for prospective students and their parents on a date which coincided with the annual Christian Unity service. The school was in no way opposed to the service. But by having their open night on that particular date, they made it impossible for the parents who were coming to them to be able to go to the service. This was pointed out to them and they duly took action and changed the date of their open night.

It is a real ecumenical challenge for the churches to help people to be honest about bigotry and sectarianism. First of all, we have to see that like racism, it is there in all of us. But the call to reconciliation invites us to become free of all that can separate us from our neighbors. Unintended bigotry can come across in the words we use to describe people. The word non-Catholic might be uncontroversial in other parts of the world, but Protestants in Ireland find it offensive. They do not like to be defined in a negative way. They prefer to be simply called Protestant. What they object to in the description non-Catholic is the concept that to be Catholic is the norm and that they are the exception to the norm.

Conclusion

These are not the heady heydays of ecumenism as it was in the 1960s. At times ecumenism might seem to have stalled. But there are good things going on here, often quietly and behind the scenes. These need to be encouraged. Pope Francis has been good for ecumenism. It is clear he worked well with Protestant colleagues in Buenos Aires. Protestants like him, and the way he acts as Pope makes the papacy attractive to them. It could well be the case that an encouraging letter or apostolic exhortation from Pope Francis would help to bring fresh energy and new impetus to the ecumenical movement in a time when it might seem to have become somewhat becalmed and stalled.

Anything which helps to bring Christian believers together to proclaim the word, celebrate the sacraments, and engage in service of the needy and the promotion of justice has to be seen as a step in the right direction. Francis would surely encourage us to do something simple and meaningful together which would warm human hearts and point the way forward, to travel in hope together. We can only wait in anticipated hope and with baited breath.

Jesuits, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals

THOMAS P. RAUSCH, S.J.

The remarkable shift of the Christian population from Europe and North America to the Global South has resulted in the proliferation of new evangelical and especially Neo-Pentecostal churches. Most of these are non-traditional, independent, non-liturgical communities, stressing Spirit empowerment, miraculous cures, and often preaching the prosperity gospel. Yet they are often vital communities where Christianity today is growing. Thus, they pose a new challenge for ecumenism. Though Pope Francis has good relations with many Pentecostals, with some exceptions, I can find few instances of Jesuits involved in conversation with these communities. Jesuits need to be more involved.

Perhaps the greatest challenge facing the church today is the massive demographic shift of the Christian population from Europe and North America to the Global South. The Pew Research Center reports that more than 1.3 billion Christians live in the Global South (61 percent), compared with about 860 million in the Global North (39 percent). While Christianity is in a precipitous decline in the West, it is booming in the southern hemisphere, particularly in its evangelical and Pentecostal expressions.

Pentecostals are generally included under the umbrella of evangelicalism, but there are significant differences, at least from the Pentecostal perspective. While many evangelicals have strong theological commitments, particularly to Jean Calvin's theology, Pentecostals see themselves as a restorationist movement that places primary emphasis, not on a particular theological tradition but on the experience of life in the Spirit and the Spirit's gifts. Scholars today speak of three waves of Pentecostal renewal: classical Pentecostals, Charismatics, and

Neo-Pentecostals.¹ The first wave embraces classical Pentecostal denominations such as the Assemblies of God and the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel; they place a priority on conversion, baptism in the Holy Spirit, and the charismatic gifts, especially tongues, traditionally seen as “initial evidence of Spirit baptism.” The second wave embraces Christians from non-Pentecostal denominations who have become involved in the charismatic renewal; some are in mainline churches, others since 1967 are in the Catholic Charismatic Renewal. The third wave includes evangelicals and Christian from other churches not identified with classic Pentecostals or the charismatic renewal; these are independent churches stressing Spirit empowerment and other Pentecostal phenomena, especially miraculous cures, exorcisms, the struggle against evil spirits, tithing, and making pacts with God to obtain divine blessings. Many preach the Prosperity Gospel and have little connection to classical Pentecostalism or the historic Protestant tradition.²

Yang Fenggang of Purdue University estimates that by 2030 China will have 250 million Christians, making it the largest Christian population in the world.³ The majority of Chinese Christians belong to independent churches, characterized by conservative theology and what Pentecostal scholar Allan Anderson cautiously calls “Pentecostal tendencies.”⁴ Based on an often-fundamentalist approach to the Bible, these churches emphasize demons and spirits, miraculous “signs and wonders,” indigenous leadership, and often versions of the Prosperity Gospel or gospel of health and wealth. As independent house churches, they

1. See C. Peter Wagner, “Third Wave,” *New International Dictionary of Pentecostal Charismatic Movements*, 1141; see also Thomas P. Rausch, “Catholics and Pentecostals: Troubled History, New Initiatives,” *Theological Studies* 71 (2010): 930–933.

2. Milton Acosta, “Power Pentecostalism: The ‘Non-Catholic’ Latin American Church Is Going Full Steam Ahead—But Are We on the right Track?” *Christianity Today* 53, no. 8 (August 2009): 40–42; also, Simon Coleman, *The Globalization of Charismatic Christianity: Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity* (New York: Cambridge University, 2000), 28–40.

3. Cited in “Religion in China: Cracks in the Atheist Edifice,” *The Economist* (Nov. 1, 2014), <https://www.economist.com/briefing/2014/11/01/cracks-in-the-atheist-edifice>.

4. Allan Anderson, *To the End of the Earth: Pentecostalism and the Transformation of World Christianity* (New York: Oxford University, 2013), 200.

Jesuits, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals

lack ties to other Christian communities. The ecclesial diversity of Asia leads Peter Phan to speak of “Asian Christianities” in the plural.⁵

The revival of religion in China, not just Christianity, is clearly of concern to the Party. In a three hour speech at the 19th Party Congress in 2017 Xi Jinping insisted on the “Sinicization of religions,” stressing that the Party will fully “uphold the principle that religions in China must be Chinese in orientation, and provide active guidance to religions so that they can adapt themselves to socialist society.”⁶ What this really means is that religions will be controlled by the state and play a much less visible role in Chinese society. Since then authorities, claiming the violation of property regulations, have destroyed over 20 churches, both Protestant and Catholic. They have removed at least 100 crosses from churches in Henan province, and many Christians have had their Bibles confiscated. New restrictions about sharing religious material online have been put in place.

In Henan, Jiangxi, Zhejiang, Liaoning and Hebei provinces churches have been ordered to fly the Chinese flag, destroy banners and images with religious messages, and sing the national anthem and Communist Party songs at their services. Children under 18 have been forbidden to attend church, and local people have been threatened with expulsion from education and employment if they “believe in religions.” In some parts of the country, the faithful have been asked to replace paintings of Jesus with portraits of Mao or President Xi.

Christianity is also flourishing in Africa. Overall, the Christian population is four times what it was in 1970, while the Roman Catholic and Anglican churches have experienced enormous growth. The Catholic population in Africa increased by 33 percent between 2000 and 2010. But a new African Christianity is also emerging with the appearance of independent churches. Many are Neo-Pentecostal, some are African Instituted Churches (AICs), especially in South Africa, Nigeria, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The majority of the later seek to give expression to African religious sensibilities, including the in-

5. Peter C. Phan, “Introduction: Asian Christianity/Christianities,” in *Christianity in Asia*, ed. Peter C. Phan (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 3.

6. “At the Congress Xi reaffirms: Sinicization of religions under the Communist Party,” *AsiaNews* (Oct. 19, 2017).

terpenetration of the spiritual and physical worlds. This cultural sense gives power to spiritual healers, witch doctors, and medicine men who use prayer, exorcisms, anointings, and religious objects as well as rituals that sometimes involve human sacrifice.⁷ A Nigerian Jesuit in my community says that the AICs are more respected than many of the African Pentecostals who place too much emphasis on miracles and exorcisms, fund raising, and adopting business practices to gather, keep, and raise money from parishioners. The AICs, he says, are more traditional. But few of these churches are liturgical or sacramental communities, and again, many preach the Prosperity Gospel.

There are some new Jesuit initiatives in Africa towards engaging with evangelicals. In Nairobi, the Jesuit Historical Institute in Africa (JHIA), directed by Festo Mkenda, S.J., has organized two conferences on encounters between African Jesuits and Protestants. While the 2016 conference was largely historical and limited in attendance, the 2017 conference drew more participants from the evangelical side. Several papers explored the spiritual, theological, and practical linkages between Catholicism and evangelicalism. The papers from the second conference are being prepared for publication. The JHIA has also begun working ecumenically with other institutions to establish the African Theological Network Press, an ecumenical press with three partner institutions, the Akrofi-Christeller Institute in Ghana, largely Presbyterian; SPCK in England, Anglican; and the *Missio Africanus*, mostly evangelical.

The face of Latin American Christianity has also changed radically in recent years. In 1970, more than 90 percent of the population identified as Catholic, but a new survey by the respected Chilean polling firm, *Latinobarómetro*, reports that Latin America today is only 59 percent Catholic.⁸ These shifts in religious belonging reflect the amazing growth of the Latin American evangelical and especially Pentecostal churches. Some like Andrew Chesnut attribute the suc-

7. Paul Gifford, *Christianity, Development and Modernity in Africa* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 157–158; also, John S. Pobee and Gabriel Ositelu II, *African Initiatives in Christianity: the Growth, Gifts and Diversities of Indigenous African Churches: A Challenge to the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva: WCC, 1998), 29.

8. Andrew Chesnut, “Is Latin America Still Catholic,” *Catholic Herald* (January 25, 2018), <https://catholicherald.co.uk/is-latin-america-still-catholic/>.

Jesuits, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals

cess of the Pentecostal churches to their ability to promote healthy lifestyles; they require that men give up alcohol and substance abuse, gambling, and womanizing.⁹ Jesuits from Latin America I have talked to about this hold differing opinions. Nor according to Edward Cleary do all Latin American Pentecostals follow the perfectionist admonitions of their pastors or attend services every week.¹⁰

Many of these new churches are Neo-Pentecostal rather than classical; they are independent and indigenous. An example would be the Universal Church of the Kingdom of God, founded in Brazil by Edir Macedo in 1977. One of their pastors, Sergio Von Helder, kicked and repeatedly abused the statue of Our Lady of Aparecida, patroness of Brazil, on the Universal Church's television network in 1995.

As I have pointed out before, the growth of these new churches, especially the Pentecostal and Neo-Pentecostal communities, presents a new challenge for ecumenism. Most of them have little concern for doctrine, confessional difference, or ecclesiology. Stressing the immediate presence of the Spirit and the Gospel of Prosperity, they are neither sacramental nor liturgical.¹¹ Peter Phan notes that in Asia many of them are "inspired by nationalism, biblical fundamentalism, or charismatic leadership...possessing little or no relationship among themselves and with mainline Christianity."¹²

9. Cited in David Masci, "Why has Pentecostalism grown so dramatically in Latin America," Pew Research Center (March 14, 2014), <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/11/14/why-has-pentecostalism-grown-so-dramatically-in-latin-america/>.

10. Edward L. Cleary, *How Latin America Saved the Soul of the Catholic Church* (New York: Paulist Press, 2009), 11; he says that a survey of Chilean evangelicals, most of them Pentecostals, found the majority nonobservant; 52 percent did not attend church weekly and almost 38 percent seldom or never attended.

11. Thomas P. Rausch, "Thinking with the Church: From Msgr. Oscar Romero to Pope Francis," in *Thinking and Feeling with the Churches: Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Jesuit Ecumenists, Vienna, Austria, 13–19 July 2015*, ed. Robert J. Daly and Patrick Howell (Chestnut Hill: Institute for Advanced Jesuit Studies, 2017), 75–95.

12. Peter C. Phan, "Reception of and Trajectories for Vatican II in Asia," *Theological Studies* 74 (2013): 309.

Yet, these are the churches that are growing today. They, not the historic confessional churches, are the majority portion of the remarkable shift of the global Christian population from the West to the Global South. From an ecumenical perspective, difficult as it may be, we Jesuits need to be in conversation with them. But with the exception of the United States as I will argue later, I can find few examples of engagement with these new churches. In preparing this report, I have written Jesuit friends and colleagues involved in ecumenism around the world, asking them what they know about Jesuit involvement with evangelicals and Pentecostals. The only evidence I could find from Jesuits in Latin America was one Jesuit who said he once gave a concert with an evangelical musician. I have already mentioned a new initiative in Africa.

One European Jesuit much involved in ecumenism said that he did not know of any involvement of Jesuits with evangelicals and Pentecostals today, attributing this to the mostly negative attitude of European Jesuits to these communities, at least in German speaking areas. For them, ecumenism means relations with Lutheran and Reformed Christians. This man, by way of exception, said that once a year he invites a Pentecostal pastor to his prayer group, and has done a congregational exchange with his church in the past. At least one Jesuit in the past involved in the charismatic renewal in Germany, Father Norbert Baumert, S.J., served on the Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue (1993–1997), but there are no Jesuits that I could locate engaged with evangelicals or Pentecostals in Germany today.

Similarly, an Indian Jesuit said that ecumenism is a forgotten issue in India; there are occasional meetings of people from different churches to address secular issues, but there is so much of anger from both of the parties that there are no efforts to discuss or do scholarship on ecumenical issues. Another highly placed source said that hardly anyone was directly and actively involved in ecumenism, though some Indian institutes did have ecumenical collaboration. A service wing of the National Council of Churches in India, entitled “Understanding and Responding to the Sexual Abuse Crisis in the Indian Church—An Ecumenical Consultation” was the title of the program organized by the Church

Jesuits, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals

Auxiliary for Social Action (CASA); it included Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox churches.

So why so little encounter between Jesuits representing the historic churches and evangelical and Pentecostal representatives from the new churches of the Global South? Certainly, Pope Francis is one Jesuit who has both experience with evangelicals and Pentecostals and friends from those communities, dating from his days as Archbishop of Buenos Aires. In a recent address to a Plenary Assembly of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity on “Pentecostals, Charismatics and Evangelicals” (9/28/18), the Pope referred to the constant growth of “these new expressions of the Christian life.” “First of all,” he said, “we have the duty to discern and recognize the presence of the Holy Spirit in these communities, trying to construct bonds of authentic fraternity with them.” Then he apologized for his early negative attitudes towards evangelical and Pentecostal communities, forbidding Jesuits in Argentina from engaging in dialogue with them when he was provincial; he said that Catholics can learn from these communities to appreciate how they “live their faith, praise God, and witness the Gospel of charity.”¹³

Francis was the first pope to visit the Waldensian Evangelical Church, Italy’s centuries old Protestant church, a community with which he was already familiar from his days in Buenos Aires. When he met with them in Turin in 2015, he apologized to them “for the non-Christian—even inhuman—attitudes and behaviors which, through history, we have had against you,” and then invited them to work together for the sake of the Gospel. In 2014 he visited the Pentecostal Church of Reconciliation in Caserta, south of Rome in the Campania region of Italy at the request of its pastor, Giovanni Traettino. The Catholics of Caserta were shocked by the news of his coming visit, so he met with their clergy at an open forum two days before. He told them, “We must not be a Church closed in on herself which watches her navel, a self-referential Church, who looks at herself and is unable to transcend.”¹⁴ To the Pentecostal congre-

13. “Audience of the Holy Father with participants in the Plenary of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity” (September 9, 2018); the texts of all Vatican documents referenced herein can be found by searching their titles on the Internet.

14. “Visit of the Holy Father to Caserta, Meeting with the Clergy” (July 26, 2014).

gation he said: “It is on this path that we Christians do what we call by the theological name of ecumenism: we seek to ensure that this diversity may be more harmonized by the Holy Spirit and become unity; we try to walk before God and be blameless; we try to go and find the nourishment we need to find our brother.”¹⁵ He has frequently gone out of his way to meet with evangelicals, including Prosperity Gospel preachers like Kenneth Copeland and Joel Osteen. Evangelical pastor Luis Palau, now living in Oregon, is a close friend.

Recently Francis has created a new structure, Charis, unifying two international groups within the Charismatic Renewal, the Catholic Fraternity of the Charismatic Communities and Associations of the Alliance. Its purpose is to promoting dialogue with evangelical and Pentecostal groups.¹⁶ From the perspective of the Society of Jesus, one positive sign is the addition of a Jesuit with experience with evangelicals and Pentecostals to the secretariat which advises father General on ecumenical and inter-religious relations.

Historic tensions

Tensions if not hostilities between Roman Catholics and evangelicals are of long standing. Some of the reasons are historical, some theological, some social and political. Like many Protestants, evangelicals inherited Luther and Calvin’s polemics that saw the pope as the Antichrist and the Catholic Church as an apostate church, often called the Whore of Babylon. Even today, this language can be heard from some evangelicals. In Latin America, tensions between Catholic and evangelicals go back to the sixteenth century, exacerbated by the “Black Legend,” a collection of myths demonizing Spanish colonialism and Catholicism.

At the same time, Latin American Protestants have not forgotten the persecution they suffered at the hands of the Inquisition, which used torture and the death penalty in the attempt to force the conversion of those who fell into their hands. In Lima, Peru, there is a horrifying Museum of the Inquisition, ex-

15. “Private Visit of the Holy Father to Caserta” (July 28, 2014).

16. “Pope wants Charismatics to dialogue with Evangelicals and Pentecostals,” *La Croix International*, November 7, 2018.

Jesuits, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals

hibiting the underground dungeons and instruments of torture used to punish heretics. The fact that for years Latin American countries privileged an established Catholicism at the expense of Protestant communities added to the tensions between the two communities. Today much of that is gone; the region's growing religious pluralism has led to an increasing emphasis on the separation of church and state.

However, theological differences remain to this day. Many evangelicals have argued that Catholicism is a false religion, teaching works righteousness instead of justification by faith alone, substituting the church for the Lord, encouraging non-biblical practices such as veneration of Mary and the saints. Most insist on the absolute inerrancy of Scripture, a position that ultimately is confessional, not biblical. Pentecostals dislike the formalism of Catholic worship, seeing it as a substitute for the vitality of worship in the Spirit. Since they consider many baptized Christians as being among the unsaved, they make them the objects of an aggressive proselytism. They look not to the visible continuity of the church through history, with an unbroken succession in faith, sacraments, and church order, but rather to the experience of *empowerment* in the Holy Spirit, particularly in worship. In the words of Pentecostal theologian Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, Pentecostals “have claimed continuity with the church in the New Testament by arguing for discontinuity with much of the historical church.”¹⁷

From a political perspective, evangelicals often saw Catholics in the United States as a threat to American liberty and the separation of church and state, fears only strengthened by the nineteenth century papacy, still reacting to the excesses of the French Revolution. Thus, Pope Gregory XVI's 1832 encyclical *Mirari Vos* condemned religious toleration as well as freedom of conscience, opinion, and the press. It is not difficult to imagine how threatening this was to the U. S. Protestantism's fierce independence and rabid fear of “popery.” In 1873 the Evangelical Alliance in the United States said that its greatest foe was not atheism but the “nominally Christian Church of Rome.” Evangelicals like John Cotton, Samuel F. B. Morse, Lyman Beecher, and Paul Blanshard were all anti-

17. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, “The Apostolicity of Free Churches: A Contradiction in Terms of an Ecumenical Breakthrough,” *Pro Ecclesia* 10 (2001): 483.

Catholic polemicists, succeeded by others in the mid-20th century like Loraine Boettner, John Armstrong, and R. C. Sproul. Of course, many Catholics have dismissed all evangelicals as fundamentalists, which is far from the truth.

The establishment of the National Association of Evangelicals by Harold Ockenga in 1942 marked one turning point, the beginning of a shifting of attitudes towards Roman Catholics that moved beyond the polemical discourse of an earlier age. The Second Vatican Council represented another. The Council recognized officially that the Church of Christ is bigger than the Catholic Church and assuaged evangelical political fears by affirming the principle of religious liberty in its Decree, *Dignitatis Humanae*.

Another important turning point was the establishment of Evangelicals and Catholics Together: *The Christian Mission in the Third Millennium* by Charles Colson and Richard John Neuhaus in 1994. Intended to find agreement on core Christian teachings, the participants acknowledged that deep differences continued to exist between them. Even so, many evangelicals were outraged, especially when the document's evangelical signers declared that some Roman Catholics may be considered "brothers and sisters in Christ." A host of articles, essays, and books followed, charging that the evangelical signers had betrayed the Reformation, with some arguing that the Catholic Church was not even a Christian religion.¹⁸ ECT did help establish new relations between some Catholics and evangelicals. Unfortunately, its concern in post *Roe v. Wade* America to find common ground—"co-belligerence in the culture wars" was the phrase—resulted in a narrow focus on conservative moral and social issues, especially abortion and same-sex marriage. Evangelical scholar Timothy George described as an "ecumenism of the trenches."¹⁹ But ECT had little to say on gay rights, support for unwed mothers or orphans, nothing on racism, ecological damage, or the excesses of capitalism.

Other evangelical initiatives were clearly hostile to the Catholic Church's social agenda. While it is not true that the explosion of Pentecostalism in Latin

18. See William M. Shea, *The Lion and the Lamb: Evangelicals and Catholics in America* (New York: Oxford University, 2004), 155–158.

19. Quotation attributed to Timothy George in Chuck Colson, "Modernist Impasse, Christian Opportunity," *First Things*, 104 (June/July 2000): 19.

Jesuits, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals

America was chiefly the result of funding from conservative evangelical sources in the United States as some allege, in some cases the charge was true. Generally, these efforts coincided with a conservative, neo-capitalist, free market agenda. In Central America, fundamentalist Protestants too often identified ecumenism with communism because of its concern to empower the poor. They found a natural ally in the military.

For example, in Guatemala, fundamentalists, many of them Neo-Pentecostals, charged that the Catholic emphasis on a liberation reading of Scripture and an emphasis on base Christian communities was really a form of communism. The result was the death of a number of priests and hundreds of Catholic “Delegates of the Word” in the 1970s and early 1980s, particularly under Guatemalan president José Efraín Ríos Montt, a member of the California-based Pentecostal Christian Church of the Word (*Iglesia el Verbo*). Supported by the Reagan administration, up to 200,000 Guatemalans went missing or were killed during his administration, making it one of Latin America’s most violent countries. On May 10, 2013, a Guatemalan judge convicted Ríos Montt of genocide and crimes against humanity.

In 1989 the Archbishop of Guatemala (1983-2001), Prospero Panados del Barrio, distinguished in a pastoral letter between the historic Protestant churches which since Vatican II welcomed a new, more open relationship with Catholics, and the fundamentalists, especially the Neo-Pentecostals with their militant anti-Catholicism as well as hostility towards traditional culture and social justice. According to *Latinobarómetro 2017*, Catholics in El Salvador make up 39 percent of the population, Protestants 28 percent and 30 percent not religious. Roughly half the Protestants are Pentecostal. Lutheran Bishop Medardo Gómez was among other church leaders who were present for the celebration of the beatification of Archbishop Oscar Romer in 2015 in San Salvador.²⁰

Another example of political tensions between Jesuits and evangelicals in Central America is due to efforts of conservative evangelicals in the United States to form young Central Americans in free-market capitalism through

20. Lutheran World Federation, “Salvadoran Catholic Archbishop Romero: a friend and a great ecumenist,” May 28, 2015.

scholarship programs. One of the principle benefactors behind this effort were Sam and Hellen Walton, founders of Walmart stores. However, they were not the only ones. Alongside the Reagan administration funding of right-wing counterinsurgencies in El Salvador and Guatemala were various conservative churches and organizations supplying material aid to the *Contra* rebels in Nicaragua, among them the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship, Gospel Crusade, World Vision, and the National Association of Evangelicals. The Christian Broadcasting Network raised funds for Efraín Ríos Montt, while student organizations such as Campus Crusade for Christ sought to oppose the growing opposition to the Reagan's administration policies towards Central America.²¹

The Walton Family Foundation educational program represented a "transition from the last Cold War proxy battles to the new frontier of hemispheric free trade in the 1990. It was not part of the coordinated Christian and neoconservative campaign of direct aid to anticommunists, but rather a parallel incubator of promarket Christians."²² Sam and Helen Walton established a four-year scholarship program to educate young Central Americans in the benefits of free enterprise at three Christian colleges in Arkansas, the University of the Ozarks, evangelical John Brown University, and the Church of Christ's Harding University. They represented three traditions in American Protestantism, frontier Presbyterianism, nondenominational evangelicalism, and hard-right fundamentalism.

Each of the three schools brought each year on campus and funded sixty students; they majored for the most part in business-related subjects, forming in the process a white-collar class familiar with Protestant evangelicalism and the service-sector culture of U. S. based multinational corporations. Their education stressed not political engagement, not concrete examples of structural injustice so prevalent in their home countries, but personal sin. One Catholic student at the University of the Ozarks, concerned about stories of torture and murder in Central America, stories that conflicted with government account of increasing respect for human rights, began a campaign of running thirty miles a day for

21. See Bethany Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart: The Making of Christian Free Enterprise* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 223–224.

22. Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart*, 224.

Jesuits, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals

two and a half months, stopping for speaking engagements. One stop was at the College of the Ozarks (as it was then-called), where students disagreed with his interpretations, casting it instead in terms of the East-West conflict. What comes to mind here is the famous remark of Dom Helder Câmara of Recife, Brazil: “When I give food to the poor, they call me a saint. When I ask why the poor have no food, they call me a communist.”

Most of the students returned to successful careers in their home countries, though some eventually moved further afield: “The roster of alumni employers reads like the *Fortune* 500: Coca-Cola, Compaq, Continental, Cargil, Colgate-Palmolive, Purina, Procter & Gamble, Pepsi. Alumni left Arkansas to run textile *maquilas*, handle sales for multinational telecom services, and supply plastic products to Wal-Mart.”²³ On their return to their countries, they took the place of a generation of more liberal students and thousands of civilians wiped out by the U. S. backed regimes. “Their Christian business educations in Arkansas linked them to a specific vision of globalization with direct roots in Wal-Mart’s own stores and offices. Their hearts and minds were won to the free-trade gospel while singing in chapel, surrounded by people who trusted and cared for them.”²⁴

In Latin America, relations between these communities have begun to change for the better, though old prejudices die hard. Pope John Paul II caused considerable offense at Santo Domingo in 1992 when he implicitly included evangelicals and Pentecostals among the “sects,” which he characterized as acting like “rapacious wolves,” causing discord in Catholic communities.²⁵ Unfortunately, too many bishops in Latin America continue to refer to these communities as sects (*sectas*), in spite of the fact that the then Prefect of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Cardinal Edward Idris Cassidy, rebuked six or seven Latin American bishops at a meeting in Rome for using this language. He

23. Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart*, 243.

24. Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart*, 247.

25. Edward L. Cleary, “Report from Santo Domingo—II: John Paul Cries ‘Wolf’: Misreading the Pentecostals,” *Commonweal* (November 20, 1992), 7.

said that the Pontifical Council does not enter into dialogue with sects.²⁶ But as late as 2000 R. Albert Mohler, president of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Lexington, Kentucky, said on *Larry King Live* that the Catholic Church was “a false church” teaching a “false gospel.”

In Latin America, most part Pentecostal pastors are uneducated; more important is their revivalist orientation. However, Pentecostals are beginning to develop their own academic societies and journals, and a new generation of academics are emerging who strive to integrate a more critical approach to Scripture, academic theology, and social concerns, without succumbing to a western rationalism. Though Pentecostals have generally resisted ecumenical initiatives, there are signs that even that is changing, at least for some communities.

The International Dialogue Between Roman Catholics and Some Pentecostals was established in 1972. A Pentecostal dialogue began with the World Alliance of Reformed Churches in 1996, one with the Lutheran World Federation in 2016 and a dialogue with the Orthodox in 2017. Especially helpful has been a new initiative from the World Council of Churches initially proposed by Konrad Raiser in 1998, an effort to broaden the ecumenical table by bringing in groups not generally interested in joining the WCC, particularly evangelicals, Pentecostals, and Roman Catholics. This “Global Christian Forum” builds relationships, not through formal theological dialogue with professional theologians, but by stressing oral testimony and fellowship, an approach far more congenial to evangelicals and Pentecostals from the southern hemisphere. In the United States, several Pentecostal denominations are part of a recent initiative called Christian Churches Together. Jesuits might easily be involved in these initiatives.

26. Cited by Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., “Roman Catholic-Pentecostal Dialogue: Challenges and Lessons for Living Together,” in *Pentecostal Power: Expressions, Impact and Faith of Latin American Pentecostalism*, ed. Calvin L. Smith, Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies 6 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011), 253.

Signs of progress

There are some signs of progress to report. Some Catholic bishops have reached out to evangelicals and Pentecostals in Argentina, though one of my friends, a distinguished Pentecostal ecumenist, says that the initiatives have come almost exclusively from the Catholic side. Some Classical Pentecostals are gradually becoming more ecumenical. The first meeting between Catholics and Pentecostals in Brazil did not take place until 2008, with the Pentecostals coming on their own initiative, not as representatives of their churches. As early as 1989, the Chilean episcopal conference invited Chilean Pentecostal Juan Sepúlveda to take part in a conference. Out of it came a commitment from the bishops to respect what Pentecostals emphasize, to refrain from derogatory comments, and to begin to work towards solidarity with these “separated brethren,” all in hopes of better relationships. In 1997, Sepúlveda attended the CELAM Synod for America as a Pentecostal observer, and in 2007 he gave a plenary address at the CELAM Conference at Aparecida in the presence of Pope Benedict. But working with the many and diverse Neo-Pentecostal communities remain a challenge.

In the United States, relations between Catholics and evangelicals and Pentecostals have become much more positive, as both communities discover the concerns they hold in common. I have already mentioned the Evangelicals and Catholics Together initiative organized by Richard John Neuhaus and Charles Colson. Its first agreement, *The Christian Mission in the Third Millennium* (1994) included Jesuits participants Avery Dulles, and Juan Diaz-Vilar. A second text, *The Gift of Salvation* (1998) included in addition to Dulles, Edward Oaks and myself. A more recent effort, a dialogue on social policy organized by John Borelli and Ronald Sider produced a fine text entitled *Catholics and Evangelicals for the Common Good*, rooted in the theology of both traditions. Jesuits among its contributors were Drew Christiansen and Leo O’Donovan. Allan Figueroa Deck has also long been an observer of Catholic-evangelical relations and has written on them appreciatively.

Catholics and evangelicals are increasingly studying together in graduate programs, many of them sponsored by Catholic institutions. According to William Shea, evangelical students make up 50 percent or more of the student body

in several Catholic doctoral programs.²⁷ Recently I reviewed a festschrift in honor of Pentecostal scholar Amos Yong. Of the nine Pentecostal contributors, five of them had their doctorates from Jesuit Marquette University.

The International Consultation between the Catholic Church and the World Evangelical Alliance (WEA) included at various times Dulles, John Haughey, and myself. The WEA represents some 600 million evangelicals and 129 national alliances. The two communities have been in dialogue since 1986, but many national associations within the WEA remain suspicious, reluctant to acknowledge any significant movement towards mutual understanding or growing communion. A recent letter to the WEA leadership from the evangelical alliances of Italy, Spain, and Malta asked if the WEA was “moving away from its historic position” of holding the line against Catholicism:

We are in total agreement with the openness towards mutual listening and even cooperation with Roman Catholics and the Roman Church on social and moral issues, while maintaining the point that we don't share the same basic understanding of the gospel. However we must refrain from talking about, and even practising, unity in evangelism and mission, for such dialogue or activity imply the acceptance of the Roman Catholic Church as an institution with its “imperial” structure, dogmatic claims and political outlook.²⁸

An article on the evangelical flagship magazine, *Christianity Today*, points out that evangelicals in Italy, Spain, and Malta have experienced years of persecution by the Catholic Church, and are acutely aware of the differences between the two traditions. Catholics in Latin America, where evangelicalism is growing rapidly, worry about compromising with “sheep stealers.” In responding, several leaders of the WEA leadership, including Bishop Efraim Tendero, a Filipino Protestant, said that dialogue was not to compromise, but to enable both traditions to more carefully articulate their positions, and to discover areas—

27. Shea, *The Lion and the Lamb*, 11.

28. “Is the World Evangelical Alliance (WEA) Moving Away from its Historic Position on Unity: An Open Letter to the WEA Leadership” (December 1, 2017), 3, https://www.alleanzaevangelica.org/documenti/Open_Letter_2017.pdf.

Jesuits, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals

marriage and family, social justice, abortion, where they can work together towards common goals.²⁹

One of the first local Catholic-Evangelical dialogues in the United States was sponsored by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles and Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena in 1987. It is still active today, co-chaired by Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., a distinguished Pentecostal ecumenist, and myself.³⁰ Since that time, the dialogue committee has given rise to a number of meetings, conferences, and articles. What remains more difficult is bringing the conversation beyond academics and ecumenists and into the congregations. One of the most interesting encounters took place at an evangelical church on worship in both communities. Well attended, what emerged in the course of the discussion was the large number of families that had members from the other tradition and appreciated the opportunity to find common ground.³¹ However, such encounters are not always easy. Another event brought together for an afternoon of shared experience Pentecostal pastors and Catholic priests and deacons. The event was quite successful, but the host Pentecostal pastor experienced some negative pushback from some of his congregation.

Conclusion

So Catholics evangelical relations at least in the United States are light years from where they were in the early twentieth century. If significant theological differences remain, they have more common ground than either tradition has with liberal Protestantism, and there is a new climate of mutual respect and often a willingness to enter into cooperative relationships with each other.

29. Sarah Eekhoff Zylstra, "How Evangelicals Do Ecumenism," *Christianity Today* (September 18, 2018), <https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2018/october/how-evangelicals-do-ecumenism.html>.

30. Thomas P. Rausch, "The Los Angeles Catholic/Evangelical Dialogue," *Ecumenical Trends* 26, no. 66 (1997): 13–16.

31. Thomas P. Rausch and Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., "Catholics/Evangelicals Conversation: Involving Our Congregations," *Ecumenical Trends* 30, no. 6 (2001): 10.

Globally, with the enormous shift of the Christian population from Europe and North America to the Global South, the face of world Christianity is changing. Mainline Protestant churches continue to decline. I've recently seen a number of speculations about the future of Christianity. The late Lutheran scholar Robert Jenson once asked if perhaps God was not winding down the Protestant experiment, suggesting that if things continue as they are, God "will carry on the *ecumene* with the Roman Catholic Church, Eastern churches, and Pentecostal groups."³² Pentecostal scholar Cheryl Bridges Johns, who notes that Pentecostals are closer to Pope Benedict XVI's understanding of the organic unity of the Bible and the church than most Protestants, cites with approval a 1969 projection of John Mackay, "The Christian future may lie with a reformed Catholicism and a mature Pentecostalism."³³

In a lecture delivered at the Gregorian in 2018, my colleague Mel Robeck said that as he looks to the next 300 years, he sees Pentecostalism, not as "Church" but as a powerful form of spirituality within the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church:

I find it is much more helpful to understand Pentecostals as offering a uniquely powerful form of spirituality, a spirituality of Divine encounter, retrieved or restored from the darkness of history. It is able to transcend all denominational boundaries. It is a form of spirituality to be shared with and by the whole Church, rather than to remain the sole possession of the collection of Pentecostal/charismatic churches.³⁴

The Pentecostal and Neo-Pentecostal churches of the Global South present significant challenges for ecumenism. Nevertheless, many are communities rich in spiritual gifts and vitality. They are clearly helping to shape Christianity's future. Jesuits need to be involved with them.

32. Robert W. Jenson, "The Strange Future of 'the Ecumenical Movement,'" *The Living Church* (January 19, 2014), 24.

33. Cheryl Bridges Johns, "Of Like Passion: A Pentecostal Appreciation of Benedict XVI," in *The Pontificate of Benedict XVI*, ed. William G. Rush (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2009), 113; Mackay's statement was in his *Christian Reality and Appearance* (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1969), 88–89.

34. Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., "Can We Imagine an Ecumenical Future Together: A Pentecostal Perspective," *Gregorianum* 100, no. 1 (2019) 66–67, here 67.

List of Participants

John Brewer	guest
Bob Daly SJ	UNE*
Tony Curren	guest
Menino Gonsalves SJ	GOA
Pat Howell SJ	UWE
Tom Hughson SJ	UMI
Tom Layden SJ	HIB
Dorian Llywelyn SJ	UWE
Cedric Prakash SJ	GUJ
Tom Rausch SJ	UWE
Randy Sachs SJ	UNE*
Frank Sammon SJ	HIB
Peter Sexton SJ	HIB
Markus Schmidt SJ	ASR**
Krystian Sowa SJ	PME
Szabi Szabolcs SJ	HUN
Norman Tanner SJ	BRI

* Bob Daly and Randy Sachs are now members of the USA East Jesuit Province.

** Markus Schmidt is now member of the Central European Province.

