Priesthood and Apostolate

My remarks may be grouped under the following headings: (1) authenticity, (2) the Spirit, (3) the Word, (4) sending, (5) the Renaissance Jesuit, (6) the Jesuit today.

First, then, authenticity. For I wish to begin from what is simply human and, indeed, from a contemporary apprehension of what it is to be human. There is the older, highly abstract, logical, and so static and minimal apprehension of being human. It holds that being human is something independent of the merely accidental, and so one is pronounced human whether or not one is awake or asleep, a genius or a moron, a saint or a sinner, young or old, sober or drunk, well or ill, sane or crazy. In contrast with the static, minimal, logical approach, there is the contemporary, concrete, dynamic, maximal view that endeavors to envisage the range of human potentiality and to distinguish authentic from unauthentic realization of that potentiality. On this approach, being human is ambivalent: one can be human authentically, genuinely; and one can be human unauthentically. Moreover, besides ambivalence, there also is dialectic: authenticity never is some pure, serene, secure possession; it is always precarious, ever a withdrawal from unauthenticity, ever a danger of slipping back into unauthenticity.

On this view, then, the basic question is, What is authentic or genuine realization of human potentiality? In a word my answer is that authentic realization is a self-transcending realization. So I must attempt to describe what I mean by self-transcending. I shall illustrate five different instances and conclude that the last four of the five form an ordered unity.

In dreamless sleep we are still alive. We are operating in accord with the laws of physics, chemistry, and biology. It may be said that we are ourselves but not that we are reaching beyond ourselves and, much less, that we are rising above ourselves. But when we begin to dream, consciousness emerges. However helpless, however lacking in initiative, the dreamer is an intending subject. What is intended, commonly is obscure, fragmentary, symbolic. In so-called dreams of the night the source of the dream is one's somatic state, say, the state of one's digestion. But in dreams of the morning the dreamer is anticipating his waking state; he is recollecting his world; he is beginning to adopt a stance within that world. In the dream of the morning, then, ~~the dreamer is getting beyond himself anticipating his~~ the dreamer has got beyond himself; he is concerned with what is distinct from himself; he is anticipating his self-transcendence.

An enormously richer self-transcendence emerges when one awakes. There is the endless variety of things to be seen, sounds to be heard, odors to be sniffed, tastes to be palated, shapes and textures to be touched. We feel pleasure and pain, desire and fear, joy and sorrow, and in such feelings there seem to reside the mass and momentum of our lives.

We move about in various manners, assume now this and now that posture and position, and by the fleeting movements of our facial muscles, communicate to others the quiet pulse or sudden surge of our feelings.

Still sensations, feelings, movements are confined to the narrow strip of space-time occupied by immediate experience. But beyond that there is a vastly larger world. Nor is anyone content with immediate experience. Imagination wants to fill out and round off the picture. Language makes questions possible, and intelligence makes them fascinating. So we ask why and what and what for and how. Our answers construct, serialize, extrapolate, generalize. Memory and tradition and belief put at our disposal the tales of travelers, the stories of clans or nations, the exploits of heroes, the treasures of literature, the discoveries of science, the ~~reflect~~ reflections of philosophers, the meditations of holy men. Each of us has his own little world of immediacy, but all such worlds are just minute strips within a far larger world, a world constructed by imagination and intelligence, mediated by words and meaning, and based largely upon belief.

If the larger world is one and the same, still there are as many different ~~apprehensions~~ constructions of it as there are stages in human development and differences in human cultures. But such diversity only serves to bring to light a still further dimension of self-transcendence. Beyond questions for intelligence -- such as what and why and how and what for -- there are the questions for reflection that ask, Is that so or is it not so? Is that certain or is it only probable? Unlike questions for intelligence, these can be answered by a simple "Yes" or "No." How we can give such answers, is beside my present purpose; but what such

answers mean, is very much to it. For when we say that this or that really and truly is so, we do not mean that that is what appears, or what we imagine, or what we would like, or what we think, or what seems to be so, or what we would be inclined to Say. No doubt, we frequently have to be content with such lesser statements. But the point I would make is that the greater statement is not reducible to the lesser. When we seriously affirm that something really and truly is so, we are making the claim that we have got beyond ourselves in some absolute fashion, somehow have got hold of something that is independent of ourselves, somehow have reached beyond, transcended ourselves.

I have been endeavoring to clarify the notion of self-transcendence by contrasting, first, dreamless sleep with the beginnings of consciousness in the dream, secondly, the dreaming with the waking subject, thirdly, the world of immediate experience and the enormously vaster real world in which we live our lives, fourthly, that larger world as constructed by intelligence with the same larger world as known to have ~~with knowledge that it has~~ been constructed as it really is.

There remains a still further dimension of self-transcendence. Our illustrations, so far, have mainly regarded knowledge. There remains action. Beyond questions for intelligence -- what? why? how? what for? -- there are questions for reflection -- is that so? But beyond both there are questions for deliberation. Beyond the pleasures we enjoy and the pains we dread, there are the values to which we may respond with the whole of our being. On the topmost level of human consciousness the subject deliberates, evaluates, decides, controls, acts. At once he is practical and existential: practical inasmuch as [illegible]

he is concerned with concrete courses of action; existential inasmuch as control includes self-control, and the possibility of self-control ~~dmm~~ involves responsibility for the effects of his actions on others and, more basically, on himself. The topmost level of human consciousness is conscience.

However, man's self-control can proceed from quite different grounds. It can tend to be mere selfishness. Then the process of deliberation, evaluation, decision, is limited to determining what is most to one's advantage, what best serves one's interests, what on the whole yields a maximum of pleasure and a minimum of pain. At the opposite pole it can tend to be concerned solely with values: with the vital values of health and strength; with the social values enshrined in family and custom, society and education, the state and the law, the economy and technology, the church or sect; with ~~and~~ the cultural values of religion and art, language and literature, science, philosophy, history, theology; with the achieved personal value of one dedicated to realizing values in ~~himself~~ himself and promoting their realization in others.

In the ~~same~~ measure that one's living, one's aims, one's achievements are a response to values, in that measure self-transcendence is effected in the field of action. One has got beyond mere selfishness. One has become a principle of benevolence and beneficence. One has become capable of genuine collaboration and of true love. In the measure that self-transcendence in the field of action characterizes the members of a society, in that measure their world not only is constructed by imagination and intelligence, mediated by words and meaning, based by and large on belief; it also is a world motivated and regulated not by self-seeking but by values, not by what is

only apparently good but by what truly is good.

Now if we compare the last four of our modes of self-transcendence, we find that they form an interlocking unity. Experiencing is presupposed and complemented by inquiry and understanding. Experiencing and understanding are presupposed and complemented by reflecting and judging. Experiencing, understanding, and judging, are presupposed and complemented by deliberating and deciding. The four modes are interdependent, and each later level sublates those that precede in the sense that it goes beyond them, introduces something entirely new, makes that new element a new basis of operation, but so far from crowding or interfering with its predecessors, preserves them, perfects them, and extends their relevance and significance. Inquiry sharpens our powers of observation, understanding enormously extends the field of data one can master, reflection and judgement force inquiry to attend to ever further data and they force understanding to revise its previous achievements, deliberation turns attention from what is to what can be, to what probably would be, and, above all, to what really is worth while.

To conclude, human authenticity is a matter of following the built-in law of the human spirit. Because we can experience, we should attend. Because we can understand, we should inquire. Because we can reach the truth, we should reflect and check. Because we can realize values in ourselves and promote them in others, we should deliberate. In the measure that we follow these precepts, in the measure we fulfil these conditions of being human persons, we also achieve self-transcendence both in the field of knowledge and in the field of action.

Now you may have been wondering why I ~~am~~ have spent so much time on so remote a topic as authenticity. I have had three reasons for doing so. First, I wished to get out of the ~~context~~ abstract and static context dictated by logical clarity, coherence, ~~&~~ and rigor and into the ~~concrete~~ concrete, open, and on-going context dictated by attention, inquiry, reflection, and deliberation. ~~I have no intention of discussing the essence of the priesthood.~~ Secondly, I wished to get out of the context of a faculty psychology with its consequent alternatives of voluntarism, intellectualism, sentimentalism, and sensism, none of which ~~have~~ has any serious, viable meaning, and into the context of intentionality analysis that distinguishes and relates the manifold of human conscious operations and reveals that together they head man towards self-transcendence. Thirdly, I wished to have a base, a ~~springboard~~ starting-point, a spring-board, in people as they are and as they can discover themselves to be; for without such a base talk about the Spirit, the Word, the apostolate, the Jesuit priesthood is all in the air; it sounds abstract, irrelevant, without substance.

2. The Spirit

I have said that human authenticity is a matter of achieving self-transcendence. I have said that such achievement is always precarious, always a withdrawal from unauthenticity, always in danger of slipping back into unauthenticity. This is not a cheerful picture, and you may ask whether ordinary human beings ever seriously and perseveringly transcend themselves.

I think they do so when they fall in love. Then their being becomes being-in-love. Such being-in-love has its antecedents, its causes, its conditions, its occasions.

But once it has occurred and as long as it lasts, it takes over. It becomes the first principle. From it flow one's desires and fears, one's joys and sorrows, one's discernment of values, one's vision of possibilities, one's decisions and deeds.

Being-in-love is of different kinds. There is the love of intimacy, of husband and wife, of parents and children. There is the love of one's fellow men with its fruit in the achievement of human welfare. There is the love of God with one's whole heart and whole soul, with all one's mind and all one's strength (Mk 12, 30). It is God's love flooding our hearts through the Holy Spirit given to us (Rom 5, 5). It grounded the conviction of St. Paul that ".. there is nothing in death or life, in the realm of spirits or superhuman powers, in the world as it is or the world as it shall be, in the forces of the universe -- nothing in all creation that can separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom 8, 38 f.).

Being in love with God, as experienced, is being in love in an unrestricted fashion. All love is self-surrender, but being in love with God is being in love without limits or qualifications or conditions or reservations. It is with one's whole heart and whole soul and all one's mind and all one's strength. Just as a total openness to all questioning is our capacity for self-transcendence, so too an unrestricted being in love is the proper fulfilment of that capacity.

Because that love is the proper fulfilment of our capacity, that fulfilment brings a deep-set joy that can remain despite humiliation, privation, pain, betrayal, desertion. Again, that fulfilment brings a radical peace, the peace that the world

cannot give. That fulfilment ~~bears~~ fruit bears in acts of love for one's neighbor, a love that strives mightly to bring about the kingdom of God on this earth. On the other hand, the absence of that fulfilment opens ~~the~~ the way to the trivialization of human life in the pursuit of fun, to the harshness of human life that results from the ruthless exercise of power, to despair about human welfare springing from the conviction that the universe is absurd.

The fulfilment that is being in love with God is not the product of our knowledge and choice. It is God's gift. Like all being in love, as distinct from particular acts of loving, it is a first principle. So far from resulting from our knowledge and choice, it dismantles and abolishes the horizon in which our knowing and choosing went on, and it sets up a new horizon in which the love of God transvalues our values and the eyes of that love transform our knowing.

Though not the product of our knowing and choosing, it is not unconscious. On the ~~contrary~~ contrary, it is a conscious, dynamic state manifesting itself in what St. Paul named the harvest of the Spirit: love, joy, peace, kindness, goodness, fidelity, gentleness, and ~~self-God~~ self-control (Gal 5, 22).

To say that dynamic state is conscious is not to say that it is known. What is conscious is, indeed, experienced. But human knowing is not just experiencing. Human knowing includes experiencing but adds to it attention, scrutiny, inquiry, insight, conception, naming, reflecting, checking, judging. The whole problem of cognitional theory is to effect the transition from operations as experienced to operations as known. A great part of psychiatry is helping people effect the transition from conscious feelings to known feelings.

In like manner the gift of God's love ordinarily is not objectified in knowledge, but remains within subjectivity as a dynamic vector, a mysterious undertow, a fateful call to a dreaded holiness.

Because that dynamic state is conscious without being known, it is an experience of mystery. Because ~~the~~ the dynamic state is being in love, the mystery is not merely attractive but fascinating: to it one belongs; by it one is possessed. Because it is an unrestricted, unmeasured being in love, the mystery is out of this world; it is other-worldly; it evokes awe. Because it is a love so different from the selfish self it transcends, it evokes fear and terror. Of itself, then, and apart from any particular religious context in which it is interpreted, the experience of the gift of God's love is an experience of the holy, of Rudolf Otto's mysterium fascinans ~~et tremendum~~ et tremendum. Again, it is what Paul Tillich named a being grasped by ultimate concern. Again, it corresponds to Ignatius Loyola's consolation without a cause, as interpreted by Karl Rahner, namely, an experience with a content but without an apprehended object.

I have distinguished different levels of consciousness, and now I must add that the gift of God's love is on the topmost level. It is not the sensitive type of consciousness that emerges with sensing, feeling, moving. It is not the intellectual type that is added when we inquire, understand, think. It is not the rational type that emerges when we reflect, weigh the evidence, judge. It is the type of consciousness that also is conscience, that deliberates, evaluates, decides, controls, acts. But it is this type of consciousness at its root, as brought to fulfilment, as having undergone conversion, as possessing a

a basis that may be broadened and deepened and heightened and enriched but not superseded, as ever more ready to grasp deliberate and evaluate and decide and act with the easy freedom of those that do all good because they are in love. The gift of God's love takes over the ground and root of the fourth and highest level of man's waking consciousness. It takes over the peak of the soul, the apex animae.

3. The Word

Being in love is not just a state of mind and heart. It is interpersonal, on-going; it has its up's and down's, its ecstacies and quarrels and reconciliations, its withdrawals and returns; it reaches security and serenity only at the end of a long appreticeship. If a man and a woman were to love each other yet never avow their love, then they would have the beginnings of love but hardly the real thing. There would be lacking an interpersonal component, a mutual presence of self-donation, the opportunity and, indeed, the necessity of sustained development and growth. There would not be the steady increase in knowledge of each other. There would not be the constant flow of favors given and received, of privations endured together, of evils banished by common good will, to make love fully aware of its reality, its strength, its durability, to make ~~ward~~ love aware that it could always be counted on.

What is true of the love of intimacy, also is true of the love of God. Though God is one, he is not solitary. One God is three persons: Father, Son, and Spirit. The Father is not only the light in which there is no darkness but also love, agape (1 Jo 1, 5; 4, 8.16). The Son is his Word, through whom all things were made (Jo 1, 3), sent into the world to manifest the Father's love for the world (Jo 3, 16; 1 Jo 4, 14-16).

The gift of the Spirit is what floods Christian hearts with God's love. United in Christ through the Spirit, Christians are to love one another (koinōnia), bear witness to God's love (marturia), serve mankind (diakonia), and look forward to a future consummation when their love of God will be not just orientation to mystery but coupled with a knowledge of God similar to God's knowledge of them (1 Cor 13, 12).

God wills all men to be saved (1 Tim 2, 4), and theologians have concluded that he gives all men sufficient grace for salvation. Just what this sufficient grace is, commonly is not specified. But it is difficult to suppose that grace would be sufficient if it fell short of the gift of loving God above all and loving one's neighbor as oneself. So I am inclined to interpret the religions of mankind, in their positive moment, as the fruit of the gift of the Spirit, though diversified by the many degrees of social and cultural development, and distorted by man's infidelity to the self-transcendence to which he aspires.

But there is a notable anonymity to this gift of the Spirit. Like the Johannine pneuma, it blows where it wills; you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it comes from or where it is going (Jo 3, 8). What removes this obscurity and anonymity is the fact that the Father has spoken to us of old through the prophets and in this final age through the ~~(Heb 1, 1.2)~~ Son. ~~His word is both linguistic and incarnate meaning.~~ It is linguistic meaning that rebukes us for our sins and announces our ~~reception~~ redemption, the forgiveness of sinners, the bond of the eucharist, the promise of eternal life. But it is incarnate meaning primarily in the life and passion and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ but consequently in the ~~lives of those that, by the Spirit, follow Christ and in his~~

the Son (Heb 1, 1.2). His communication is twofold: it is both by linguistic meaning and by incarnate meaning. By linguistic meaning he rebuked those that give scandal, announced redemption for sinners, provided for the forgiveness of sin, established the bond of the Eucharist, promised the gift of the Spirit, and set before men the destiny of eternal life. But all such linguistic meaning was endlessly reinforced by the incarnate meaning to be contemplated in the life and ministry and, above all, in the suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ.

4. Sending

Both Christ's communication by linguistic meaning and his communication by incarnate meaning were circumscribed spatially and temporally. The gift of the Spirit can be everywhere at once, but the challenge of the Word radiates to the ends of the earth only through human mediation.

Such mediation may or may not be institutionalized. Institutionalized mediation may be discerned in New Testament statements about the Twelve, about the Seventy-two, about the Seven, about the Apostles that were not among the Twelve, about their companions, helpers, deputies, about bishops and deacons, and finally about elders. On the other hand, mediation that is not institutionalized is represented by the man casting out devils in Christ's name though he was not a follower of Jesus (Mk 9, 38), by the least of these, my little ones, that are to be loved as Christ himself (Mt 25, 40.45), by the duty of every Christian to express in his words and his deeds what he has received from Christ and his Spirit.

We are prone to think of the institutional as impersonal, but the institutionalized mediation of the New Testament was strictly personal. To the Twelve Matthew has Jesus saying: "To receive you is to receive me, and to receive me is to receive the one that sent me" (Mt 10,40). To the Seventy-two Luke has Jesus saying: "Whoever listens to you, listens to me; whoever rejects you, rejects me. And whoever rejects me, rejects the one who sent me" (Lk 10, 16). To those in the upper room late the first Easter Sunday John has Jesus saying: "As the Father sent me, so I send you." And "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive any man's sins, they stand forgiven; and if you pronounce them unforgiven, unforgiven they remain" (Jo 20, 21-23). In the speech made before King Agrippa Luke reports Paul to have said that ".. the Lord replied, 'I am Jesus whom you are persecuting. But now rise to your feet and stand upright. I have appeared to you for a purpose: to appoint you my servant and witness, to testify both to what you have seen and what you shall yet see of me. I will rescue you from this people and from the Gentiles to whom I am sending you. I send you to open their eyes and turn them from darkness to light, from the dominion of Satan to God, so that, by trust in me, they may obtain forgiveness of sins, and a place with those whom God has made his own'" (Act 26, 15-18).

Next, the early mediators are described as wonder workers. The Twelve were sent not only to preach the kingdom but also to heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, and cast out devils (Mt 10, 7.8). The Seventy-two were told to announce the proximity of the kingdom and to heal the sick (Lk 10, 8.9); they cast out devils and were able unhurt to tread underfoot snakes and scorpions (Lk 10, 17.19). After the coming of the Spirit,

Peter cured a well-known cripple outside the "Beautiful Gate" of the temple with sensational results (Acts 3 & 4). Later we are told, "In the end the sick were actually carried out into the streets and laid there on beds and stretchers, so that even the shadow of Peter might fall on one or another as he passed by; and the people from the towns around Jerusalem flocked in, bringing those that were ill or harassed by unclean spirits, and all of them were cured" (Acts 5, 15.16). Stephen worked great miracles and signs among the people (Act 6, 8). Philip in Samaria exorcized devils, and cured paralytics and cripples (Acts 8, 7). Miracles by Paul at Paphos, in Lycaonia, at Philippi, at Troas, on the storm-ridden ship at sea, and on Malta are recounted in Acts (Acts 13, 11; 14, 10; 16, 18; 20, 7 ff.; 27, 21; 28, 3.8). But at Ephesus ".. through Paul God worked miracles of an unusual kind: when handkerchiefs and scarves which had been in contact with his skin were carried to the sick, they were rid of their diseases and the evil spirits came out of them" (Acts 19, 11.12). Finally, according to Paul the accompaniment of signs, marvels, and miracles is among the marks of a true apostle (2 Cor 12, 12; cf. Rom 15, 18 f.); and this view echoes the response Jesus gave to the question put him by the disciples of the Baptist (Mt 11, 2-6).

Thirdly, institutionalized mediation slowly developed. The sending of the Twelve during the public ministry seems to have been an incidental task. But choosing them to be his permanent companions (Mk 3, 14) and giving them authority to cast out unclean spirits and to cure ailments of every kind (Mt 10, 1) are the beginnings of an institution. So, after ~~the resurrection, the Eleven realized that they who had been with our Lord from the days of the preaching of the Baptist~~

the resurrection, the Eleven could be told that they were to bear witness to Jesus to the ends of the earth (Acts 1, 8) and they decided to restore their original number by choosing another who had been with Jesus since the days of the preaching of John (Acts 1, 15 ff.). Finally, after the coming of the Spirit, they begin to preach and perform great deeds; and the number of converts moves to three thousand and then five thousand (Acts 2, 41; 4, 4); and persecutions begin.

The sending of the Seventy-two seems to have been incidental, a task rather than an office, but at least it set a precedent to the effect that others, not of the Twelve, could perform the same mission as the Twelve performed. Of the Seven, five are not mentioned again. Stephen soon became a martyr. Philip after evangelizing in Samaria and in the towns from Azotus to Caesarea, seems to have settled in the latter place where he and his four virgin and prophesying daughters were visited by St. Paul (Acts 21, 8).

After three chapters recounting mainly the activities of Stephen and Philip, Acts narrates the conversion of St. Paul. He is the clearest instance of one that is not of the Twelve yet an apostle. As he styled himself, ".. an apostle, not by human appointment or human commission, but by commission from Jesus Christ and God the Father...." (Gal 1, 1) and, again, "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen the Lord? If others do not accept me as an apostle, you at least are bound to do so, for you are yourselves the very seal of my apostolate, in the Lord" (1 Cor 9, 1.2). Finally, St. Paul very sharply distinguished his position from that of those with charismatic gifts. He asked the Corinthians: "Did the word of God originate with you? Or are you the only people to whom it came? If anyone claims

to be inspired or a prophet, let him recognize that what I write has the Lord's authority. If he does not recognize this, he himself should not be recognized" (1 Cor 14, 36-38).

A further step in the development may be discerned in Paul's companions, helpers, deputies. Of many of them very little is known, of others more, but best known are Timothy and Titus. Timothy's name appears in the inscriptions of the second letter to the Corinthians, of the letters to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon, and of the first and second letters to the Thessalonians. The Romans learn that he is Paul's companion in labor (Rom 16, 21) and the Corinthians are told that he does the work of the Lord as does Paul himself (1 Cor 16, 10). He was sent by Paul on various missions: from Ephesus to Macedonia (Acts 19, 22), to Corinth (1 Cor 4, 17), from Athens to Thessalonika (1 Th 3, 2), and there was a project of sending him to Philippi (Phil 2, 19). Finally, the author of the first of the pastorals instructed him on the appointment of bishops and deacons (1 Tim 3, 1-13) and later on the treatment to be accorded elders (1 Tim 5, 17-22). Titus accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem where circumcision was not required of him (Gal 2, 1.3). He was sent on a mission to Corinth and the second letter to the Corinthians repeatedly refers to his success (2 Cor 2, 13; 7, 6.13-14; 8, 6.16.23; 12, 18). The second letter to Timothy reports that he is in Dalmatia, while the letter to Titus himself says that Paul left him in Crete to correct abuses and to appoint elders in each of the towns (Tit 1, 5).

After untitled companions, helpers, deputies there come titled elders and titled bishops and deacons. Of these the best attested are the elders. The synoptic gospels speak of Jewish elders and in Matthew's passion narrative they are associated with the archpriests and the scribes. In Acts Christian elders are mentioned a number of times. There a group of elders was at Jerusalem. The alms sent to the church there were received by the elders (Acts 11, 30). At the council of Jerusalem the apostles and the elders were in charge (Acts 15, 2,4,6,22,23; 16, 4). After his third journey Paul visited James in Jerusalem and, on that occasion, recounted to James and all the elders his missionary activities (Acts 21, 18).

The existence of Christian elders also is attested for Asia Minor, Ephesus, and Crete. At the end of his first journey Paul is said to have instituted elders in the churches (Act 14, 23). On the return from his third journey Paul asked the elders of Ephesus to come to Miletus where he addressed them at some length (Acts 20, 17-35). Titus was instructed to institute elders in each town in Crete (Tit 1, 5).

The main function of the elders was watchfulness. Paul in his farewell discourse bade the elders from Ephesus to "Keep watch over yourselves and all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has given you charge, as ~~sheph~~ shepherds of the church of the lord, which he won for himself by his own blood. I know that when I am gone savage wolves will come in among you and will not spare the flock. Even from your own body there will be men coming forward who will distort the truth to induce the disciples to break away and follow them. So be on the alert; remember how for three years, night and day, I never ceased to counsel each of you, and how I wept over you" (Acts 20, 28-31).

The letter to Titus sets forth the moral qualities to be required of elders to conclude with the prescription that an elder ".. must adhere to the true doctrine, so that he may be well able both to move his hearers and to confute objectors. There are all too many, especially among Jewish converts, who are out of all control; they talk wildly and lead men's minds astray. Such men must be curbed, because they are ruining whole families by teaching things they should not, and all for sordid gain" (Tit 1, 9-11; cf. 1 Pet 5, 1-5).

The first letter to Timothy speaks of the elders both as leaders and as preaching and teaching (1 Tim 5, 17). It implies that they are constituted by the laying on of hands (1 Tim 5, 19). Inversely, Timothy himself is said to have received grace from the laying on of hands by the college of elders (1 Tim 4, 14; cf. 2 Tim 1, 6). The letter from James states that the elders are to be summoned to pray over the sick and to anoint them (Jm 5, 14).

A few notes are in order.

The Greek word for elder is presbuteros. From it are derived the English, priest, the French, prêtre, the German, Priester, the Italian, prete. But while the New Testament thinks of the elder chiefly as leading and teaching, later thought gives more prominence to the priest's role as dispenser of the sacraments.

Again, while the English word, priest, is derived from the Greek, presbuteros, it also is used to translate the Greek, hiereus, and the Latin, sacerdos. Later on these terms were used to refer to members of the Christian clergy, but in the New Testament they refer to Jewish and pagan priests, to Christ, and to all the faithful.

From this twofold use of the word, priest, there can arise some confusion. The priesthood of all the faithful means, not that all the faithful are elders, presbuteroi, but that all are hiereis, concerned with to hieron, the sacred.

Finally, the tasks performed by the elders elsewhere, were performed by untitled laborers at Thessalika. To the Thessalonians Paul wrote: "We beg you, brothers, to acknowledge those who are working so hard among you, and in the Lord's fellowship are your leaders and counsellors. Hold them in the highest possible esteem and affection for the work they do" (1 Th 5, 12). But though the letter to Romans does allude to the one that presides (Rom 12, 8), and first Corinthians speaks of gifts of guidance (1 Cor 12, 28), the silence about local leaders in much of St. Paul's writings suggests a gradual development.

There remain bishops and deacons. In two passages it would seem that these terms denote, not simply "overseer" and "helper", but ranks or orders in the church. The letter to the Philippians salutes all the faithful there with the bishops and the deacons (Phil 1, 1). The first letter to Timothy lists the qualities to be required first of bishops (1 Tim 3, 1-7) and then of deacons (1 Tim 3, 8-13). The term, deacon, occurs elsewhere frequently enough, but it seems to mean simply a helper. The term, bishop, occurs on the three other occasions: once it is applied to Christ (1 Pet 2, 25); twice it is applied to persons that in the context have already been referred to as elders (Act 20, 17 & 28; Tit 1, 5 & 9). It seems to me doubtful that those named bishops in the New Testament were bishops in the later sense: first, they are not assigned functions distinct from those of elders; secondly, there hardly could be successors to the apostles

when the apostles were still around.

5. The Renaissance Jesuit

There are the constants of Christianity and the variables. The constants are man's capacity and need for self-transcendence, the Spirit of God flooding men's hearts with God's love, the efficacy of those that mediate the word of God by word and example, by linguistic and incarnate meaning, for cor ad cor loquitur, speak from the heart and you will speak to the heart. But there also are the variables. Early Christianity had to transpose from its Palestinian origins to the Greco-Roman world. The thirteenth century had to meet the invasion of Greek and Arabic philosophy and science, and Thomas Aquinas had the merit not merely of preventing a destruction of faith but also of using the new knowledge to develop the faith and its theological expression. So too the old Society sized up and set about meeting the problems of its day.

There were the needs of the people, and the Jesuits worked in hospitals, taught catechism, preached, and dispensed the sacraments. There were the voyages of exploration and the beginnings of colonization, and the Jesuits were in India, Malaya, Indonesia, Japan, China, and North and South America. There was the Reformation, and the Jesuits were eminent in the labors of the Counter-reformation. The renewal of Greek and Latin studies contained a threat of a revival of paganism, and the Jesuits became the school-masters of Europe.

If we can be proud of our predecessors, we must also note that they took on the coloring of their age and shared its limitations. The Renaissance ideal was the uomo universale, the man that can turn his hand to anything. In the measure that ideal was attained by superiors and by subjects, it was possible for subjects to be shifted from one task to another, and it was possible to have superiors that could give such orders both wisely and prudently. Again, the culture of the time was classicist. It was conceived not empirically but normatively, not as the meanings and values inherent in a given way of life, but as the right set of meanings and values that were to be accepted and respected if one was not to be a plebeian, a foreigner, a barbarian. a native, Classicist philosophy was the one perennial philosophy. Classicist art was the set of immortal classics. Classicist laws and structures were the deposit of the wisdom and prudence of mankind. This classicist outlook was a great protector of good manners and a great support of good morals, but it had one enormous drawback. It included a built-in incapacity to grasp the need for change and to effect the necessary adaptations. In my opinion this built-in incapacity is the principal cause of the present situation in the church and in the society. Today most of us grant the need of change, but we would not be at such a loss when it comes to saying what are the needed changes, if today's openness had existed in 1870, or 1770, or 1670.

6. The Jesuit Today

A principal function of the Society of Jesus, in its original conception, was to meet crises. There is a crisis of the first magnitude today. For a principal duty of priests is to lead and teach the people of God. But all leadership and all teaching occurs within social structures and through cultural channels. In the measure that one insists on leading and teaching within structures that no longer function and through channels that no longer exist, in that very measure leadership and teaching cease to exist. The sheep are without shepherds: they are disorientated, bewildered, lost. Indeed, what is true of the sheep, can also be true of the shepherds as well: they too can be disorientated, bewildered, lost.

~~Perhaps the best I can attempt is to characterize certain basic features of our time. I shall~~

Perhaps the best I can attempt will be to outline three fundamental features of our time: modernity, secularism, and ~~technocracy~~ self-destructiveness.

By modernity I do not mean just anything that exists or functions today. I mean the basic developments out of which ~~have~~ has come the modern world. Of these the first is empirical science. It is something quite different from the notion of science set forth in Aristotle's Posterior Analytics. Not only is it a new notion but also it admits application, and its application has resulted in industrialization, urbanization, automation, a population explosion, mass media, instantaneous world news, rapid transportation, guided missiles, and thermonuclear bombs.

Next, despite the Renaissance ideal of speaking Latin, writing Greek, and reading Hebrew, there developed the modern languages and literatures. In the nineteenth century new conceptions and procedures were introduced into philology, hermeneutics, and history by a phalanx of investigators following the lead of Friedrich Wolf, Friedrich Schleiermacher, August Boeckh, and Leopold von Ranke. The classicist, normative notion of culture was replaced by an empirical notion: a culture came to denote the set of meanings and values inherent in a way of life. Human studies, Geisteswissenschaften, set about investigating, understanding, depicting the cultures of mankind. All were found to be man-made, contingent, subject to development, propagation, alteration, decay. All were found to have their good points and their weaknesses and, when to knowledge of them was added respect for them, there resulted cultural pluralism. The new methods, applied to Hebrew and Christian religion, made it plain that one had to dilute conciliar statements about quod tenet atque semper tenuit sancta mater ecclesia. Not only was development a fact that had to be acknowledged, not only were previous theological positions to be reversed, but the whole conception and method of theology has had to be overhauled.

~~A new type of natural science, new human studies, an~~ overhauled theology antiquated Scholastic philosophy. Not every theologian had the time or taste to develop an ade adequate substitute replacement, and the consequence has been ~~that now is the time for all good men to come to the aid~~ of the

The natural sciences and the new human studies have had their repercussions on philosophy. Positivism would drop philosophy and make sociology the queen of the sciences. Kantians offer a foundations for science, absolute idealists set forth a super-science, Kierkegaard, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Blondel turn to decision and action. The Catholic decision, ~~mmmfmm~~ promulgated by Leo XIII in Aeterni Patris, was "Back to Aquinas." While this movement flourished in the early part of this century, in the last decade it has completely collapsed, first, because historical studies of ~~medieval thought~~ the medieval period made any accurate statement of Thomist thought enormously complicated and permanently open to revision and, secondly, because the infiltration of the new types of human studies into theology necessitated a far more sophisticated type of philosophy than the medieval world could ~~provide~~ furnish. However, as yet there is no generally accepted up-to-date philosophy and, until there is, we can only expect a theological pluralism far more radical than the old-style pluralism of Thomists, Scotists, Suarezians, and so on. Such pluralism is the first item on the agenda of the recently formed International Theological Commission.

The problems that Catholics finally are facing have long existed. In his book, The Modern Schism, Martin Marty has them splitting the West into a religious minority and a secularist majority between the years 1840 and 1870. Further, he distinguished three types of secularist. In continental Europe secularists considered religion an evil and aimed at extirpating it. In Great Britain they considered it a ~~pue~~ private affair of ~~not~~ no ~~[illegible]~~ importance. In the ~~usa~~ United States religious leaders themselves tended to adapt religion to the secularizing trends of the times. But where religion is ~~pp~~ persecuted or ridiculed or watered down, there is unbelief, and unbelief is contagious. When everyone believes except the village atheist, doubting is almost impossible. When few believe, doubting is spontaneous,

~~A third feature of contemporary society is antihumanism. The eighteenth-century Enlightenment hoped to break the Church by decrying the accpetance of presuppositions and thereby the acceptance of [illegible] traditional Christianity~~

The eighteenth-century Englic Enlightenment hoped to end the acceptance of traditional Christianity by attacking tradition and insisting on itself with the principle of presuppositionless thought. But as Hans-Georg Gadamer has pointed out, a man's assumptions are not his personal achievement but ~~mm~~ his reality as a historical being.

A third feature of m contemporary society results from the rationalist rejection of tradition by the E eighteenth-century Engli Enlightenment. The intended victim was traditional Christianity, but the real victim has been something far larger. Down the millenia men have learnt a great deal, and all that has been learnt has been passed on from generation to generation. To eliminate that on-going growth of human under-

and believing is difficult.

A third feature of contemporary society is the consequence of secularism. It was Newman's theorem in The Idea of a University that to suppress a part of human knowledge has three effects: first, it results in ignorance of that part; secondly, it mutilates what of itself is an organic whole; thirdly, it causes distortion in the remainder in which man endeavors to compensate for the part that has been suppressed. On this showing, one is to expect that secularism not only leads to ignorance of religion but also mutilates knowledge as a whole and brings about distortion in what remains. Consider a few instances of such distortion.

Human knowledge results from a vast collaboration of many peoples over uncounted millenia. The necessary condition of that collaboration is belief. What any of us knows, only slightly results from personal experience, personal discovery, personally conducted verification; for the most part it results from believing. But the eighteenth-century Enlightenment was not content to attack religious belief. It prided itself on its philosophers. It set up a rationalist individualism that asked people to prove their assumptions or else regard them as arbitrary. In effect it was out to destroy not only the religious tradition but all tradition. Such rationalist individualism in the twentieth century seems to have infected our educationalists. Students are encouraged to find things out for themselves, to develop originality, to be creative, to criticize, but it does not seem that they are instructed in the enormous role of belief in the acquisition and the expansion of knowledge. Many do not seem to be aware that what they know of science is not immanently generated but for the most part simply belief.

A second distortion occurs in man's apprehension of man. Positivists, naturalists, behaviorists insist that human sciences have to be conducted on the same lines as the natural sciences. The resultant apprehension of man, if not mechanistic, is theriomorphic. Nor is this view of man as a machine or as an animal confined to some rarefied academic realm. It is applied. The applications reach out into all departments of thought and into all walks of life. They have the common feature of omitting advertence to human dignity and respect for human morality.

A third distortion is in the realm of technique. ~~Technicians are the people with the task of figuring out the most efficient use of currently available hardware.~~ Applied science and consequent inventions have given us our vast industrial, commercial, financial, administrative, educational, military complex. Technicians are the people with the task of figuring out the most efficient use of currently available hardware. The more successful they are, the greater the domain that they organize, and the less the domain under the control of old-style decision-makers, of managers, directors, mayors, governors, presidents. Again, the more brilliant they are, the less is it possible to explain to the uninitiated why things are done the way in which they are done. Finally, the more thorough the application of the principle of efficiency, the more must men adapt themsevles to its dictates in all their ~~work, now is the time for all good~~ labor hours and in all the goods and services they ~~receive~~ purchase from the technological establishment.

If I am correct in assuming that the Jesuits of the twentieth century, like those of the sixteenth, exist to meet crises, then they have to accept all the gains of modernity in natural science, in human science, in philosophy, in theology, while working out strategies for dealing with secularist ~~cries~~ views on religion and with concomitant distortions in man's ~~xi~~ notion of human knowledge, in his apprehension of human reality, in his organization of human affairs. How such strategies are to be worked out is, of course, an enormous question, and I must be content to offer no more than the briefest suggestions. First, any such strategy is not a conclusion from premisses but a creative project emerging from a thorough understanding of a situation and grasping just what can be done about it. Secondly, it is not some static project set forth once and for all but, on the contrary, it is an on-going project constantly revised in the light of the feed-back from its implementation. Thirdly, it is not some single, on-going project but a set of them, constantly reported to some central clearing-house with the ~~function~~ twofold function ~~of~~ (1) of drawing attention to conflicts between separate parts and (2) of keeping all parts informed both of what has been achieved elsewhere and what has been tried and found wanting. Finally, all such projects must be in Christ Jesus, the work of those that take up their cross daily, that live by the Spirit in the Word, that consecrate themselves to loving, that banish all tendencies to ~~war~~ hatred, reviling, destroying.