

CHRISTOPHER RUDDY

# Heroism, Hospitality, and Holiness

---

## Generational Perspectives on the Church-World Relationship<sup>1</sup>

IT IS PERILOUS—and presumptuous—to speak as a representative of a generation. Although born in 1970 and having watched an inordinate amount of MTV growing up, I am not a typical Generation X-er in terms of faith as described by Tom Beaudoin in his book *Virtual Faith*,<sup>2</sup> particularly in the Gen-X preference for personal “spirituality” over institutional “religion.” And, although everyone under thirty or forty may seem alike to those older, I am increasingly struck by the ever-greater differences between my students and me: born in the early to mid-1980s, they have no memory, for example, of Ronald Reagan or even the Gulf War, much as I am completely incompetent when it comes to Web page design and instant messaging. Moreover, although I am young, my Catholicism is largely old and thick. I grew up in the novelist Alice McDermott’s country—Queens and Nassau Counties, New York—a dense, urban Catholicism, where my all-boys high school classmates identified themselves by parish, and immigrant culture and employment still endured; my high school lost nearly twenty graduates on September 11, 2001, at the World Trade Center, many of whom

were city firefighters. The geographic rootlessness, parish-shopping, suspicion of institutions, and fragmented families so characteristic today are not my experiences.

Nonetheless, even if I cannot pretend to speak for an entire generation or generations, I do think that I am representative of many younger believers and theologians, particularly in a certain distance and freedom from the polarizations of the Vatican II generation: the mention of John Paul II does not reflexively raise for me the specter of Pius XII or the promise of John XXIII, nor is *Humanae vitae* shorthand for repressive sexual teaching or the corrosive dissent of theologians. If younger generations are often frighteningly ignorant of their church's history, that same "clean slate" also offers much space with which to work and to open new ways of life and thought.

Accordingly, the "signs of the times" reveal, along with grief and anguish, many joys and hopes for the church and the world that I hope to explore. I will proceed in three steps: first, a brief definition of the terms "church" and "world"; second, an exploration of two signs of the times—heroism and hospitality—that I have encountered in my students and my peers and that I find personally helpful in envisioning the church's engagement with the world; and third, a concluding look at holiness as perhaps the best lens with which to view the church-world relationship today. My focus is not primarily sociological or statistical, but theological and ecclesiological (mindful, of course, that these categories can never be separated cleanly). Moreover, even though the immediate context for my remarks is North American, I also will look at a more global perspective.

For the sake of simplicity, I define "church" and "world" as *Gaudium et spes* does. The "church" is that pilgrim community sharing in the Triune life and announcing the good news of salvation to the world. Its nature is to be a sacrament of communion; its mission is evangelization (GS 1). The "world," in turn, is the "entire human family," the "theater of human history, bearing the marks of its travail, its triumphs and failures" (GS 2). The council further defines the

world theologically and Christologically: it is created in love, fallen through sin into slavery, liberated by the cross and resurrection—all moving toward the fulfillment of the Father’s plan.

The social ethicist Bryan Hehir has said that the most important word in the extended title of *Gaudium et spes*—“Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World”—is “in.” Unlike “against” or even “and,” “in” rules out any simple juxtaposition, opposition, or detachability of church and world. While not identical, church and world are yoked together as partners: the church “travels the same journey as all of humanity and shares the same earthly lot with the world: it is to be a leaven and, as it were, the soul of human society in its renewal by Christ and transformation into the family of God” (GS 40).<sup>3</sup>

Following Gerhard Lohfink (and Augustine), I would say that the church is, objectively, the world reconciled. In *Does God Need the Church?* Lohfink writes:

It is the will of God to have a people in the world so that one can clearly see, by looking at that people, how God proposes that human society should be, so that the world can see the unanimity and peace that is possible in such a people and thus come to peace for itself. It is the will of God to lead the whole world to liberation and redemption through the redemption and liberation that happens in one people.<sup>4</sup>

The church, in this view, exists to remind the world of its true story (Robert Jenson) or final destiny (Timothy Radcliffe) and to make that truth and life present, I will argue, through heroism, hospitality, and holiness. It *almost* goes without saying that the church sometimes needs to be reminded of its mission by the world—even by that erstwhile target of divine power, the *Boston Globe*! For Lohfink and Vatican II, the church’s high calling should always be a cause for humility, repentance, and service. Gift and task go hand-in-hand.

In this time of self-inflicted crisis for the American church, a call to heroism can seem arrogant and presumptuous, even dangerous. Isn't a dose of humility exactly what's called for? I nonetheless find the call to heroism encapsulated in the Lucan refrain of Pope John Paul II's 2001 apostolic letter, *Novo millennio ineunte*: "Put out into the deep"—a refrain that has nothing to do with willfulness or self-aggrandizement, but instead calls one to trust and generosity. In the breadth of its vision and the depth of its hope, *Novo millennio* is one of the finest documents of John Paul's papacy, alongside *Dives in misericordia*, *Evangelium vitae*, and *Ut unum sint*. One might have thought that the conclusion of the millennial Jubilee year would have occasioned a certain relaxation and satisfaction, even on the part of an ailing octogenarian who had fulfilled his charge to lead the church into the third millennium. Instead, the pope tells us to "put out into the deep," and that "if ours has been a genuine pilgrimage, it will have as it were stretched our legs for the journey still ahead" (NMI 59). His trips to Azerbaijan and Bulgaria are proof of the power—and limits—of papal calisthenics!

Heroism has had a hard go of it, sometimes for good reasons. One thinks immediately of the atrocities committed in the twentieth century in the name of various totalitarianisms and their grand schemes of social revolution. On a more constructive level, the philosopher Charles Taylor has identified the "affirmation of ordinary life" as one of the fundamental signs of the times of modernity, having roots in Protestantism's rejection of Catholic monasticism, sacramental worship, and hierarchy, and the consequent recovery of vocation for all believers—no matter how mean or exalted their employment or estate in life.<sup>5</sup> In Catholic terms, Karl Rahner has stressed the ordinariness of grace and the Christian life, partly in response to the disincarnated, kitschy devotionism and extreme asceticism of his day.

In American Catholicism, the sacramental or analogical imagination has rightly emphasized the ubiquity and ordinariness of God's

presence in his creation. This emphasis on the ordinary and the human dimensions of grace comes as no surprise when one realizes that many of the foremost proponents of the sacramental imagination—David Tracy, Andrew Greeley, Richard McBrien, Michael Himes, Charles Curran, and Bryan Hehir—are diocesan priests, that is, “secular” clergy. The theological substance of the sacramental imagination has been accompanied by a corresponding style—dialogue, interaction, service, consensus—partly as a response to the ghettos, defensiveness, insecurity, and militancy of the preconciliar American church. Those who experienced that church as constricting or suffocating saw Vatican II and the sacramental imagination that found conceptual form in the council’s aftermath as affirmation of a church at home in the world, of the goodness and integrity of God’s creation.

All of this was and is good and necessary. I cut my theological teeth in college on David Tracy and his *The Analogical Imagination*, and it remains a touchstone for me. The contemporary mantra of finding God in all things, however, is not always the most appealing or helpful approach today. On the one hand, it often leads indifferent students to remain indifferent and unconverted; such an ubiquitous God seemingly makes no demands: “if God is everywhere, then I’ll just keep on doing what I’m doing and try to recognize God a bit more.” On the other hand, more passionate or skeptical students ask, “So, why commit to Christianity? Why should I live—or die—for something available elsewhere?” In this context, we should remember that St. Ignatius’s counsel to “seek God in all things” comes only at the very end of his *Spiritual Exercises*. The fourth, concluding week of contemplation on God’s love in the resurrection is preceded by a demanding purification and recognition of oneself as a beloved sinner in the first week; an identification with, and election to serve, Christ the King in the second week; and, thus humbled and chosen, a sharing in Christ’s passion and death in the third week.

In an essay from the 1930s, “The Ignatian Mysticism of Joy in the World,” a young Karl Rahner noted that the Jesuit is one who can accept the world precisely because he has fled from it and embraced the foolishness of the Cross. His obedience to the God beyond the world is the condition for his immersion in the work of the world. In words that ring true today, Rahner wrote:

Adaptation, the acceptance of the demand upon time, the fostering of culture, love for the sciences, acceptance of the humanism and individualism of the Renaissance, the cheerful brightness of the Baroque, the avoidance of the external forms of monasticism, all this and much besides has been regarded—and rightly—as a sign of Jesuit affirmation of the world. But one has really grasped this phenomenon only when one is able to explain it as arising from one spirit: how this one spirit inspired those possessed of it in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries both to build Baroque churches with their joyous exuberance of a shining transfiguration of the world *and* at the same time to offer themselves for the distant missions in order to die agonizingly for Christ in the boiling fountains of Japan or the bamboo cages of Tonkin.<sup>6</sup>

Why this long Jesuit, if not Jesuitical, digression? The sacramental imagination is often presented or popularized today in a diminished form and has lost its edge in a world that has replaced sin with therapy and fatalism and ignored the necessity of conversion if grace is to be discerned and embraced. Grace has become cheap—and many of our students and young people know it. As Rahner put it, “Ignatius does not admit for himself or his disciples any joy in the world in which the world and God, time and eternity, are from the beginning reconciled in amicable harmony.”<sup>7</sup> Simply put, the church today needs to recover that same spirit of heroism and generosity that sent those Jesuit missionaries to certain suffering and possible death and that inspired such glorious humanism. Heroism knows that

the amicable harmony of God and humanity, church and world, comes only at a high cost.

I suspect this is why a number of my students find John Paul II inspiring. They sense his authenticity and integrity, his respect and warmth toward them, his willingness to challenge them to the high standards of Christian discipleship: "If Christ is presented to young people as he really is, they experience him as an answer that is convincing, and they can accept his message, even when it is demanding and bears the mark of the cross."<sup>8</sup> Fearless and secure in his identity as Christian and bishop, the pope has no apparent desire to be accepted or be considered popular. Even as I have reservations about the increasing power of the Roman Curia or his appointment of bishops, I greatly admire his obvious love for Christ and humanity. As his recent trips to eastern Europe have made clear, John Paul has devoted unprecedented attention to the role of martyrdom in the life of the church.<sup>9</sup> He has also made clear, following Vatican II, the common holiness demanded of all believers by their baptism. He writes in *Novo millennio ineunte* that it would be a "contradiction" for the baptized "to settle for a life of mediocrity marked by a minimalist ethic and a shallow religiosity." Christian life, he continues, does not involve "some kind of extraordinary existence, possible only for a few 'uncommon heroes' of holiness. The ways of holiness are many, according to the vocation of each individual."<sup>10</sup> Heroism, then, is at once ordinary and exacting, and this paradox needs to be recovered.

If heroism involves a certain disregard for the world (an insight Catholic colleges and universities would do well to ponder), it also calls for a real love for the world. Not shrill, pseudoprophetic denunciations of the culture of death that make little demand on the laity and still less on the hierarchy. Not the numbing repetition of "countercultural" by clerics and academics alike. A community that builds Chartres and the Sistine Chapel never can be simply countercultural; Christianity, the religion of Incarnation, is as cultural as it gets. For

example, at the 2001 Catholic Theological Society of America convention, Cardinal Francis George of Chicago—no slouch as a critic of American culture—said he dislikes the word “countercultural.” Christians, he said, must, like their founder, always love the world they seek to evangelize and transform.

Without such love, heroism can quickly shade into stridency and thereby exacerbate the crises of authority and trust already so evident in the West. Heroism thus calls for the corresponding virtue of hospitality, a way of “making room”<sup>11</sup> for the gifts and burdens of others, a way of providing stable community in an increasingly mobile and fragmented world. The opening paragraphs of *Gaudium et spes* speak famously and eloquently of the deep solidarity between the church and the world, of the dialogue engendered and required by such solidarity, and of the mutual exchange of gifts between the church and the world. “Travel[ing] the same journey as all of humanity” (GS 40), the church is a pilgrim community in the world on its way to the Lord. If earlier I took John Paul’s “put out into the deep” as a shorthand for heroism, I now take Timothy Radcliffe’s reflections on the Johannine “I call you friends” as the shorthand for hospitality, both within the church and in the church’s relationship with the world.

In his intervention at the Second Synod of European Bishops in 1999, Radcliffe, an English scripture scholar and then-head of the Dominican order, uses Luke’s Emmaus story as a model for the hospitable role of the church in a world that has been “crucified by ideologies which made absolute claims”<sup>12</sup> and that shares the Enlightenment’s prejudice against authority. Recalling the disciples’ flight from Jerusalem in despair over the seeming failure of their hope in Jesus, Radcliffe notes that Jesus does not stop them, but walks with them and shares their grief and anguish. He explains the scriptures to them. In the end, their eyes opened in the breaking of the bread, the disciples return to Jerusalem to announce the resurrection they have seen and witnessed. Through his hospitality, Jesus overcomes the cri-

sis of authority and bestows life and true authority. He has authority in the first place because he listens and walks with them; second, because he talks with them and brings reason to bear on the scriptures; third, because he breaks bread and gathers them into community; and, last, because such hospitality empowers them to proclaim the truth. In Radcliffe's words, proclamation, not submission, is the result of Jesus' authority. He shares with us his authority:

We [must] show that the Word we proclaim does not just stand over and against us. It is more intimate to our being than any word we could speak; it made us and it enters the darkest places of the human heart and offers us a home. Then we will all be able to speak of the absolute claim of Christ with authority, and show it to offer us true freedom.<sup>13</sup>

The hospitality embodied by Jesus on the road to Emmaus manifests itself in at least two forms: friendship and truth. Friendship comprises two elements: love and equality. Jesus reveals that our relationship to God is not primarily that of servant to master, or even of creature to creator, but of lover to lover and of friend to friend. And, we are friends of God only because through and in Jesus we have become equals with God and can share his life.<sup>14</sup> The church, in this context, makes the "joys and hopes, the grief and anguish" of the world its own, not for its own advantage or even out of duty, but out of love for its partner. Such friendship—God's essence and our destiny—involves a sharing of life, even in the most difficult of circumstances. I think of the seven Trappist martyrs of Tibhirine in Algeria, who remained at their monastery in the midst of fundamentalist terror out of love for Christ and of friendship with their Muslim neighbors. Their threefold mission of "la présence, la prière, et le partage" cost them their lives, even as it gave life to Christians and Muslims alike.<sup>15</sup>

Second, genuine friendship, which wills the good of the other, as Aquinas teaches, is always grounded in truth. Radcliffe notes that

truth has been tainted as “cold, cerebral, and even arrogant.” Ever the good (and proud) Dominican, he sees it instead as “a light that reveals the beauty and goodness of God’s world, and also its suffering and pain.”<sup>16</sup> This truth unifies and sanctifies: “[It] heals and unites because it is a truth that transforms us, that undoes all our little claims to domination, explodes all ideologies, and breaks down the boundaries.”<sup>17</sup> Such truth is not a possession to be hoarded and wielded defensively but is a gift to be shared. It is to be proclaimed with the confidence that it is of God and the humility that such divine mystery always exceeds our grasp of it. This larger and deeper truth simultaneously unites and diversifies and is opposed to the narrowness of fear and heresy; it is truly catholic. The French Benedictine Ghislain Lafont has written that Catholicism needs to foster diversity *ab intra* if it is to have any chance of being open to the diversity found *ad extra* in other churches and religions; ecumenism and inter-religious dialogue will be hampered apart from a sense of the catholicity of truth.<sup>18</sup>

How is this truth to be engaged and received? Through listening and argument. I think of the words of Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O’Connor of the diocese of Westminster, England, who said that we need “ears as large at least as [our] mouth[s]” if dialogue is to succeed.<sup>19</sup> I also think of the listening sessions presently underway in several dioceses concerning the sexual abuse scandals. Globally, I think of Umberto Eco and Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini of Milan conducting a public conversation on topics ranging from immortality to sexuality,<sup>20</sup> and the “chair of non-believers” that Cardinal Martini established in his cathedral. Radcliffe, for his part, notes that Aquinas had no interest in debunking strawmen or conquering his questioners. Rather, he always sought to present his opponent’s arguments in the most positive terms and to acknowledge whatever truth was found therein. Through such listening and genuine argument, the particularly Catholic confidence in the power of human reason to discern truth finds expression in the building up of community.

Such an emphasis on truth may help to counter the downside of an otherwise positive sign of the times among younger generations: a tolerance and openness toward other beliefs and ideas that can slip into a well-intentioned, but sloppy, relativism and indifference. In one sense, such tolerance is clearly good. My students carry no baggage concerning Protestant inferiority to Catholicism and wonder how Christians could ever have accused the Jews of being “Christ-killers”; the historical import of *Nostra aetate’s* rejection of Jewish deicide raises scarcely an eyebrow among them. They are open to other religions and largely free from triumphalism.

In another sense, however, such tolerance rests partly on a flabby conception of religious truth that ignores claims of revelation and objectivity. Two forms of relativism are common: what I call the “all roads lead to God” and “Duff beer” approaches. In the first form, numerous religious rivers all flow to the same divine ocean; one religion is just as good as any other. In the second form, borrowed from *The Simpsons*, the same product (be it beer or God) is dispensed under different brand names: “Duff,” Duff Light,” and “Duff Dry”; all religions are basically the same. Whether the movement is from the many to the one or from the one to the many, such lazy tolerance is deeply patronizing and disrespectful of persons and truth.<sup>21</sup> We are called instead to show that in Christ and his church, truth and friendship find their home *and* their fullness. But where does the world find such hospitality and catholicity in our parishes and dioceses, our leaders, our documents, our theologies?

Hospitality and heroism meet in what I consider a third sign of the times: holiness. In his 1975 apostolic exhortation, *Evangelii nuntiandi*, Pope Paul VI wrote, “Modern man listens more willingly to witnesses than teachers, and if he does listen to teachers, it is because they are witnesses.”<sup>22</sup> The witness of holiness remains powerful when words are suspect, even bankrupt. Has there been a time in any of our Catholic lives—younger or older—when such holiness has been more lacking or more needed? If, in the American

church, there is a single sign of the times to be “interpreted in the light of the Gospel” (GS 4), then surely it is holiness and its lack thereof. And, both sadly and blessedly, the world has brought this to the church.

Heroism and hospitality have, in various ways, already touched on the theme of holiness. By way of conclusion, I wish to look briefly at three specific dimensions of holiness: poverty, beauty, and the spirituality and structures of communion.

If holiness is, ultimately, a belonging to God in Christ, then the closer the church is to the Christ who is poor in means and in spirit, the closer it will be to God. *Novo millennio ineunte* calls for a “new creativity” in charity by “getting close” to the suffering, so as to make it an experience of hospitality between brothers and sisters rather than the (unintended) humiliation of the weak by the strong.<sup>23</sup> And, in words that should give pause to those who would locate the church’s prophetic witness in the condemnation of contemporary culture, John Paul makes the remarkable claim that

we must therefore ensure that in every Christian community the poor feel at home. Would not this approach be the greatest and most effective presentation of the good news of the kingdom?<sup>24</sup>

In a more spiritual sense of poverty, *Lumen gentium* called the church to both acknowledge its own poverty and sinfulness before the Lord and to identify more deeply with the Christ who freely became poor for our sakes (LG 8). It is significant that *Lumen gentium* speaks of the “church of the poor” at the conclusion of its opening chapter on the mystery of the church, thereby forestalling any pretensions to triumphalism and self-satisfaction, and it is terribly clear how important such poverty and humility are today for the American church. Only such a poor and penitent church can have internal and external credibility at a time when its words and formal authority are so compromised.

Paradoxically, though, such poverty is also deeply attractive and beautiful. Beauty reaches its fullest glory in the crucified and risen Christ. Think, for instance, of the radiant appeal of St. Francis: the “second Christ,” exemplary for both his unequaled identification with the poor and crucified Christ, as well as his equally unequaled love for all creation. Is it mere coincidence that Francis is, next to Mary, the most popular of saints, and the saint most appealing to those not Christian?

Often mistakenly held to be a “luxury,”<sup>25</sup> in Andrew Greeley’s words, beauty is certainly the most neglected of the three doors—truth, goodness, beauty—that lead to God. In his intervention at 2001’s extraordinary consistory of cardinals, Cardinal Godfried Danneels of Brussels noted that, in a time where people “hesitate before the true” and are “impotent before the good,” beauty remains irresistible—even, or especially, to those suspicious of the church. They find themselves “disarmed and left speechless,” for instance, by a performance of Bach’s “Passion According to St. Matthew.”<sup>26</sup> Likewise, at Yale University, a local Episcopalian church conducts a Sunday Compline service that often attracts scores of undergraduates, Christian or not. The church is lit by hundreds of candles, and the congregation is led through some of the highest and most intricate chants imaginable. Through such beauty, what can be otherwise distant and other can touch something deeply intimate even in those of different or no faith. Hans Urs von Balthasar once remarked, “The Church . . . is credible only in the saints.”<sup>27</sup> Perhaps we might say that only a church beautiful in service and worship is credible today:

It is not enough to deplore the ugliness that fills our world. Neither is it enough, in our “disincarnated” age, to talk of justice, duties, the common good, pastoral programs, and the demands of the Gospel. We must talk with a heart full of compassionate love, experiencing that charity which gives with joy and enkindles the enthusiasm of all it touches. We must radiate the beauty of that which is *true* and *just* in life,

because only this beauty truly captivates the heart and turns it to God. . . . It is a beautiful thing to stake our own existence on he who is not only the truth in person, not only the greatest good, but the only one who reveals to us the divine beauty for which our hearts have a profound longing and intense need.<sup>28</sup>

Last, the witness of holiness must be manifest in the spirituality and the structures of communion. In *Novo millennio*, John Paul writes, "To make the church the home and the school of communion: that is the great challenge facing us in the millennium which is now beginning if we wish to be faithful to God's plan and respond to the world's deepest yearnings" (NMI 43). Communion literally means "sharing" or "participation," and the pressing need for the greater participation of all of the baptized in the life and structures of the church has been a frequent theme in recent months for the American Catholic church.

Among the young, who often sadly lack institutional commitment but keenly seek authenticity and detect hypocrisy, such participation represents a special challenge and opportunity. In particular, while the loss of deference to authority has its bad aspects, it also offers possibilities. Because many people no longer defer automatically to authority, leaders must earn respect. Cardinal Murphy-O'Connor recently said, "Happily [young people] look to us, and regard us, more as people than as hierarchs. It is both humbling and liberating to remember that in the eyes of our young people our teaching authority and our evangelizing power derive far more from the authenticity of our personal witness than from the authority of our office."<sup>29</sup> As de facto authority replaces de jure authority at this moment in the life of the church, Pope Paul's words about the priority of witness to teaching are increasingly apt.

Doubtless, any number of other signs of the times concerning the church-world relationship could be offered; I make no pretense to omniscience or exhaustiveness. Nonetheless, I do think that the

interplay of heroism, hospitality, and holiness represents a new moment for the church in its relationship with the world. In such ways, we will not only attend to the signs *of* the times, but also be signs of Christ *for* our times.<sup>30</sup>

When the Church of Love lives in full its identity as a community gathered together by the 'beautiful Shepherd' in divine charity, it offers itself as a living 'icon' of the Trinity and announces the beauty that saves the world. This is the Church that has generated us in the faith and continually makes our hearts beautiful with the light of the Word, the forgiveness of God and the strength of the bread of life. This is the Church that we would like to be, a Church in which we open ourselves to the splendour that radiates from above, so that this splendour—dwelling in our communities—might attract the 'pilgrimage of the nations.' . . . Through his people the 'beautiful Shepherd' will be able to reach many with the light of salvation. Thus many will be attracted to him, and his beauty will save the world.<sup>31</sup>

The world which, paradoxically, despite innumerable signs of the denial of God, is nevertheless searching for him in unexpected ways and painfully experiencing the need of Him—the world is calling for evangelizers to speak to it of a God whom the evangelists themselves should know and be familiar with as if they could see the invisible. The world calls for and expects from us simplicity of life, the spirit of prayer, charity toward all, especially towards the lowly and the poor, obedience and humility, detachment and self-sacrifice. Without this mark of holiness, our word will have difficulty in touching the heart of modern man. It risks being vain and sterile.<sup>32</sup>

## Notes

1. An earlier version of this essay was presented to the Ecclesiology seminar at the 2002 Catholic Theological Society of America Convention in New Orleans. I would like to thank the convener, Susan Wood, SCL; the moderator, Bradford Hinze; and the participants for their comments and questions.

2. Tom Beaudoin, *Virtual Faith: The Irreverent Spiritual Quest of Generation X* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998).
3. For further reflections on the interaction or “interculturality” of the church and world, see John Coleman, “How Culture and the Gospel Meet and Interact,” *Origins* 31 (June 7, 2001): 58–64.
4. Gerhard Lohfink, *Does God Need the Church? Toward a Theology of the People of God*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Collegeville, Minn.: Michael Glazier, 1999), 302. See also 288–89:

Therefore *through the Church* the exalted Lord draws the world under his rule. The necessary consequence is that the Church itself is worldly. It is not *above* the world or *beyond* the world. We cannot even say that the Church is *in* the world. No, the church itself is world and nothing else. But it is world under the rule of Christ. It is a world in which his fullness is already present. In this sense and only in this sense can we say that through it the whole world and the whole of society are to be drawn into the space of reconciliation that the Risen One creates in the world.

Such a position has consequences. Ephesians itself does not reflect on those consequences, but they are obvious enough. To bring the world together, to draw it to its home, to transform it certainly cannot mean standing over against it like know-it-alls and handing it faith from without, but drawing everything there is in the world in the way of reason and enlightenment, goodness and success, into the realm of faith so that it may become the praise of God. The Church’s task is to grasp all the spheres of life, to transform all the matter of the world, and to gather into itself all wisdom and beauty so that the new face of the earth can be illuminated and become visible.

5. Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1989), 13–14, 23–24, 211–33.
6. Karl Rahner, “The Ignatian Mysticism of Joy in the World,” *Theological Investigations*, vol. 3, trans. Karl-H. and Boniface Kruger (Baltimore: Helicon, 1967): 277–93, at 290.
7. *Ibid.*, 283.
8. Pope John Paul II, *Novo millennio ineunte*, no. 9. The entire paragraph reads

Yet again, the young have shown themselves to be for Rome and for the church *a special gift of the Spirit of God*. Sometimes when we look at the young, with the problems and weaknesses that characterize them in contemporary society, we tend to be pessimistic. The Jubilee of Young People however changed that, telling us that young people, whatever their possible ambiguities, have a profound longing for those genuine values which find their fullness in Christ. Is not Christ the secret of true freedom and profound joy of heart? Is not Christ the supreme friend and the teacher of all genuine friendship? If Christ is presented to young people as he really is, they experience him as an answer that is convincing and they can accept his message, even when it is demanding and bears the mark of the cross. For this reason, in response to their enthusiasm, I did not

hesitate to ask them to make a radical choice of faith and life and present them with a stupendous task: to become “morning watchmen” (cf. Isa 21:11-12) at the dawn of the new millennium.

9. See Lawrence Cunningham, “The Universal Call to Holiness: Martyrs of Charity and Witnesses of Truth,” in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia Jubilee Volume: The Wojtyła Years* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2001), 109–16; “Saints and Martyrs: Some Contemporary Considerations,” *Theological Studies* 60 (1999): 529–37.; “On Contemporary Martyrs: Some Recent Literature,” *Theological Studies* 63 (2002): 374–81. Also, Sven-Erik Brodd, “A Communion of Martyrs: Perspectives on the Papal Encyclical Letter *Ut unum sint*,” *Ecumenical Review* 52 (April 2000): 223–33.
10. Pope John Paul II, *Novo millennio ineunte*, no. 31.
11. *Ibid.*, no. 43.
12. Timothy Radcliffe, “The Road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35),” in *I Call You Friends* (London: Continuum, 2001): 173–75, at 173.
13. *Ibid.*, 175.
14. Herbert McCabe, “God,” in *God Still Matters* (London: Continuum, 2002): 3–12.
15. John W. Kiser, *The Monks of Tibhirine: Faith, Love, and Terror in Algeria* (New York: St. Martin’s, 2002), 81; also, 144:

During their years of living together, they had built up a mutual dependence with the neighbors. The monks were conscious that they bore witness to a Christianity that was open and accepting of differences in the way people worship God. Their neighbors represented an Islam that was also accepting and respected them as they were. In all Algeria, only in the ultra-traditional Medea did church bells still ring without offending people. The monks and their Muslim friends had become like a married couple which, despite their differences, had grown together with time, seeing in “*la différence*” also “*la richesse*.”

See also, René Guitton, *Si nous nous taisons . . . Le martyre des moines de Tibhirine* (Paris: Calmann-Levy, 2001).

16. Radcliffe, *I Call You Friends*, 55.
17. Radcliffe, “Consecrate Them in Truth (John 17:17),” in *I Call You Friends*, 113–17, at 116.
18. Ghislain Lafont, *Imagining the Catholic Church: Structured Communion in the Spirit*, trans. by John J. Burkhard (Collegeville, Minn.: Michael Glazier/Liturgical Press, 2000), 88.
19. Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O’Connor, “The Pastoral Office of a Bishop: Lecture Given on the Centenary of the Birth of Christopher Butler,” [www.rcdow.org.uk/archbishop](http://www.rcdow.org.uk/archbishop).
20. Umberto Eco and Carlo Maria Martini, *Belief or Nonbelief? A Confrontation*, trans. Minna Proctor (New York: Arcade, 2000).

21. See Radcliffe, *I Call You Friends*, 114–15:

Tolerance is good, and we Christians could benefit from a lot more of it. But tolerance alone is not enough. Absolute tolerance fails to take the other person seriously. It is patronizing. I am told that 25 percent of all Americans believe in reincarnation, but if someone tells me that they were Napoleon in a previous life, or that God is a green rabbit, then it is not enough to say: “Well, if that is what makes you happy, then it is fine by me; just be comfortable with your feelings.” That is immensely condescending.

22. Pope Paul VI, *Evangelii nuntiandi*, no. 41.  
 23. See also, Carlo-Maria Martini, *Saving Beauty: Cardinal Martini’s Vision for the New Millennium* (London: St. Paul’s, 2000), 52–53:

In charity there is no relation of dependence between the one who gives and the one who receives, but an exchange that takes place through the shared participation in the gift of Beauty crucified and risen, in the divine Love that saves. We must rediscover the value of the one who is other and is different. In doing so, we model ourselves on the interrelationship between the three divine Persons: the other is not a rival or a dependent, but an enriching and grace-filled Other.

24. Pope John Paul, *Novo millennio ineunte*, no. 50. See also no. 49: “This Gospel text [Matt 25:35–37] is not a simple invitation to charity: It is a page of Christology which sheds a ray of light on the mystery of Christ. By these words, no less than by the orthodoxy of her doctrine, the church measures her fidelity as the bride of Christ.”  
 25. Andrew Greeley, “The Apologetics of Beauty,” *America* 183 (September 16, 2000): 8–14.  
 26. Cardinal Godfried Danneels, “The Contemporary Person and the Church: An Intervention at the Consistory,” *America* 185 (July 30–August 6, 2001): 6–9.  
 27. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Love Alone*, trans. Alexander Dru (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 98.  
 28. Martini, *Saving Beauty*: 13–15.  
 29. Cardinal Cormac Murphy-O’Connor, “Evangelizing the Young in a Post-Modern Europe,” Address given at the Symposium of European Bishops, Rome, April 24, 2002: [www.rcdow.org.uk/archbishop](http://www.rcdow.org.uk/archbishop).  
 30. *Ibid.*  
 31. Martini, *Saving Beauty*, 43.  
 32. Pope Paul VI, *Evangelii nuntiandi*, no. 76.