

H< 9'G9A =B 5 F `C B `>9GI =H'GD=F =HI 5 @=HM

The Seminar is composed of a number of Jesuits appointed from their provinces in the United States.

The Seminar studies topics pertaining to the spiritual doctrine and practice of Jesuits, especially American Jesuits, and gathers current scholarly studies pertaining to the history and ministries of Jesuits throughout the world. It then disseminates the results through this journal.

The issues treated may be common also to Jesuits of other regions, other priests, religious, and laity. Hence, the studies, while meant especially for

(+ # % ; ' GDF =B ; '&\$%')

the first word . . .

What am I doing here? More at issue, what is anyone doing here? In other

many technical terms in their future professions have Latin roots. They would be a step ahead of their peers and competitors from non-Jesuit high schools. Fair enough, but if I'm going in for a coronary bypass, it offers little assurance that my surgeon can translate *a a a*. If that's all he knew about the term, the next translation might be *ab a*. And if I'm on death row, knowing my attorney knows the Latin meaning of *ab a*

ing to a recent news release, the most popular major among undergraduates is economics, followed by finance. Understanding and managing wealth place high among priorities. Biology and nursing were also among the leaders as well, no doubt because health care is currently viewed as a growth industry. (Organic chemistry traditionally thins the ranks of pre-meds, but I wonder if it comes in time to allow for a switch in majors.) It doesn't seem much of a leap to conclude that a good number of our students and their families regard education primarily or even exclusively as an investment or, more bluntly "preparation for a job." In student advisement interviews, it comes out with distressing regularity that "core courses" (literature, language, philosophy, history, and theology) are regarded as distractions to be gotten out of the way with the least effort possible. A confidential survey might reveal that a significant number of faculty share this sentiment.

In addition, after the shock of the economic meltdown of 2008, we've come to realize that some traditional American industries are gone forever and the American worker now competes with workers around the world. The result of course is a growing income disparity, since workers in the developing world can do the same job and provide the same services at a much lower cost. The consensus seems clear: to compete in the new global economy, we have to emphasize STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering, math) if we are to keep up. That's where the money is going, and that's where student interest lies. One recent survey put Stanford ahead of perennial leader Harvard in student desirability because of its engineering programs and proximity to Silicon Valley. As one who hangs his tattered biretta in a fine-arts department, I can't help but feel besieged, underappreciated, and marginalized by these developments. With my rapidly fading recollection of classical languages and my refusal to buy a smartphone, I'm clearly a cultural misfit, and the culture, now in obvious decline, is at fault. I'm a misunderstood guardian of a fading civilization. *O a! O !* Boo-hoo.

But this perception is wrong, or at best only partially correct. As I've mulled over these questions through the years, I've come to appreciate the fact that I occupy a very strange vantage point. We Jesuits have had the benefit of a highly privileged and atypical education. As the times changed, some of my contemporaries have sourly characterized their training as perfect preparation for a renaissance prince. I'm not one of them. I'm grateful beyond expression for my years of Latin and Greek, of philosophy and theology, and the freedom to pursue studies in English literature and film history. But the fact is I never had to worry about tuition bills, never had to bus tables in the school cafeteria to meet expenses, and did not graduate with a staggering debt. There was nev-

ties into the conversation, but the issue remains the same: education to have a good life, or education to understand what a good life is; information or wisdom/skills or reflection.

The duration of the question leads to the obvious conclusion that it has no simple solution, and we should not be disappointed or frustrated if we can't agree on one. Any educational institution is a community business. It has many scholars from different disciplines who espouse different value systems. Many, probably most, students search for ideas and skills to expand their horizons. That's the delight in teaching. Some few may be content to inherit the family business, values, and membership in the country club, thus living the rest of their lives in a gated community of the mind. For centuries teachers have searched for the magic formula, like a *quadrant* or the perfect curriculum, only to discover that one size doesn't fit everyone, and in fact probably doesn't fit anyone. And probably never did.

One of John's observations struck close to home as a worthy examination of conscience for all teachers at every level. No doubt with the explosion of information, scholarship has become more specialized, even in the humanities. It follows, then, that today more than ever teachers and professors must bring more specialized professional training to their classrooms. All to the good. Yet without even being aware of it, we can reproduce the compartmentalized approach to learning and neglect the more basic, generalized humanistic approach to learning, as though we were preparing students to publish articles in *PMLA* rather than enjoy a good story or laugh with Falstaff and weep with Lear, exciting but admittedly useless endeavors in the world of jobs and paychecks. In other words, have English classes become just as pre-professional as accounting and, if they have, have we compromised the humane element of education, which traditionally helps young people to become more human regardless of their career trajectory? John doesn't really provide an answer, simply because one simple formulation will not work. It's something all educators, from Nativity schools to the university have to discover in practice, and be forewarned it's harder work than we might have imagined.

The majority of our readers, especially in the United States, have appreciated John O'Malley's work for a number of years.

Since the question has been around for several hundred years, I'll stop trying to answer it just now. It's time to head off to class to take a group of undergraduates through *C* *Ka* (Welles, 1941) yet one more time to try to have them consider the destructive effects of narcissism and *b*, the value of loyalty and altruism, the limits of wealth and power, and the unfathomable mystery of the human person. The process is absolutely useless in landing their dream job at the Bank of America, and they know it. But someday, perhaps, when they sit on the board of directors, having gotten inside Kane's soul at one point in their lives, this process may lead them to think a bit more carefully about agreeing to a business strategy that may affect the lives of millions. Aha moment! Maybe that's what I'm doing here.

Richard A. Blake, S.J.
Editor

CONTENTS

I. THE RISE OF TWO TRADITIONS

John W. O'Malley, S. J., noted historian and author, is currently University Professor in the Theology Department of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. In 1979 he published

easily. The Jesuit system has in the past and in the present assumed they were partners, which does not mean that even in our schools the partners have always got along well together, as the heated discussions today about core curriculum make manifest.

These discussions echo discussions and debates that have gone on for at least four centuries, beginning just about the time the Society of Jesus came into being. In our contemporary version of such discussions, the humanities generally end up being on the defensive. Yet both historically and theoretically those subjects have been the core of Jesuit education. Where can we turn for light on how to handle this issue?

I believe that if we turn to the history of the two traditions and their interaction with the Jesuit charism, we can begin to find our way. At least we will know how we got to be where we are. Studies by Jesuits about Jesuit education generally base themselves on principles found in the *Spiritual Exercises*, on other writings by Ignatius and his contemporaries, and on later in-house documents, such as, the *Ratio Studiorum* and pronouncements of our fathers general. Such studies are not merely fundamental but indispensable. However, they need to be placed in the larger context of the two larger traditions. That is what I will try to do here. I ask you to bear with me as I do so before arriving at Jesuit schools themselves. It should - e.#bho bhem scn shemC

phenomena. His efforts constituted an organized and coherent system of knowledge, fully justifiable on rational grounds. The system's goal was to *understand* the objects in question.

Isocrates, an older contemporary of Aristotle and a younger contemporary of Plato, had different goals in mind. He worked at constructing a system for training young men for active life in Athenian democracy, where ability to speak in public and persuade one's fellows of the right course of action was essential for ensuring the common good. For such a career, not knowledge and understanding of the physical world and other subjects analyzed by Aristotle, but the

non, were known through Boethius's translations. But a large, though certainly incomplete, corpus of Latin literary texts, such as, Virgil and Ovid, was relatively widely available and fed the literate culture of the Middle Ages. As late as the twelfth century, St. Bernard of Clairvaux emerged as one of that tradition's luminaries, an elegant and persua-



As was true into the early-twentieth century, a person could practice law or medicine without a university degree, but a degree commanded greater prestige and higher fees. Students keen on such success came to the universities, and they in turn made the universities successful. Success begets success, and universities began to multiply. They tended in a general way to model themselves on either Paris or Bologna. In the former case, theology remained an important faculty, whereas in the latter it was smaller, sometimes to the point of being almost negligible. In the latter, law and eventually natural philosophy attracted the most and the best students.

Every university had a Faculty of Arts. It was the entrance faculty and usually took students at about ten to thirteen years of age. Although a degree in this faculty was not absolutely a prerequisite for en-

of the liberal arts or a liberal education. You will note, moreover,

cation was secular.³ By secular I mean that, even though a university might hold a papal charter *qua university* it did not concern itself with anybody's eternal salvation, did not professedly concern itself with playing a constructive role in church or society, and did not concern itself with the students' personal development, religious or otherwise. It concerned itself in all four of its faculties with intellectual problem solving and the honing of professional, highly technical skills.

It was secular, moreover, in that attendance at a university, especially if one earned a degree, spelled upward socioeconomic mobility whether in church or in society at large. Universities then as now were institutions for 'getting ahead.' Then as now they came to enjoy enormous prestige. By the sixteenth century there were some eighty institutions that called themselves universities spread across the face of Europe. Even so, the percentage of the population that attended them, even for a few years, was almost minuscule.

Please note that I am speaking of universities *qua universities*. But universities, their professors, and their students did not live in a vacuum, but were an integral part of medieval society, which was a Catholic society. Thus, in most residence halls, for instance, religious ideals were promoted and religious practices often imposed. Moreover, there is no doubt that producing better-trained professionals contributed to the well-being of society. We can assume, further, that at least some professors tried to inculcate a sense of service in their students. My point, however, is that the universities never articulated in either word or deed that that was what they were about.

This generalization holds even for the Faculty of Theology. True, the theologians saw themselves as engaging in three tasks: lecturing (*legere*), engaging in academic debate with peers (*disputare*), and preaching (*prædicare*), yet that last goal was not officially professed by

tive and much feared. But that was the result of a historical evolution, not the result of official university policy.

To summarize. The university *qua university* acquired its impetus from the pursuit of two secular goals. First, intellectual problem solving (or, from a slightly different perspective, the production of knowledge)/second, career advancement through the acquisition of professional skills. Individual professors or even groups of professors might have further goals, but that is a different issue altogether. Students came to the university in order to prepare themselves to get a good job. In so doing, some students certainly had altruistic and religious motives, but the university *qua university* provided no systemic encouragement for them in this regard. This was the situation the humanists set out to remedy.

The Humanistic Alternative

Although ever since ancient Athens the humanistic tradition had been much more pervasively operative in Western culture than what came to be the university tradition, it did not receive mature institutional form until two centuries after the founding of the universities, that is, not until the Renaissance of the late-fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries. It did so largely as an alternative to the university and even as a reaction to it. Unlike the university, that institution has been known by a variety of names—the humanistic school, the Latin school, the Grammar school, the *lycée*, the *liceo*, the Young Ladies' Academy, and, in the Jesuit system and elsewhere, simply the college. That we today refer to our entrance school as the college is directly related to this phenomenon. Our college still professes some of the aims and bears some of the characteristics of its origins in the Renaissance.

Firstwhile rival to the university, at its origin and, especially in the Jesuit system, it borrowed from the university certain structures, such as, set curricula, advancement through examinations, and so forth. It also shared with the university the trivium and euadrivium, but interpreted them quite differently. In the trivium rhetoric, the art of the word, the art of saying what one meant in an intelligible and persuasive way, took precedence over logic, though it, of course, included it. The euadrivium, which we might call the mathematical component, played a role secondary to other elements in the curriculum.

The big news, however, is this. Although even historians of Renaissance humanism pay relatively little attention to it, the rhetorical tradition founded a powerful engine to propel its values by the creation of an institution correlative to the university. The stunning success and force of that institution reaches to the present. The universities had early come to be known simply as "the schools" and their teachers as "the schoolmen." But now a second school bounded onto the scene, a school based on a different set of assumptions about what a school was meant to accomplish.

Even on the surface this new school—this new engine of values—clearly diverged from its alternative. Set textbooks, yes, but of authors and subjects that found no place in the university curriculum. Let me commit another anachronism and call those authors and texts "the humanities."⁴ It would be more accurate to use the original Renaissance term, the

rather than their best instincts. "Getting ahead" seemed to be the university's motto.

Here are some of the most fundamental of those principles. First, while the acquisition of technical and professional skills is, of course, important, the first aim of education—at least up to a certain point in the student's life—is to further their personal development. This tradition is thus radically student centered or, to use the current Jesuit expression, imbued with



grace and clarity what one means and meaning what one says. Cultivation of it was a fifth principle.

It implied a sixth principle that cultivating expression through the written and spoken word was an essential part of the process of thinking itself. The theorists of this philosophy of education realized, at least implicitly, that having a thought and finding the right word to express it were not two acts but one without the right word one did not have the thought, the eureka experience of insight, but rather a musing, a rumination, a grappling. No room, therefore, for "I know what I mean" because "I know what I mean" makes clear you do not know what you mean. As Mark Twain allegedly said, "The difference between

cal element was crucial. Quintilian put its aim succinctly: *vir bonus, dicendi peritus* (a good person, skilled in speech) or, better put, skilled in communicating worthy ideals and goals. That person was to be free of vice, a lover of wisdom, and committed to the welfare of his family, his colleagues, his hometown, his country and its people. Rhetoric was known as the civic discipline.

Renaissance educators like Erasmus launched one of the most successful propaganda campaigns in all history and convinced Europe that this humanistic education was the absolute prerequisite for any young man (and, eventually, young woman) who wanted to lead a humanly satisfying life and play a role, modest or great, in the affairs of the day. To be educated was to be educated in the humanistic mode.

The program was, therefore, complete in itself. It was not a prep for another school, even though students normally completed the program when they were only about eighteen or nineteen. Of course, if students wanted to go on to become doctors, lawyers, or theologians, they could supplement their education by entering one of those professional faculties. But otherwise those students were ready for life in society. We need to remind ourselves that great figures, such as, Descartes, Molière, and Voltaire, had no formal education beyond what they received in a Jesuit college. We also need to remind ourselves that students at a Jesuit *collegio* and students in the Arts Faculty of a university were drawn from the same age group, boys around ten to thirteen years old.

In the Renaissance the humanistic program was intended for students in the upper social and economic strata of society, for those who had the leisure to enter public life in one form or another. In time, it was adapted, especially by the Jesuits, to appeal to a much wider class of students. Central to its aims was cultivation of correct and effective skills in communication, oral and written. Then as now few skills are more practical than that or more likely to help young men and women get ahead. When we recall that during the Old Society the majority of Jesuit schools in Europe were in moderate-size towns or sometimes even in hamlets, we realize that the schools could not by definition be called elitist. Even parents in the lower socioeconomic strata saw value

Those schools, for all their smashing success in the late Renaissance and subsequent eras, did not put the universities out of business. Nor, despite humanist propaganda, were these two institutions hermetically sealed off from each other. They interacted in various ways and were reciprocally influential. As early as the late-fteenth century, for instance, some universities, especially in Italy, admitted the *studia humanitatis* in modest measures into the curriculum of the Arts Fac-



words, like the humanistic educational program, the Exercises wants to produce a certain kind of person.

Although the Exercises have proved themselves helpful to people in all walks of life, they are geared more directly toward persons engaged in an active life in church or society, as suggested by the meditations on "The Kingdom of Christ" and "The Two Standards." The person the Exercises wanted to help was, in the first instance, a person engaged in the affairs of the day. With its base in the Exercises, the spirituality of the Jesuit order itself has traditionally and correctly been

smashing success, the Jesuits, including St. Ignatius, undertook the enterprise of formal schooling in such an enthusiastic and comprehensive way as soon to make it the primary and premier undertaking of the order, which profoundly influenced their more directly pastoral ministries, such as, preaching and missionary evangelization.

written by Erasmus himself. Although composed by a leading member of a religious order sometimes known in history as the shock troops of the Counter Reformation, none of the goals are polemical against Protestants or suggest that Catholic apologetics were to play a role in the curriculum. The last of the fifteen goals sums up the ethos of the others. "Those who are now only students will grow up to be pastors, civic officials, administrators of justice, and will fill other important posts to everybody's profit and advantage."

As that goal makes clear, the schools had a

by the Spiritual Exercises. As mentioned, the Exercises look to the development in the individual of deep, heartfelt commitment, that is to say, they do not primarily try to inculcate simple behavior modification. The Jesuit schools included a chapel where a variety of religious

such schools, to provide theaters, playing fields, assembly halls, and chapels where various activities could take place outside the classroom setting¹ as part of training¹ the whole person.¹

By making use of the pedagogical techniques of the so-called *modus parisiensis* (Parisian style), the Jesuits transformed teaching in most places where they opened schools.²⁰ Especially important was the introduction in a comprehensive way the principle that learning was not a passive activity but required active engagement. It was not enough,

Jesuit Universities

Finally, the Jesuits were among the educators who did not see an unbridgeable gap between professional and humanistic training. Remember, the ten founders of the Society of Jesus headed by Ignatius all held prestigious Master of Arts degrees from the University of Paris, of which they were justifiably proud. They new firsthand what a university was, and they were determined that recruits to the order now the same.

Their degrees, moreover, were not from the Faculty of Theology but from the Faculty of Arts, with its fully developed program of the three philosophies. Jesuits who in the early years joined the Society in Italy with a university background had studied at places that gave a prominence to natural philosophy. Although the program the Jesuits

vised the calendar, known as the Gregorian Calendar, upon which we operate today. He and his important but lesser-known successor, Christopher Grienberger, trained the first generations of those remarkable Jesuits, led by Matteo Ricci, who made their way into Beijing in the late-sixteenth century and won entrance into the imperial milieu especially in virtue of their skill in mathematics and astronomy

But it was not simply at the Roman College that the Jesuits moved beyond the humanities. A French scholar, Antonella Romano, some years ago published a remarkable book on the history of mathematics (and therefore science) in the story of the Jesuit schools from their inception, through the Scientific Revolution, all the way to 1683.²³ She showed how pervasive that study was in the Jesuit system and showed that, contrary to older historiography, the Jesuits were fully in touch with scientific developments of the day and contributed to them. In recent years, similar studies have proliferated.

With some qualification it can be said that Jesuit schools did not include faculties of medicine or law¹ for several reasons, but most pointedly because Jesuits, who formed the bulk of the faculty generally had no training in these disciplines.²⁴ The vast majority of colleges, moreover, did not teach theology, regarded as a professional discipline. They rested content with an hour or so of catechism per week, supplemented by sermons and similar services. The religious and moral for-

²³See Antonella Romano,

mation too_ place, supposedly, both across the curriculum and outside it in what we today call "extra curricula." What was important for the students was not so much intellectual problem solving about the Christian faith, which was what formal theology did, but a lived appreciation of it and its values.

The so-called Magna Carta of Jesuit education is the *Plan of Studies (Ratio studiorum)* of 1586. It is an important but a deceptive document. The *Plan*, which includes a full course in both philosophy and theology was intended in the first place for the training of Jesuits themselves. It was a plan that was therefore never fully operative in more than a relatively few Jesuit schools. Second, it has the basic problem of all such normative documents, namely, the gap between norms and the *Plan*,

2 The duties prescribed by justice must be given precedence over everything else, including the pursuit of knowledge, for such duties concern the welfare of other human beings, and nothing ought to be more sacred in our eyes than that. There are some people who either through absorption with their own self-advancement or through some other more basic coldness to others, claim that all they need to do is tend to their own business, and thus they seem to themselves not to be doing any harm. But this means that while they avoid any active injustice, they fall into another. they become traitors to the life we must all live together in human society, for they contribute to it none of their interest, none of their effort, none of their means. (1.-.2-)

With texts like these, we can see that the promotion of justice was not as alien to the Jesuit tradition of schooling as some have argued. Of course, once again, what Cicero and the early Jesuits had in mind is very different from our modern concepts of injustice as systemic in certain institutions of society. Nonetheless, we again see a correlation.

III. After the Restoration of the Society

The Society of Jesus was suppressed in 1773, and its network of schools brutally dismantled. It was restored by another papal decree in 1814 in an entirely different cultural scene. The humanistic schools, by this time simply a fact of life in Western culture, had continued to evolve and change under changing circumstances, most obviously by vernacular literatures gradually taking the privileged place once enjoyed by the Greek and Roman classics. In English, Shakespeare, Milton, Austen, and eventually Mark Twain found a welcome.

The universities had changed perhaps even more radically with the abandonment of Aristotle and other normative authors from antiquity in favor of experiments in the sciences and the cultivation of modern philosophical schools. But they never swerved from the two basic aims that had animated them from the beginning, even as the new emphasis on research specified what "intellectual problem solving" would henceforth mean.

The Jesuits set to work trying to rebuild their network of schools, perhaps nowhere more notably than in the United States. Here they were faced with a largely immigrant population that needed basic skills to make a living and to rise above the poverty level. Adjustments were made. Moreover, the schools had to fit to a large degree into the ongoing development in America of both secondary and tertiary education. Adjustments were made. The *Ratio Studiorum* of 1580 was hopelessly out of date and impracticable, and all efforts to revise it failed utterly. The world had changed. As time went on, the Jesuit schools became ever more complex and sophisticated to keep pace with the ever more complex and sophisticated developments in the world at large. They added not only a Graduate School of Arts and Sciences but other professional schools as well, including the traditional law and medicine, but also business, nursing, architecture, and so forth.

But what about the humanities in this new situation? Although they are under siege in virtually every university and today have to fight for turf even in Jesuit institutions, the Jesuit schools still profess to do for the student what the original humanist philosophy of education promised to do, and they try, with greater and lesser success, with greater and lesser zeal, to provide a good space in the curriculum for the humanities. In the meantime, what we mean by the humanities has itself expanded to include most notably philosophy and theology, taught now in the undergraduate curriculum, supposedly not as professional disciplines but as subjects pertinent to the students' lives.

Ah, there is the sticking point. If the subjects we now as the humanities are taught as professional disciplines, as if they were introductory courses for somebody contemplating a professional career in them, they hardly deserve the designation humanistic. They lose their humanistic value and become, well, a form of professional or pre-professional training. Unfortunately, that is the pattern into which all of us teachers trained in graduate school tend unthinkingly to fall. We teach as we have been taught. Liberal Arts is no subject in itself liberating.

I believe still have relevance for what we are trying to do today. What I have to say is of special relevance to our traditional high schools and the undergraduate colleges of our universities. Nonetheless, the basic assumption is that, even in the professional and graduate schools we are trying to do something more for our students than promote their professional success.

I have created five hooks or pegs or slogans or bullet points on which to hang the basic goals that I believe capture aspects of the tradition that are as valid now as they ever were and that express what the tradition wants to accomplish, especially in its incarnation in Jesuit schools. We can look upon them as constituting a profile of the ideal graduate according to the humanistic tradition. The five hooks are. (1) The Fly in the Bottle, (2) Heritage and Perspectives, (3) Not Born for Ourselves Alone, (4) *Eloquentia perfecta*, or The Art of the Word, and (5) The Spirit of Finesse.

- 1.

leap beyond the accepted paradigm to another and to see the relationship between them that has escaped others. Training in the humanities is a training, if all goes well, in exploring "the other" and seeing how it relates to the "known" — an exercise in imagination. The cultivation of this skill is certainly not exclusive to the humanities, but they are especially apt for it.

2. "Heritage and Perspective." This goal or value is closely related

in England, where she was educated and which she remembered with great affection. She said that whatever she had become since then had its seeds planted in those years. It was such training that inspired her,

the webs we weave with our own lives, which are webs that are not neat geometrical patterns but are bro_ en in places and often f lled with _nots and tangles.

Again, the virtue the humanists especially wanted to inculcate

tage of being non-confessional, yet at the same time open to enhancement by the Jesuit traditions.

I did not promise to enter into [†]ust how these goals might be feasible in today's culture, nor to attempt to answer how they might be implemented. I had a limited objective, which I hope I have in some measure accomplished. I will further comment, however, that for the goals I have described to have the slightest chance of success, the institution in question must at least officially profess them and then provide means for their accomplishment.

lives. I want to help them Úy out of the bottle, have a sense of their heritage and cultural location, see their lives as meant for something more than self-promotion, be able to express themselves properly and thus to thin_ straight, and in their thin_ing develop a spirit of f nesse. Whatever else is to be said on the theoretical level about the compatibility or incompatibility of the two great traditions of schooling, there is no doubt in my mind that they can be reconciled in ourselves. If they are reconciled in ourselves, they have a chance of being reconciled in our students and of affecting the ethos of the institution with which we are aff liated.

Past Issues of STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JES

- 14/5 Ivorn, Hhe: i ti reof: aith anX Ji stice Rej iek of Decree: di r (Nov. 1982)
- 15/1 O'Malley, Hhe: di rthJ ck in ðs-gnatian 7 ontel t (Jan. 1983)
- 15/2 Sullivan and Faricy, Cn A aking the Spiriti al 9l erdices for Renek al of Jesi it 7 harisms (Mar. 1983)
- 15/3-4 Padberg, Hhe Society Hri e to ðself: A 6rief < istory of the' &nX; eneral 7 ongregation of the Society of Jesi s (May-Sept. 1983)
- 16/2 O'Malley, Hb Hraj d to Any Dart of the WorlX: Jerónimo Baxal anX the Jesi it J cca-tion (Mar. 1984)
- 16/3 O'Hanlon, ðtegration of 7 hristian Dractices: A Western 7 hristian @ooks 9ast (May 1984)
- 16/4 Carlson, Ī A : aith @j eX Ci t of Doors ĩ ĩ C ngoing : ormation (Sept. 1984)
- 17/1 Spohn,

25/4 Stahel, Hok arX; eneral 7ongregation ' (Sept. 1993)
25/5 Baldwin,

!"#\$%&'(&)*+*,) %- .(&)*+0,,0\$(&10+2.*" .%3+4567

"8!8+20!"&(!

!"\$""%\$&'%(')*+,.-."#'#,*./+010#(2#-31#41'%+#5."61*1")1#6.*#789#41'%+-'##+/+:"#"-#31#7"-+10#
9-\$-1'#"\$0#789#41'%+-'#;3.#\$*1#'-+##<1<(1*'#.6#\$#789#==*./+)1#(%-##&+/+):#.-'+01#-31#7"-+10#
9-\$-1'8##

.99+) (:0%+!"#\$%�%!

All subscriptions will be handled by the Business Office

789\$#?"1#21\$*#ABBC#-.#21\$*#@ADES##F;<=>?@AB+AB#6.*#G1('+-1#,\$2<1"-8H

5\$"\$OS\$"\$0# I 1J+).>#?"1#21\$*#AKEC#-.#21\$*#@ALB##F;<=>?@AB+AB#6.*#G1('+-1#,\$2<1"-8H

?-31*#01'-+"\$-." '>#?"1#21\$*#AKDC#-.#21\$*#@AME##F;<=>?@AB+AB#6.*#G1('+-1#,\$2<1"-8H

)% ; 0%&*C+. * ; +'.3 - 0* (

+DDD#EFGHI=@<B=>? J +
- EKI>LI>K=-MENEOP+I+B?

#. \$Q&!!'0!

!"#\$%3+/1#.6#1)1"-#+'%1'#'#\$/\$+&\$(&1#-3*.%:3#-31#G1('+-1#.6#-31#41'%+#5."61*1")1#>
3--,>N ; ; ; 801'%+8.*:

!#).<,&1-1#\$)3+/1#)\$"(1#)\$)1'10#-3*.%:3#-31#P.'-."#5.&&1:1#Q+(*\$2#>
3--,>N10.%*"#\$'8()810#N01'%+'

Paper copies of most issues are available through the Business Office for \$4 each plus postage.

+DDD#EFGHI=@<B=>? J +

\$: . *C0+) , + . ; ; %0!!/+0*0R.9!/+ . * ; +!"#\$%&'(&)*!

R"0+/-0%\$&'#)\$"#% , 0\$-1#<\$+&":#\$00*1'1'#\$# ; ; ; 8\$:*01'%+'8).<#.*#(2#)."-)-":#-31#P%'+'1'#\$
Office directly.

9%(')*+,.-."#\$*1#6*.<#4\$"#8#4\$"#8#1"1 ; \$&'#"11010#(2#4\$"#8#TL-38

The Business Office handles all transactions through its website or at the address given below.

0 ; & () % & . 9+) , , & \$ 0

#"!&*0!!+) , , & \$ 0

91<+"\$*#."#41'%+#9,+*+-%\$&+2
US(1*#V.%'1
TEB#5.&&1:1#W.\$0
531'-"-#%V+&&# I !#EBDMXYKZDT

9-%0+1'#+'"#-31#9,+*+-%\$&+2#.6#41'%+-'
!#_*\$,3+>#W1'%.%)1#R")8
ZELE#GS-'.'#W.\$0#9%+-1#B\ E
9-8#Q.%+'# I ?#MKT\

[1<#MTX#LLBYZB\ E
USJ>##MTX#LLBYE\BL
]Y<\$+&#*.''-.^()810%
#

[1<#KTDYXB\YTMEEC#ZEEVLEEYDTTE
USJ>#KTDYXB\YTMETM
G1('+-1#& ; ; ; 8\$:*01'%+'8).<

