FORMATION: A SEARCH FOR RULES

By GEORGE SCHNER

EVERY ESSAY OF this sort begins with certain presuppositions, and it might be well to set mine down briefly before I proceed. Any definition of the nature and purpose of formation for ministry in the christian Church depends upon a prior notion of what ministry is. This may be an obvious statement, but the effect of varying notions of ministry on the nature, purpose and dynamics of formation is considerable, and cannot be taken for granted. Formation might be thought of as a matter of *individual* development, of the search for christian perfection in what ultimately is a private way. It might be understood as principally a *psychological* development, or *training* in skills, or *socialization* in a particular ecclesial community. Or it might be considered to be the promotion of *basic human qualities* or the hidden and almost *mystical work* of the Holy Spirit.

I need only quote the documents of Vatican II to locate my own starting point within the request for renewal in the Church, and specifically, renewal in the matter of formation. Speaking of religious life, *Perfectae Caritatis* gives us a first rule: 'Since the fundamental norm of the religious life is a following of Christ as proposed by the gospel, such is to be regarded by all communities as their supreme law' (2). Of revelation, *Dei Verbum* states: 'Therefore, all the clergy must hold fast to the sacred scriptures through diligent sacred reading and careful study . . .' (25) and of the faithful, *Apostolicam Actuositatem* states that 'the success of the lay apostolate depends upon the laity's living union with Christ' (4).[1] As my essay unfolds, it will become clearer that my preference for a particular notion of ministry and my understanding of the dynamics of formation as a process of growth are consciously christocentric. The specifics of what goes on in formation and the resolution of various tensions among its demands will follow from this presupposition.

Introduction: ministry as human action for the sake of Christ in the Church

This is not the place to advance a complex theory about ministry. The present theological discussions on the matter are many and varied, a situation which itself causes complexity in my own

subject. Of course, it is difficult to determine the nature of formation if there are a multiplicity of notions about ministry. I do not judge this situation to be an unfortunate one; rather, it encourages a search for deep structures and principles of operation.

I am proposing a comprehensive definition of ministry which, as the essay unfolds, will be seen to aid my exposition of the dynamics of formation and to be broad enough so as neither to settle what are complicated theological and political issues, nor to confine this essay to allegiance to only one or other theology of ministry. I want to begin with rules fundamental enough so that they can be available as operative principles in whatever model of ministry may be put forward. The use of models has become rather popular as a technique for dealing with pluralism in a variety of doctrinal areas in theology, but it is not sufficient in itself, however, to give full insight into a particular area of study. Models themselves are capable of being understood as a family of uses that follow certain fundamental rules. The origin and nature of those rules is, of course, a complex issue. Put very simply, I propose that we define ministry as human action specified by the phrase 'for the sake of Christ in the Church'. Such a phrase seems to lay open the possibility that all christian living is ministry and would rob the word of its meaning. Though all of life can indeed be informed by christian principles, one does not want to devalue the use of the term or the reality of the enactment of ministry in the contemporary Church by calling everything and anything 'ministry'.

The specific kinds of human action which are ministry will be determined by understanding more fully what it means to act *for the sake of Christ*. I act for the sake of, in the name of Christ because of a specific kind of relation to the person of Christ, not of my own choosing alone, in a somewhat private way, but through the recognition by the Church of that personal calling. The call to ministry—and therefore the process of formation which precedes it—is the act of God in and through the Church. In so moving the Church to choose its ministers, the Holy Spirit leads the community into the mystery that is the person and work of Christ.

Here I verge on another large discussion about the modes of access to God's acts in the world and, indeed, about just what one understands religion to be. Let it suffice to say that I presuppose a notion of religion as a communal reality, determining me as a person from outside myself, rather like a culture in which I find myself, or a language which I come to learn to use. I cannot act 'for the sake of Christ' except by learning from and being initiated by a community. Further, christian ministry, as a very specific

kind of human activity, is the work 'of the Church' as is formation
for such ministry.

George Tavard has presented an analysis of this work of the
Church as having a four-fold structure of mediation, proclamation,
service and education.[2] It is not difficult to see these activities as
essential to the description of the person and work of Jesus, and
to understand, therefore, why they are constitutive of the work of
ministry. While all four form the basic structure of ministry, one
or other of them might receive prominence. Tavard observes that
catholic church order has tended to give primacy to mediation,
reformation Churches to proclamation, and certain nineteenth-
and twentieth-century groups to service.[3] Taking at least these
structures as constitutive of christian ministry, one notes obvious
consequences for the particulars of formation. A development of
this matter of the structure of ministry itself would be to expand
unnecessarily my preliminary observations. I will, however, refer
to Tavard's structure later in the essay.

Whatever I have, then, by way of motivation or inner conviction,
has been shaped and formed by encounter with Christ, in the
Church through the power of the Holy Spirit. Motivation alone,
however, does not make my christian activity ministry. I may
indeed have a personal investment in Christ and his companions,
but my external acts must be 'conformed to Christ' in the Church.
If we take the New Testament as a test case in our search for
principles to shape formation for ministry, the evidence seems to
fall predominantly on the side of formation through communal
elements.

The phrase 'conformity to Christ' seems appropriate, though
terms like *imitation, collaboration* and *conversion* indicate other aspects
of the dynamics of formation. There is, however, a priority of
conformity, in as much as *conversion* to God in Christ is an essential
first stage and a perduring demand within and beyond formation.
As with the other terms 'conformity' is not the result of a single
act or moment of human life. Scriptural images bear this out,
whether one takes a passive sense of formation with the potter and
the clay vessel, or the somewhat independent action of the seed
which falls on good ground. Growth, development, change are of
the essence.

Likewise, when considered precisely as human action, ministry
poses a question, namely, what is the operative principle of such
action? While free, human agency is likewise habitual. In the
special kind of education that is formation, I become habituated
to acting as Christ acts; this perhaps is the common sense in which
we discuss formation. We speak of becoming the instrument of

God by the grace of the Holy Spirit, such that my acts become the sacraments of God. In this way, in my ministry I effect the building up of God's kingdom. I engage in the life-work which has its characteristic acts, which can properly be named a following of Christ, and therefore is the official ministry of the Church.

The search for rules

In asking questions about formation, we are not simply describing a pattern of natural growth, but rather a series of activities that are more like a process of education. In that sense we are describing a *ruled* set of activities which have a goal or aim, which can be tested for effectiveness and which can be understood as the result of an operant rationale. If the notion of education is used, it would require a distinction between pedagogy (or better still, androgogy, since formation for ministry deals esentially with adults) and content. As will become clear, the pedagogy—the procedures involved in formation—is in interaction with the content and goals of formation, but subordinate to them.

The rules by which ministry is undertaken might be called an ideology. This term has a quite complicated history of its own, and within a marxist vocabulary is used to indicate concepts or language uses that 'hide their social dependence behind a semblance of autonomy, which makes them appear different than they are'.[4] Such a warning is to be taken seriously. We might profitably consider how principles of formation do become somewhat abstracted from their situatedness in the world and take on the independent life of an ideology in the pejorative sense. We are left forming individuals for ministry according to rules which have ceased to relate those formed to an existing world. However, a non-pejorative understanding of ideology can be developed by considering the fact that, despite its disregard for its social and historical origin, an ideology does not lose its practical effect or necessarily become an illusion.

Operative principles are at first simply coincident with the action itself; the description of the action is the presentation of the rules. The development of the narrative of action into the form of rules for further action, which is now properly called imitation, is a complex matter deserving investigation elsewhere.

For the Christian, this interaction of persons through the narrative towards new action is the movement from the lived encounter with the living Jesus first to the oral and written account of that life and then to the use of that narrative as the source of the 'rule' of life for others. What were first sentences about empirical events become a set of rules of grammar, so to speak, which indirectly

determine what is said and done by others and shape their way of life.

It is in this context that I wish to speak of the scriptures as ideological. The scriptures form discourse which is removed from its own time and space in order to become operative in other times and places, in order to shape the thought and action of other individuals.[5] Such a narrative is not an illusion or a falsification; it is heuristic and ideal, inasmuch as it can *become* the principles of operation for an individual or a community, once it has been proclaimed and interiorized.

Conceiving of ideology as a particular sort of language-use is also particularly helpful. The use of such language is essential to the good functioning of both thought and action, that is, it is necessary in the maintenance of both consistency or fidelity to the tradition (as handing on), a means to ensure the integration between thought and action, and an exercise of the necessary critical function which reflection and critique have to give to any form of life and its companion discourse.

To range a bit farther before returning to the major focus in this essay, I borrow here the notion of 'craftbound discourse' which James Ross has developed in discussing the nature of religious discourse.[6] He does not deal directly with the narrative structure of christian religious discourse. In the course of setting aside the non-cognitivists' arguments against the religious use of language, however, Ross does explicitize two themes of my argument here. First, encounter with the scriptures considered as heuristic ideology is for the sake of being in the world in a new way:

> Yet anyone who knows the Christian or Jewish religion will recognize instantly that bible stories, credal teaching, stories of saints and all the religious talk (even sermons when properly done) are designed to modulate one's conception of oneself and of one's relationship to other people, to modulate one's judgments about the physical world, about the goals and values of life and one's judgments about God (who is to be encountered through faith, in obedience to moral law and in the pursuit of holiness). The discourse is inherently action-oriented, response, self-construal and judgment oriented.[7]

Second, the work of such a use of language is essentially bound up with a narrative:

> Religious talk *construes*, often with different words ('grace', 'sin',

'salvation', 'redemption'), those characteristically human experiences and puts them into a story.[8]

When ministry is construed as an attending to the needs of persons in accordance with a certain ideology, we are dealing with action according to a logic of ideals. Not ideals which are abstract or reified, but ideals which are held together with a narrative logic, the logic of a story. Formation for ministry, then, is not the learning of a set of abstract principles, not the testing of behaviour and interior awareness according to a set of rules determined by disciplines like psychology or sociology, however 'christianized' these may be. Rather, conformity to Christ through formation is conformity to a story, to an agent acting in this world. Achieving such conformity is far more indirect; so is the testing out of the individual being formed.

Of course, one cannot simply repeat another's life. The object is not to imitate in a one-to-one correspondence the acts and words of Christ. It is to become so familiar with that life by the most ordinary and imperceptible means, like the following of the liturgical year and the reading of the scripture texts in the context of prayer, as to become habituated to think and act in an 'evangelical' manner. Much as we take up the habits, attitudes or even the speech patterns of our parents, spouses or heroes, so the aim of formation is to become habituated to think and act as Christ does.

What I am suggesting is that formation ought to be conducted according to a story logic and not an abstract logic of concepts. This preference is in keeping, I would maintain, with an important shift in the understanding of a fundamental notion which pervades all of christian theology, namely, a notion of revelation and its relation to orthodoxy, orthopraxis and the correct formation of the person (what might be called an 'ortho-asceticism'). This shift of articulation is amply found in the document of the Second Vatican Council, *Dei Verbum*, on revelation.

I have argued elsewhere that the presentation of revelation in that document is primarily an encounter with a life and the meaning of that life; the handing on of a way of living (with all that this entails about knowledge, language, habits of action and interior sensibilities) can be grasped in a few essential 'rules of grammar'.[9] Since a doctrine of revelation is not one doctrine among many but, in a certain sense, is very much the work of all theology in its various parts, the rules which govern that doctrine are fundamental to and formative of all theology. If there is to be formation for ministry in the christian Church, it surely must be an activity within the life of the Church as a whole. As such, it

must be in concert with sound doctrine and aided by sound theology. Hence, the conclusion is simple. The rules of formation for ministry should be constructed in concert with the rules proposed by this renewed notion of revelation from the Second Vatican Council.

By way of a preview, let it be noted that just as a change in criteria for 'good' theology is necessary once the paradigm shift I have been noting is made operative, so also the problem of tests and measurements for formation will change. A story-logic inspired formation will demand a different sense of when and how a candidate for ministry gives evidence of apt development. I will return to this matter at the end of my essay.

To give but one example of the complex process involved and the need for the particularization of these general rules, I refer the reader to the tradition of formation for ministry which I am most familiar with, the Society of Jesus. Michael Buckley S. J. has detailed and analyzed the first stages of formation for ministry by the Jesuits. He notes a continuity from the *Spiritual Exercises*, with its development of freedom and liberality into an election 'which realizes the peculiar providence of God within the life of this individual human person', through the General Examen, which 'searches for a choice that comes out of the intersection of a religious history shaped by grace and a christian liberality founded in personal freedom', to the classical six experiments of formation in the novitiate. Buckley summarizes by saying:

> They are pedagogy, an organic series of experiences, a recapitulation of the life of Christ, in which one can move through devotion, poverty, and humiliations to the self-transcending service of God in others that is *ministerium*.[10]

Within this example, we can also see at work the specification of this 'recapitulation' of the life of Christ taking on the specifics of proclamation, mediation, service and education.

To be even more concrete, let me reflect on a specific example. An individual is sent to work in a hospital as a chaplain as part of a programme of formation for ministry. The student must learn various skills in dealing with patients, nurses and doctors, and a variety of techniques can be taught with adequate supervision. Theological reflection must accompany this entire exercise for the purpose of inquiring, not into the psychological or social theory and practice that rules the novice chaplain, but into the *theological* norms for that form of ministry. Principally, I suggest, the questioning should be about how these human words and actions of

comfort, advice, and exhortation are in imitation of Christ, and the commissioned work of the Church. Further, it will be helpful to discuss this activity as the work of forming images of persons, the subject of the next section of this essay.

Formation as 'personicating'

The dynamics of formation are the dynamics of person-forming. Whether of the ancient philosophical kind or the modern empirical, analytical or even behaviourist kind, psychology has long been concerned with discovering the nature of the human person. Beyond the statement of ontic structures, psychology names onto-logical dynamics in varying ways according to varying presupposi-tions. In his comprehensive and penetrating analysis in *Psychologists caught*,[11] Dr Lewis Brandt has explored the many frameworks within which psychologists function. In the course of this intriguing book, he proposes a new classificatory framework called 'personicat-ing', that is, the process by which we form impressions of persons. All of us are caught in a framework of personicating, both in everyday life and in the professional activities which make up our lives. Of psychologists in particular Brandt observes:

> Psychologists must personicate (form impressions of people, includ-ing of themselves) not only in everyday life but also in many aspects of their field. Personality theories and tests, classifications of psychopathology, and norms of psychological development are, in the last analysis, based on personicating.[12]

Brandt continues by showing the multiple ways in which the subtle activities of forming an impression of one's client or analy-sand of oneself in relation to that person, and of the other persons spoken of take place in the course of therapy: 'Their tests, their theories of personality, their diagnostic categories are based, in the final analysis, on personicating other people'.[13] Such activities he calls 'a complex process-structure with many feedback loops', a 'Gordian knot' whose strands can be studied and mapped but not cut without the danger of alienation.[14]

Formation involves such personicating and their interrelations. A sort of alienation might well be observed in *formatores* who either try the impossible by attempting to distance themselves from the transference and counter-transference at work in their efforts at guiding formation, or are simply unaware of it. As well, some important results in the matter of assessment follow from conceiving formation as essentially a process of personicating. I will return to both these points in my conclusion.

At this point, I wish only to note the results of specifying formation as a process of education which is essentially personication. As a specific sort of interaction, such education has goals and objectives, and operates according to a certain *ratio*. This *ratio* and the taking of the measure by it, according to my argument to this point, is a person who acts, that is, formation as shaping who acts is in accord with the criteria of another person who acts. The whole process involves the work of the imagination and creative memory.

It is complicated by the fact that we are dealing with the personication of Jesus as well as the personication of and by the directors of formation and those being formed. This heady mix of personal interaction on the human level—let alone the necessity of the personication of a transcendent God incarnate in the person of Jesus—puts a note of serious caution in the process of passing judgments on the success or failure of formation activities and the preparedness of the candidate for ministry.

The more fundamental rule I have been developing could take on specificity in a variety of models and their companion spiritualities. It is all well and good to make the root and basis of all formation the imitation of Christ, which includes all the work of imagination and memory, personicating of Christ, self and others, the formation of habits of thought, speech and action such that a person is able to act for the sake of Christ in the Church. Quite rightly, the question must be asked: what is that action which such an encounter evokes?

Though mediation and proclamation must have content, they must equally have context. Service and education must be according to norms and with specific purposes. But they must be for and with others within a given culture. Ministry is situated and so must formation be.

Formation as situatedness

This being in a world, what I am calling situatedness, is a determining factor of formation, though in a different sense than the person and work of Christ. Those charged with formation must first consider the kind of world brought by the individuals seeking to be formed. That world, with its heroes and ideals, has already shaped the habits of thought and action of those entering the process of formation, and a stage of critical reflection which issues in a work of 'de-formation' must occur. This is not unlike the hermeneutics of suspicion which is suggested as an essential moment of a proper reading of a text. I do not want to suggest that the Church and its ministry form a world parallel to the

so-called secular world. The whole thrust of the renewal of lay, priestly and religious life since the Second Vatican Council argues against such a notion. The challenge for those engaged in the process of formation is to aid the individual to move from an assessment of the habits already formed, through those 'exercises' which change old habits and shape new ones, to the spontaneous interaction with the world in which action and reaction can properly be named 'for the sake of Christ in the Church'.

Equally important is the assessment of the history of grace already operative in the individual's life. The task is to search out the work of God already accomplished, the ways in which conformity to the person and work of Christ has already begun, and acknowledge the demands it has already evoked. This is done not in an abstract way or by assessment with abstract principles. What is attended to is the concrete life of the individual in counterpoint with the life of Christ. Buckley notes the importance in this task of the discernment of spirits, calling it a 'hermeneutics of religious experience',[15] a companion work to the effort I named above with the borrowed term, hermeneutics of suspicion.

Both of these activities involve a use and reshaping of the imagination, of the sensibility. As such, no element of human life is left untouched, and those elements which constitute the major aspects of human life—one's sexuality, one's intellectual perception, one's self-articulation and creativity—none of these is left unattended to. Thus, whether one uses as a model that of psychosexual development for the dynamics involved, or the ascetical path of purification, illumination and unity, or the imitation of Christ according to a variety of techniques, there is an underlying principle which requires the reshaping of the ability to conceive of oneself, the world and God according to habits learned by making the person and work of Christ normative for one's own life. Further, whether one adopts the model of apprentice learning from a master, or the intern learning a profession or even the manager learning skills, matters of procedure in each case are patient upon a deeper ruling. I am suggesting that whatever ways we conceive both the person's development and the character of the social interaction required in the formation process, both of these are determined and evaluated by principles which go beyond those intrinsic to the model itself.

The analysis of contemporary culture is a chief way in which the situatedness of both the *formatores* and those in preparation for ministry is attended to. Whether we call such an analysis 'reading the signs of the times', or use the vehicle of a sensitive liberal arts education with an intensive study of philosophy and culture, or

various other means, it is essential that we become wisely reflective about the ways all of us are bearers of a cultural heritage, makers of culture itself, and alienated from that very culture as well. This is not the place to detail what that involves in our present age, or to prescribe the role of christian ministry in addressing the world. It is important primarily to note that the inculturation of the faith works both to shape our ability even to conceive of christian faith and live it, as well as to permit us as ministers of word and sacrament to carry on the work of the Church.

However, in the present age, several long developing aspects of human situatedness make the work of formation for christian ministry particularly difficult. It would be a mistake, I think, to consider those who undertake the work of formation, either directing it or being formed by it, as somehow exempt from the difficulties which contemporary culture presents for christian believers. Cultural influences are both subtle and grossly obvious, and the task of reflection is of equal importance for those directing formation as those being formed. What is obviously presupposed by my emphasis on a search for deeper rules is a conviction of the need for christian ministry to challenge contemporary culture and to clothe itself in an appropriate rhetoric and image so as to be understood.

As to the characteristics of our present age, several major themes must be considered. Since a wealth of essays have been written on the subject, let it suffice for me to note the basic themes and their effects on formation. First, there is the loss of transcendence in contemporary culture. This involves structures and attitudes, and has been long in the making. A subtle, but nonetheless real lack of belief in a truly transcendent dimension to human existence issues not only in soul-wearying efforts to maintain christian hope but also irrelevant retrievals of past forms of piety and spiritual enthusiasms. Second, there is the turn to subjectivity with its consequent emphasis on experience and the internal as opposed to language and symbol systems in general, the social and interpersonal. This preoccupation with the self in isolation can be detected in an overemphasis on the inner experience as the ultimate court of appeal, and in a variety of difficulties with social controls and authorities. Third, the absolutization of human freedom and the diminishing of a sense of the fallibility and frailty of the whole human enterprise can involve those in formation in an overly optimistic interpretation of human action and a thoroughly idealistic and even strident pursuit of ideas and causes, instead of in an involvement with real persons and situations.[16] This is not to suggest that the heuristic function of ideals and convictions should

not be at work in ministry; rather, they are often at work in opposition to a healthy estimate of the situation or with a lack of regard for persons. Fourth, the relativization of truth which comes with the intensification of a sense of history makes it very difficult for the maintenance of a tradition of any kind. The need for ever new and varying situations and ideas, and the fear of stagnation or unreality when tradition is invoked, hamper the very heart of the kind of rules at work in formation as I have envisioned it. And fifth, the secularization of the sacred, if not the complete loss of it as an immediate and daily part of human living, can be seen in a variety of ways, not the least of which is the very real difficulty we must ultimately face of the loss of a sense of the sacred, of that sense of devotion which Buckley speaks of as among the first moments of formation according to St Ignatius.

The impact of these themes on the Church, on its self-conception, and especially on its ministry are considerable and clearly the subject matter of another essay.

Conclusion: some problems resolved?

My suggestion has been that attention to the deeper rules of formation would provide a foundation for a variety of models of formation within various traditions of spirituality and ministry, and would admit different actualizations of emphasis within the structure of ministry itself. In concluding this essay, I will add brief remarks on how such a reconception of the fundaments might affect the practicalities and problems which attend putting theory into practice.

First, the rules I am suggesting help to bridge the much talked-of gap between practical and theoretical. The theory of practice is the practice of theory in this case. Formation is an inherently practical activity where the content which is focussed upon is itself the shaping agent. Such is the way when it is a person, not an idea that is being encountered. Nonetheless, the theoretical, if we mean by that the knowledge of the person and all that is required to come to a nuanced knowledge of that person, is the well-spring of the action, the practice, which is to follow precisely as ministry. It is not the case that first one gathers the information and then proceeds to learn the techniques. Gathering the information is coming to know the person and work of Christ; that coming to know is the establishment of habits which are acquired, enacted, and assessed in the doing.

Second, the dichotomy of pastoral and academic components of formation as a process of education can also be set aside. I have argued this matter at length elsewhere.[17] Simply put, I see the

coincidence of the two to be the same as that of the theoretical and practical. The matter is misunderstood when academic is taken to mean theoretical, abstract ideas, and when pastoral, the learning of skills. Both presumptions are wrong. The problem dissolves as do the makeshift solutions developed to attend to it.[18]

Third, the dynamic I have suggested can be worked out with the aid of a variety of models (psycho-sexual, social-analytical) or the vocabulary of a variety of spiritualities. In fact, it might be intriguing to try out different theological positions in general with these rules, with the proviso that certain extreme positions would not fit.

Fourth, the relation of internal and external formation is also more organic. I tend to favour the external over the internal; in other words, a hard look at the preoccupation with the religious dimension of experience as the chief focus of formation is in order. However, I am not thereby suggesting that the preoccupation with forms of activism as the solution to the problems of relevance and meaning in formation is anything but a symptom of a deeper problem either. Potencies are known in their acts, to quote an old adage, and the character of so-called internal events is known in the telling and the doing.

Fifth, the testing of the candidate for ministry by various expectations and criteria can take on new shape, and perhaps some of the experience of those charged with approving and promoting individuals in ministry might be given clarity and an appropriate relativity. Tests and measurements for the kind of development I have suggested, according to deeper rules, do not come easily. This may be proof for some that my formulation is fanciful enough to be intriguing but impractical for those in the business of formation. However, if the preceding analysis and exposition are at least in part true to the subject matter, then the problem of the indirect character of formation as a whole must be contended.

NOTES

[1] Flannery, A. P.: *The documents of Vatican II* (New York, 1975).

[2] Tavard, George H.: *A theology for ministry* (Wilmington, Delaware, 1983), pp 75–92.

[3] It is interesting to note that Tavard does not name a particular group in which education is primary. Perhaps that is the particular role which certain religious orders and congregations throughout history have taken on as their special ministry or which, quite simply, has been neglected.

[4] Dupré, L.: *Marx's social critique of culture* (New Haven and London, 1983), p 218. In what follows about ideology, I particularly depend upon Fernand Dumont, *Les idéologies* (Paris, 1974).

[5] See G. P. Schner, 'Introduction', in *Ignatian spirituality in a secular age* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1984), pp 1–13.

[6] Ross, J. F.: *Portraying analogy* (Cambridge, 1981), esp pp 165–71.

[7] *Ibid.*, p 167.

[8] *Ibid.*, p 169.

[9] Schner, G. P.: 'Commentary on the dogmatic constitution on divine revelation: *Dei Verbum*', *The Church renewed*, ed G. P. Schner, S. J., (Washington, 1986), pp 81–97.

[10] Buckley, Michael J.: 'Freedom, election and self-transcendence: some reflections upon the ignatian development of a life of ministry', *Ignatian spirituality in a secular age*, ed G. P. Schner, (Waterloo, Ontario, 1984), pp 65–91.

[11] Brandt, Lewis Wolfgang: *Psychologists caught* (Toronto, 1982), esp. pp 153–83.

[12] *Ibid.*, p 158.

[13] *Ibid.*, p 181.

[14] *Ibid.*, p 182.

[15] Buckley, *Op cit.*, p 82.

[16] See J. G. Schner, 'The failure of the flight from intimacy', *The Pius Riffel lecture* (Toronto, Ontario, 1984).

[17] Schner, G. P.: 'Formation as a unifying concept of theological education', *Theological education XXI*, 2 (Spring 1985), pp 94–113.

[18] See Farley, Edward, *Theologia: the fragmentation and unity of theological education* (Philadelphia, 1983).