

THE VOCATION OF THE JESUIT BROTHER TODAY¹

William R. Rehg, S.J.
*Professor of Philosophy,
St. Louis University, U.S.A.*

What makes the Jesuit brother's vocation an attractive, viable option for young men drawn to religious life? In view of the worldwide decline in the proportion of brothers in the Society, this question has become urgent.² Unless we can articulate a convincing vision of the distinctive attractiveness and value of the brothers' place in the Society, that decline is likely to continue. In this essay I hope to contribute to that task of articulation.

Although each brother has a unique story of his call to the Society, those who choose to become brothers affirm the value of the brother's vocation as a specific way of living the Jesuit life that opens up attractive opportunities for service, love, and evangelization. Those opportunities have evolved over the centuries. In the Society before its suppression in 1773, the range of brothers' training and work was tremendously diverse. Open to both unlettered peasant and skilled craftsman, the brother's vocation made room in the Society's mission for all those who otherwise would have been excluded by a strict ordination requirement. Similarly, the post-restoration Society gave Catholic workingmen the chance to contribute their humble labors to the mission of the Society—which in places like the United States included the daunting challenges of native evangelization and institution-building. In these earlier times, before the Second Vatican

Council, a particular spirituality—emphasizing humility and labor—affirmed the brother's vocation as an attractive option for men who lacked the education or desire for ordination, but who wanted to contribute their labor and talent more directly to the apostolic work of the Church than they could as non-religious laymen.

Can we say something similar about the brother's vocation today? Similar, yes—but that means we must also understand the differences in the brothers' situation since Vatican Council II and General Congregation 31. In particular, we must clarify the idea of *complementary equality* that emerged over the course of the 1960s—the idea that Jesuit priests and brothers share fully and equally in “one and the same vocation,” albeit in complementary ways.³ In this essay I take complementary equality as a path to understanding the value of the Jesuit brother's vocation in particular, keeping in mind that a definitive analysis would be premature. Consequently, I limit myself to some touchstones that strike me as plausible points of departure. I start with one of the greatest interpreters of the Jesuit charism today, Pedro Arrupe.

*Jesuit priests and brothers
share fully and equally in
“one and the same
vocation,” albeit in
complementary ways*

Arrupe on the Jesuit brother

In a 1978 talk, General Pedro Arrupe expressed concern about the “extinction” of the Jesuit brother. He maintained that the brothers' contribution, “both to community life and that of the apostolate, is irreplaceable”; consequently, the “extinction of this grade of Brothers would be a great loss, a mutilation with grave consequences for the body of the Society and for its apostolate.”⁴ What is that irreplaceable contribution? Arrupe focused on the brothers' importance for the “apostolic community of the Society,” distinguishing three specific contributions that correspond to three dimensions of Jesuit life: *koinonia*, *diaconia*, and *kerigma*—that is, the contributions brothers make to a stable and loving community life, their readiness for gratuitous service of the community, and their witnessing

THE VOCATION OF THE JESUIT BROTHER TODAY

to the community, above all by example.⁵ As so many exemplary brothers have demonstrated over the centuries, the brothers' capacity for making such contributions transcends the particular kinds of work assigned to them.

However, Arrupe then added, "we are talking about dimensions for which every Jesuit is responsible."⁶ If that is so, then in what sense do brothers make a "specific" contribution? No doubt brothers enrich Jesuit life along these three dimensions, often in an exemplary manner. But must not an understanding of the brother's vocation also identify a *distinct* positive contribution to the Jesuit life and mission? As more and more brothers work in outside apostolates that are as demanding on time as the work of priests, it becomes increasingly important that every member contributes along all three dimensions. Valuable as Arrupe's remarks are, more must be said about the distinctive character of the brother's vocation. Otherwise the idea of the complementary equality of brothers and priests remains unconvincing. Nor need we worry too much about the brothers' extinction.

Passing of the old regime

It once was more straightforward to explain that distinctiveness.⁷ When Jesuits occasionally reflected on the brother's vocation before Vatican Council II, they tended to associate that vocation with the "hidden life" of prayer and labor that Christ practiced before entering into his "public life"—the domain of Jesuit priests.⁸ In the first half of the twentieth century, this traditional rationale still had some plausibility, its oversimplifications notwithstanding: the rural novitiates, mission schools, and other institutional works of the Society had need of support personnel (not to mention cheap labor), just as Ignatius had found out by 1550.⁹ The value of the brother's vocation thus had a firm pragmatic basis. In fact, the reason for the Jesuit priesthood, as for Ignatius's own path to ordination, also had a pragmatic element: to accomplish his aims in the sixteenth-century Church, ordination was all but mandatory. That is, Ignatius's original desire to "help souls" through conversation and instruction in the Christian life led him into territory then reserved for priests—as he found out through his run-ins with Church authorities while still a layman. To be sure, sacramental ministries immediately entered into the *Formula of the Institute* as one of the core aims of the young Society.

The traditional rationale for brothers broke down with the general improvement in lay education, the expansion of lay roles in the Church after Vatican II, and the end of Jesuit farms and vineyards. The changed situation has affected brothers more than priests, who still have a clear role in serving the sacramental aims of the Society. The brothers no longer seem to have a clear function in the *economy* of the Society: the blue-collar tasks from which brothers once freed Jesuit priests have either disappeared altogether or are now in the hands of laymen, whereas all of the new activities open to brothers, as well as their traditional white-collar roles, are carried out by priests as well. The upshot is a gradual erosion of the lived practices that grounded pre-Vatican II statements regarding the complementary roles of priests and brothers. Those practices once gave complementarity (if not always equality) a clear sense: the craft labor of brothers was both necessary and distinctive of their vocation, and it clearly complemented the work of priests. Lacking such practices and practical needs of Jesuit life, complementarity has become problematic. Meanwhile, the greater opportunity for married laypersons in ministerial roles that were once reserved largely to priests and religious has undercut the distinctive character of the brother's vocation from the other direction. At least in part and in some places, the decline in the percentage of brothers is the result of this two-sided loss of distinctiveness at the level of lived practice: today, the brother's role differs from the priest's merely by its lack of sacramental (and jurisdictional) power, and his distinctive labors have lost their monastic patina and been taken up by lay employees. Consequently, any viable interpretation of the brother's vocation, if it is not to hang in mid-air, must confront this new reality. To do so, it must begin with the brother's lack of sacramental power—and then find the distinctive positive contribution that lack conceals.

A sacerdotal Order

In working out such an interpretation, one must avoid a potential pitfall. Both in its documents and history, the Society has understood itself as a sacerdotal order. This point has been forcefully invoked by Popes to resist Jesuit desires to abolish grades in the Society.¹⁰ Given that the Society understands itself as essentially sacerdotal, and that brothers are not priests in the sacramental sense, does it follow that brothers are necessarily second-

class citizens? Not if the “sacerdotal character of the Society” refers to a property of the Society as a corporate body rather than to a claim about every member of that body. In fact, when he affirmed the Society’s priestly character as “essential,” Pope Paul VI carefully referred to the Order and not to every member; in doing so, he linked the sacerdotal character of the Society with its distinctive apostolic charism.¹¹ An apostolic religious institute or congregation need not be sacerdotal—think, for example, of congregations of religious women or of brothers, such as the Alexian Brothers. But as Pope Paul pointed out, the Jesuit mission involves universal availability, a readiness to be “fit for all missions” and sent into the whole world like the first apostles, taking the Gospel to new places. Consequently, the Society must be apostolic in the full sense—“*pleno sensu*”—able to bring both the Word and sacraments to those to whom they are sent.

But precisely because the Society is apostolic in the full sense, sacramental ministry does not exhaust the Society’s understanding of its

*precisely because the
Society is apostolic in the
full sense, sacramental
ministry does not exhaust
the Society’s understanding
of its apostolic charism*

apostolic charism. Non-sacramental activities are likewise “essential,” written into both the founding documents and history of the Order.¹² The *Formula* includes not only sacramental work and preaching among the Society’s tasks, but also religious education and corporal works of mercy. This is reiterated in Ignatius’s guidelines in the *Constitutions* regarding preferred ministries, which include

“undertakings ... directed toward benefits for the body through the practice of mercy and charity.”¹³ And the history of Jesuit endeavors testifies to the wide range of temporal activities undertaken by its members, priests and brothers, over the centuries: work in education, the arts and sciences, medicine, law, social outreach, and so on.

Indeed, as far as apostolic importance goes, in many areas of endeavor the sacramental activities have little place, either because the needs are first of all “bodily” and temporal, or because the clientele is non-Christian or even hostile to the Church. In such areas, the “more universal good”—Ignatius’s first criterion for preference of ministries¹⁴—is achieved precisely through non-sacramental forms of engagement.

Full and equal sharing in the vocation

The previous point suggests we think of the Society's priestly character as pertaining first of all to the Order as a whole, as characteristic of its mission to the world. However, is there some sense in which we might think of brothers as exercising a priestly ministry—not only as members who support a corporate sacerdotal mission, but precisely in the way that they themselves, as individual brothers, bring Christ to the world and the world to Christ? Some brothers have in fact been described as “priestly.”¹⁵ Graham Wilson provides a clue as to how to pursue this line of thought. Wilson reiterates that all Jesuits, both brothers and priests, share in the Society's “single fundamental charism—availability for universal mission.”¹⁶ In order to serve that universal apostolic mission, it is necessary that some Jesuits be ordained and others, non-ordained. But Wilson takes a further step: as religious, Jesuit *priests* “share in the brotherhood that is the Society.”¹⁷ This suggests a way of understanding the equal share of Jesuit priests and brothers in “one and the same vocation,” with respect to both identity and mission.

On the one hand, we can say that as *religious*, all Jesuits, priests included, are brothers. Indeed, most Jesuits spend a decade, give or take, as non-ordained religious, and even after ordination we continue to address one another as “brothers.” This mode of address reflects the fact that all Jesuits commit themselves to live in a community of equals, as “friends in the Lord” who remain brothers to one another. Here then, we find equality in our identity as religious. On the other hand, as available for the Society's universal, *apostolic mission*, all Jesuits, brothers included, are priests—in a specifically Jesuit sense of the term, which distinguishes the priesthood of Jesuits from that of laymen, yet transcends the differences between Jesuit priests and brothers at the level of sacramental ministry. This follows simply from the statements we have seen above: if brothers and priests both share fully in the same apostolic charism of the Society (as affirmed by GC 31), and if that charism defines the sacerdotal character of the Society (as Pope Paul VI held), then we must regard the apostolic work of brothers as a priestly work.

*brothers and priests both
share fully in the same
apostolic charism of the
Society*

THE VOCATION OF THE JESUIT BROTHER TODAY

Conversely, we must understand ordained Jesuit ministry as primarily apostolic, in a sense that contrasts with diocesan priesthood. More on that below.

The developments on the side of mission represent a significant evolution in the understanding of the brother's vocation. In linking that vocation with availability for the Society's apostolic mission, recent Congregations have dissolved the pre-Vatican II categories that aligned priests with public ministry and brothers with background support roles: the brother's vocation is now *directly* apostolic and public. The practice of the brothers has followed suit, at least in some assistancies. At the same time, a glance at the history of Jesuit brothers reveals that the directly apostolic character of the brother's vocation was present *in nuce* all along, both in theory—recall Ignatius' expectation that all Jesuits would engage in spiritual conversation—and in the effective apostolic practices of exemplary brothers like Alphonsus Rodriguez, John-Joseph da Costa, and Guiseppe Castiglione.¹⁸

The question of complementarity

Still, the question of complementarity remains. As a corporate body, the Society is, at its core and precisely as sacerdotal, committed to both sacramental and non-sacramental ministries. As sharing in the Society's apostolic mission, priests as well as brothers have always engaged in non-sacramental temporal works, bringing what we might call their "lay talents" to the service of the Society's mission to the world. But today the distribution in work has crucially shifted, at least in developed countries like the United States, such that the brothers can no longer claim the old-style craft labors as their distinctive contribution to Jesuit life. In practice, complementarity has passed over to our lay employees, who now fill the shoes of the old-style brothers and are officially recognized as co-workers in the apostolic mission of the Society.¹⁹ Thus the question becomes acute: how do brothers complement priests? If one cannot say, then suspicion of the brother's second-class status returns: granted that both sacramental and non-sacramental works are essential, the Jesuit priest, but not the Jesuit brother, is available for both. This difference could suggest that the priest is, in a practical sense, "more" of a Jesuit, official protestations to the contrary

notwithstanding. Moreover, if non-ordained laity can fill the brothers' shoes without pinching, then are brothers so "irreplaceable" as Arrupe maintained?

The issue here does not have to do with whose work counts for more. Rather, it regards the *practical attractiveness* of the brother's vocation for men who want to make themselves entirely available to the service of Christ as religious. If we assume such generosity on the part of men entering the Society, why would they "stop short" with brotherhood, if by becoming priests they are more available to Christ and the Society? Otherwise, why not give their lay talents to the service of Christ as ordinary laymen?

Here too we can see an evolution in the Society's self-understanding. At the Society's inception, Ignatius could indeed say that the professed Fathers constituted the Society in the "most precise sense."²⁰ But this view was on the way out by 1960²¹; GC 31 and the Brothers' Congress in 1970 officially rejected it. Nonetheless, as I noted earlier, claims of a complementary equality have little meaning if we cannot identify the positive complementarity the brother supplies in practice—why men with all the smarts to become priests can be just as generous, as brothers, in the Society's service to the Church—in a way that also complements the role of non-ordained partners.

Because the question here regards the brothers' *complementary* availability for the Society's apostolic mission, it does not suffice to say the brother shares in the priesthood of the Society. To get at the practical meaning of the complementary equality of priests and brothers, we must say more—we must identify the brother's *distinctive* contribution that complements that of the priest precisely because it supplies something the priest cannot.

A distinctive display of the value of religious life

In addressing this question, there are two fairly solid starting points, both of which were on the table before Vatican Council II. First, the presence of brothers in the Society anchors the Order in the Church's religious tradition, which began primarily as a lay movement. LaFarge makes this point, and Kolvenbach develops it: "In some ways the religious brother embodies religious life in its essence, and so is able to illustrate that life with particular clarity."²² The Jesuit brother, in other words, witnesses to the value of the Jesuit vocation precisely as a religious vocation, apart from any position one might have as a priest in the ministerial hierarchy. We have

here the sought-for absence of sacramental power that has a positive value: *just because* the Jesuit brother is not a priest, just because he opts out of the clerical structure, he is in a position to display the value of religious life as such, without admixture. Moreover, this very same commitment to the religious life also distinguishes his vocation from other lay states of life.

The second point concerns the lay aspect of the brother's vocation. Though LaFarge associates the brother with labor, the connection he sees between brothers and laymen applies to any non-sacramental work: the brother's "practical view of the dignity of labor, though based on the concept of the supernatural mission of the Son of Man, offers nevertheless a wonderful contribution towards bridging the distance that sometimes seems

to separate the priest from the layman."²³

The National Jesuit Brothers' Committee Statement on the Brother echoes LaFarge's sentiment: "the brother is in fact a valuable bridge for the Church as both lay person and religious."²⁴

*the brother is in fact a
valuable bridge for the
Church as both lay person
and religious*

Putting these two ideas together, we might see a positive attraction to the Jesuit brother's vocation in these

distinctive characteristics: like all Jesuits and unlike ordinary laymen, the brother commits himself completely to God as a vowed member of a religious community, freed from the obligations of family and self-support to serve the Church's apostolic mission without reservation²⁵; unlike priests and like ordinary laymen, he wants to do this entirely through the gift of his lay talents, as someone working shoulder-to-shoulder with other non-ordained members of his profession or trade or lay ministry, as someone who meets these other members eye-to-eye, equal in ecclesial rank.

The brothers' essential role in Jesuit priesthood

To summarize, then, Jesuit brothers and priests are equals, both as members of a religious community and as available for the apostolic mission of the Society. But Jesuits exercise their common vocation in complementary ways. Precisely because the brother opts out of clerical status, he remains on a par with his lay colleagues, even as his vows bind him to his ordained brothers in religious community. This position, I suggest, allows brothers to

make a distinctive contribution to Jesuit life. That contribution is not only distinctive, however. It is essential, indeed in a surprising way that bears on the brother's role in the Society's *sacerdotal* charism.

As we have seen, Arrupe contended that the brothers play an "irreplaceable" role in the communal and apostolic life of the Society. The idea of complementary equality allows us now to develop Arrupe's insight: brothers play an essential role today precisely in virtue of their distinctive apostolic position as non-ordained religious. On the one hand, as non-ordained religious they make an invaluable contribution to the identity of the Society as a religious community. Precisely as non-ordained, brothers remind all Jesuits of the value of the religious life on its own terms. Not that brothers are necessarily better community members than Jesuit priests. Rather, I mean that by regarding brothers as equal members of the Society, we affirm our commitment to life in religious community as a central feature of our identity as Jesuits.

*brothers remind all
Jesuits of the value of
the religious life on its
own terms*

On the other hand, by regarding brothers as equally available for direct apostolic work, and thus as sharing in the priestly work of the Society, we say something about the specifically Jesuit character of the work of our *ordained* members: we remind ourselves that sacramental ministry in the Society is primarily apostolic, oriented by the Society's evangelizing, missionary charism and its current apostolic preferences. Unlike the sacramental ministry of diocesan priests, which aims primarily to sustain the existing community of faith, the sacramental work of Jesuits is oriented toward an outward-looking apostolic mission, that of bringing Christ to the world through "the defense and propagation of the faith and for the progress of souls in Christian life and doctrine."²⁶ This apostolic orientation does not exclude parish work by Jesuits, but it does have implications for our acceptance of parishes and, more broadly, for our choice among opportunities for sacramental work in general. It is no accident that Jesuit parishes tend to be located in needy areas, consistent with our apostolic commitment to solidarity with the least.

If the above points are on target, then we can readily agree with Arrupe: the extinction of brothers would constitute "a mutilation with grave consequences for the body of the Society and for its apostolate." The reason is that the brother plays a key role in preserving both the religious identity

THE VOCATION OF THE JESUIT BROTHER TODAY

of the Society and its apostolic orientation. More provocatively, we can say that without brothers, not only the Society's religious identity but also the distinctively Jesuit character of its sacerdotal charism is in peril.

The value of the brother's vocation

The upshot, in a nutshell, is this: the attractiveness of the Jesuit brother's vocation rests on the apostolic value of religious life on its own terms, without the benefits (or burdens) of the clerical position. As General Kolvenbach put it in a 1997 interview with Charles Jackson, the brother's vocation "needs nothing else—nothing is lacking. It is really a *full* vocation and a *full* mission."²⁷ The happy Jesuit brothers I have known, young and old, bear this statement out: they find their vocation complete. As one brother explained to me, he chose to become a brother because "it just fit." These men testify to the value and viability of religious life today.

However, in that same interview, Kolvenbach warned that we should not expect many brothers' vocations precisely for that reason, that is, because the attractiveness of that vocation depends so heavily on the intrinsic value of religious life—hardly a high-demand market in today's status- and consumer-oriented world. The freedom to live out that value distinguishes the vocation of the religious brother from the other lay states of life. However, for most young Catholic men, the brother's vocation still lacks the visibility of the priest's.

This is unfortunate, for the apostolic mission of the Society of Jesus needs brothers as much as ever. To spread the Gospel in pluralistic societies beset by the demands of globalization, the Society certainly has need for men, priests and brothers, who can engage the world through their lay talents—in science, education, administration, areas of health care, and so on. And given the increasing professional demands in such areas of engagement, there is a need for Jesuits whose full mission has them devote all their energies to the requirements of such non-sacramental apostolates. Thus the need for brothers in the Society of Jesus continues—not only for theological reasons connected with the Jesuit charism, but also for very pragmatic reasons, just as in 1550.

Ultimately, however, the theological reasons are more important than the pragmatic ones. We will attract Jesuit brothers only if we Jesuits

treasure our life together as apostolic religious and communicate its joys to Catholic laymen. The stakes are high, for nothing less than the Society's charism is at stake. The young brothers in formation today, though few, are a sign of hope for the whole Society.

¹ This article is excerpted and revised from "The Value and Viability of the Jesuit Brother's Vocation: An American Perspective," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 40, no. 4 (2008): 1-38, here 27-38. I thank Timothy McMahon, S.J., for first inviting me to undertake a study of the brother's vocation; I am especially grateful to John Fava, S.J., for access to material on the National Jesuit Brothers' Committee (NJBC file). For feedback on drafts, stimulating insights, interviews, and help with source materials, I thank John Padberg, S.J., David Miros, John Fava, S.J., Eleonore Stump, Kevin Burke, S.J., Charles Jackson, S.J., Ray Schroth, S.J., members of the Studies Seminar; Joan Gaulen; Louis Mauro, S.J., Phil Pick, S.J., Ray Reis, S.J., Thomas Kretz, S.J., Tom Buckley, S.J., and Jim Boyton, S.J. Finally, I thank Eddie Mercieca, S.J., for inviting me to prepare this essay for *CIS*.

² With some exceptions (e.g., Brazil), a decline in Jesuit brothers holds for the whole Society over the last century. In 1900, there were 3,944 brothers out of 15,073 Jesuits worldwide (26.2%), whereas today the figure stands at around 9%, 1,758 out of 18,815; see "The Society in Numbers," *News and Features*, Documentation N. 88 (April 2008): 14; for the 1900 figures, see Charles J. Jackson, S.J., "One and the Same Vocation: The Jesuit Brother, 1957 to the Present," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 30, no. 5 (November 1998), appendix.

³ The idea (though not the term "complementary equality" itself) is evident in GC 31 and the 1970 World Congress of Brothers; see Decree 7 in *Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1977); Brother's Congress, "Final Conclusions," private Jesuit document distributed by James J. McQuade, S.J. (June 6, 1970), no. 32.

⁴ Pedro Arrupe, S.J., "Contribution of the Brother to the Life and Apostolate of the Society," in Arrupe, *Challenge to Religious Life Today*, ed. J. Aixala, S.J., 2nd ed. (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1979), 279-293, here 281.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 282-285.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 286.

⁷ The claims in this section are based primarily on the history of Jesuit brothers in the United States. Though I suspect that this history parallels that in other countries, no doubt there are also differences, so I am not sure how much the changes described here account for declines in the percentages of brothers in other assistancies.

— THE VOCATION OF THE JESUIT BROTHER TODAY —

⁸ See Edward J. Meier, S.J., *Unknown Soldiers of Christ: How Jesuit Brothers Aid in Extending Christ's Kingdom* (St. Louis: Queen's Work, 1930), 5-6; also John LaFarge, S.J., *A Report on the American Jesuits* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1956), 113-22.

⁹ In the nineteenth-century United States, Jesuit schools, missions, and houses of formation tended to be associated with (and partly supported by) agricultural operations.

¹⁰ The traditional understanding of ecclesiastical jurisdiction provides a further, and perhaps more important, reason for papal resistance to the abolition of grades; on the recent history, see Jackson, 13-17; also John Padberg, S.J., "The Society True to Itself: A Brief History of the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 15, nos. 3-4 (May – September 1983).

¹¹ Pope Paul VI, "Address to the Members of the 32nd General Congregation," December 3, 1974, in *Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations*, 525-526.

¹² On the importance of the Society's history for understanding its charism, see John W. O'Malley, S.J., "Five Missions of the Jesuit Charism," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 38, no. 4 (Winter 2006).

¹³ *Constitutions*, [623b]; from *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, translated, with an Introduction and Commentary by George E. Ganss, S.J. (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Studies, 1970).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, [622a].

¹⁵ For example, see the obituary of a brother who worked at Holy Cross College in New England in the 1920s, "Brother Patrick Hagerty, S.J.," *Woodstock Letters* 70 (1941): 273-78. As the writer reports: "to many a student this indefatigable Brother was not unlike a very saintly priest." Hagerty, I suspect, is hardly alone in this respect.

¹⁶ Graham D. Wilson, "Jesuit Identity and the Jesuit Brother: A Contemporary Understanding of the Charism of the Society of Jesus," M.A. Thesis, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley (1996), 83. (Wilson is a former Jesuit brother.)

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 81.

¹⁸ Rodriguez's role as porter at the college in Majorca allowed him to counsel a wide range of visitors; da Costa, a brother surgeon in China, and Castiglione, painter in the imperial court in China, both used their lay skills as openings to apostolic engagement: the former to work with the poor and train lay ministers, the latter to influence imperial policy; on these two brothers in China, see Pius L. Moore, S.J., "Coadjutor Brothers on the Foreign Missions," *The Woodstock Letters* 74 (1945): 5-20. For Ignatius's expectation that brothers engage in spiritual conversation, see *The General Examen and Its Declarations*, [115], in *Constitutions*, trans. Ganss.

¹⁹ For official recognition of lay "collaboration," see *Documents of the Thirty-Fourth General Congregation of the Society of Jesus* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1995), Decree 13; also *The Decrees of General Congregation 35* (Washington, D.C.: Jesuit Conference, Society of Jesus in the United States, 2008), Decree 6.

²⁰ Qtd. in George E. Ganss, S.J., "Toward Understanding the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation, Especially as Described in the Papal and Jesuit Documents," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 13, no. 3 (May 1981), 10.

²¹ See the Meier and LaFarge, *op. cit.*, both of whom affirm the equality of brothers and priests as Jesuits.

²² Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., Preface, Loyola Symposium on the Vocation and Mission of the Jesuit Brother, 1994, in *CIS: Review of Ignatian Spirituality* 26-1, no. 78 (1995): 3; cf. LaFarge, 118.

²³ LaFarge, 115.

²⁴ NJBC, "The Jesuit Brother: A Statement by the National Jesuit Brothers' Committee," 1 (1986).

²⁵ In saying the religious brother (or sister) is free of the obligations of self-support (or income), I refer to an ideal: the idea that the religious community should choose its works primarily according to a criterion of apostolic service rather than income. The reality, of course, is more complicated, and members of some communities have been forced to seek employment primarily to bring in income. Note also that some forms of the lay state might fit this ideal, e.g., the Catholic Worker Movement, a lifestyle both communal and poor.

²⁶ *Formula of the Institute*, [3], in *Constitutions*, trans. Ganss; for a historical argument supporting this point, see William Harmless, S.J., "Jesuits as Priests: Crisis and Charism," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 19, no. 3 (May 1987); Harmless emphasizes the apostolic character of Jesuit priesthood, oriented primarily to ministries of the word—which includes the brothers' practice of spiritual conversation. See also John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), chaps. 3-4. I thank Kevin Burke, S.J., for the idea of the brothers' role in sustaining the identity of the Jesuit priest.

²⁷ Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., "Father General Addresses the Brothers of the U.S.," transcript of videotaped interview with Br. Charles J. Jackson, S.J., May 27, 1997 (St. Louis: NJBC file).