

THE HUMAN PERSON AND SEXUALITY

By JOSEPH TETLOW

A BRIEF DOCUMENT ON THE WHOLE of formation for religious life could hardly have developed a coherent philosophy of the human person or a full approach to human sexuality. Inevitably, however, its authors say a good deal on these topics, both explicitly and by implication. Their quotations from and references to scores of conciliar, papal, and other official documents add to the substance of what they say.

From the beginning, they work singlemindedly out of a specific appreciation of religious chastity and strongly imply that it has a specific sign-value. They stress community in a distinctive way, influenced by their basic attitude toward human friendship and love. They maintain, as they write on these topics, the traditional teaching on asceticism and on the central place in religious' lives of the Virgin Mary. Significantly, neither the imitation of Christ nor the rich social fruitfulness of dedicated celibacy figure large in their treatment of chastity. If that marks a slippage, their insistence on maturing in sexuality and their stress on the differences between the masculine and feminine mark a notable advance.

The meaning of chastity

The authors take from Canon Law [CIC 599] their definition of chastity as 'a sign of the future world and a source of more abundant fruitfulness in an undivided heart'. Then throughout the document they consider chastity the *proleptic realization of the Kingdom*.¹ One author describes this as 'the inauguration here below of an aspect of the definitive state of glorified man', and 'a prelude of the angelic life to which all the elect are called in Eternal Glory'.²

They apply this concept of chastity to the vocation of each religious person, seeing in vocation the fundamental grace of redemption. 'The call of Christ, which is the expressing of a redemptive love, embraces the whole person, soul and body, whether man or woman, in that person's unique and unrepeatable personal I' [2]. The authors could be clearer here that the encyclical they are citing, John Paul II's *Redemptionis donum*, speaks about the universal summons to disciple-

ship and not about the specific call to chastity. They are content to remain unclear because, in their view, the person summoned to religious life experiences baptismal grace and the call to Christian discipleship as a call to a more perfect union with God in chaste celibacy. Hence, chaste celibacy is itself a 'response to love . . . to Christ their redeemer: a love which is given entirely and without reserve' through the evangelical counsel. This love, the authors affirm, 'is of a nuptial character' [9]. Throughout this document, therefore, chastity is understood in some unitive sense that can be called marital. Many religious, particularly in contemplative orders, experience their chastity at the core of their union with God, perhaps even as its core.

Formators know, however, that very many deeply dedicated women and men do not experience chaste celibacy as their direct response to the divine charity and as a definer of their union with God. Rather, they experience it as a means to the relationship they seek with God and with others. They perceive their chaste celibacy less in eschatological terms, in light of the last things to come, and more in functional terms, in light of the sacrifices demanded by the life they have chosen, be it of contemplation, of apostolic activity, or of devout Christian living in the single state. This has been called a functional celibacy, and would be recognized by very many religious as their kind of celibacy.³ This functional celibacy does not emerge much in the pages of the *Directives*.

As one consequence, the authors give much greater stress to the interior fruitfulness of chaste celibacy than to more palpable fruitfulness. In this, they shift away from an emphasis in earlier documents. In 1954, to take one instance, Pius XII illustrated the celibate's being 'solicitous for the things of God' this way: Francis Xavier baptizing in India, Vincent de Paul feeding his poor, John Bosco educating his youth, Francis Xavier Cabrini mothering immigrants. After these and more, he got around to adding 'yet another reason' for chaste celibacy: 'advance in the spiritual life'.⁴ A more recent instance: in his letter of 1983 to the American hierarchy concerning their relations with religious, the present pontiff praised the fruitfulness of chaste celibacy in the New World's colonies and in the United States. He listed the educational system stretching from elementary school to university, numerous hospitals and orphanages, multiple social services labourers, and the constant social and political struggle for justice.⁵

The sign-value of chaste celibacy

The authors' emphasis on the interior fruitfulness of chaste celibacy is linked with their assumption that celibate life in and of itself continues to symbolize in Church and world the Reign coming at the endtime. Many formators cannot share that assumption. It would seem, rather, that celibacy does not now have an unambiguous meaning, not to the secular world and not even to Christians.

It is true that the opinion, shaped by early depth psychology, that celibacy is somehow unnatural is losing credibility. Celibacy nonetheless still puzzles many, first because it is the choice of living alone. As a Benedictine study puts it, 'any mode of human life or fidelity not grounded in personal relationships is unintelligible to many people, and a celibate way of life is presumed to exclude them'.⁶ It puzzles many, further, because it begins with a permanent commitment. Humankind today cannot escape the uneasy conviction that a permanent commitment once made, even in genuine freedom, cannot endure in genuine freedom since later experiences may well demand change.⁷

In differing degrees in their various cultures, formators meet this limitation on the sign-value of chastity not in the abstract, but in the persons whom they form. Some young religious anguish over whether they are fleeing marriage for motives buried in their unconscious. Some suffer bitter confusion in their sexuality, often after childhood sexual abuse. Some find their chastity challenged as women and men religious work together more closely, a development the authors note [39]. Since Vatican II, many also find their comprehension of chastity challenged by the fact that they work along with, and do the same work as, married men and women. As their conception of celibacy is functional they ask whether it is better to do the Church's work celibate or married.

The sign-value of chaste celibacy has blurred under pressure from forces outside of the Church. The authors remark several times how currents of eroticism, hatred and violence, all damaging to chastity, scar the human person in some cultures today. Perhaps because they draw only on other hierarchical documents, they do not explore other currents damaging the human spirit. Novices need to know that their *anxiety* is not theirs alone but is shared by their world, as Karen Horney argued, and that their life world shares their *loss of meaning*, as Viktor Frankl argued.⁸ They need to know that we are all 'proletariat' in Arnold Toynbee's sense of having all that we need and still

feeling *alienated from society*. The young need to know that their *ambiguity about sexual morality* rises not only from conflict within the self and in the Church, but also and more from what Charles Taylor called the 'ethic of inarticulacy', society's voluble insistence on individual rights and silence about the common good.⁹ All of these tensions in the human person today affect the ability to live chaste celibacy and have an impact on its sign-value.

As one consequence, formators recognize that forming the young to chaste celibacy does not always begin with '*preserving joy and thanksgiving*' [13]. Instead, they regularly have to help young religious *accept* joy and *choose* to give thanks for their celibate call. More than that: because of this same ambiguity in the meaning of celibacy, formators and superiors have learned not only that 'recourse to a psychological examination can be useful' [43], as the authors allow, but that recourse to psychological therapy might be necessary. The authors seem too reticent on this matter; we have had enough experience worldwide with sexuality and psychotherapy and might have anticipated a clearer directive for both individuals and communities.¹⁰

Life in religious community

In its emphasis on the importance of community living, the *Directives* make a considerable advance over earlier documents. In *Sacra Virginitas*, for instance, Pius XII wrote a genuinely beautiful encomium of chaste celibacy, putting little stress on community life. The authors of these *Directives* mention community a number of times, always asserting its importance: novitiate formation 'depends to a great extent on the quality of community' [26]. Young religious cannot be authentically formed except in community. Temporarily professed, like the fully formed, must make every effort 'to accept the reality of this life and to discover within it the conditions for their personal progress . . . and to feel personal responsibility within the same community' [60]. Formed religious find their continuing formation only in community. The authors leave no doubt whether they consider community important.

The authors' view of community life, however, refracts distinctively ecclesiastical interests. The first mention of community life [10] comes in a citation of the new Code of Canon Law [607.2]. They later return to Canon Law [673] for the assertion that 'the apostolate of all religious consists first in their witness of a consecrated life' [17]. In a paragraph rare because it does not quote or cite anything but scripture, they explain what this witness consists in:

The fact that religious belong to an institute causes them to give to Christ and to the Church a public witness of separation with regard to 'the spirit of the world' (1 Cor 2, 12) and to the behavior which it involves, and at the same time of a presence to the world in keeping with the 'wisdom of God' (1 Cor 2, 7).

This separated presence makes religious 'experts in communion' [25]. It gradually grows clearer, however, that 'communion' does not refer so much to union of persons in common life as to union with the Church. An indication of this comes early on: 'Through the charity to which these counsels lead, they are joined to the Church and its mystery in a special way' [7].

When they do speak of the human relations that are community life, the authors tend to hedge.

Chastity frees the human heart in a remarkable manner (1 Cor 7, 32), so that it burns with a love for God and for all people. One of the greatest contributions which religious can bring to humanity today is certainly that of revealing, by their life more than by their words, the possibility of a true dedication to and openness toward others, in sharing their joys, in being faithful and constant in love without a thought of domination or exclusiveness. [13]

Are dedication, openness, sharing, fidelity, constant love given to all people without distinction? Or are they given preferentially to the members of the religious community? Which loving witness do religious reveal 'by their life more than by their words'? The authors do not speak with secure clarity. Formators need the corrective of authors like the theologian who acted as secretary for the Brazilian union of women and men superiors: 'Whatever the kind of community, the communion of persons is fundamental: it is indeed the unavoidable condition for the manifestation of love'.¹¹

The authors are quite explicit in their ecclesiological appreciation of community. They claim that the 'basic inspiration' for living in community 'is obviously the first Christian community' spoken of in *Acts* [26]. They are writing tendentious history; it is not at all obvious that religious life began with the *apostolic* community. The basic inspiration of at least founders was the *evangelical* community formed by Jesus of Nazareth and his disciples. They formed the first community of New Covenant love.

What can it mean that nowhere in this document about communities of Christian love do the authors quote Jesus's own command-

ment that we are to love one another? They find space to mention how Jesus modelled self-sacrifice but not how he modelled the way we are to love. The authors surely believe that our love for one another lets people know that we are Christ's disciples. But both their ecclesiology and their Christian anthropology keep them from emphasizing the sign-value, so important at the end of this century, of a vibrantly loving community.¹² They quote the present pontiff's observation about the young that 'their hearts are disposed to fellowship, friendship and solidarity' [87]. They have not adverted adequately to the fact that all hearts in this post-modern world are so disposed.

This is a critical matter in interpreting chaste celibacy. As Robert Nisbet wrote under the threat of nuclear devastation some forty years ago: 'Out of intimations of dissolution and insecurity has emerged an interest in the properties and values of community that is one of the most striking social facts of the present age'.¹³ He spoke no more strongly than the present pontiff speaks, who has considered the 'growing need for participation' one of the 'distinctive features of present-day humanity'. John Paul II has established as part of the Church's current vocabulary a powerful slogan-word from the experience of people in the Second World joining together in the risky struggle for dignity and freedom: solidarity.¹⁴ It seems a lost opportunity that the authors did not lay greater stress on the very powerful sign-value of chaste celibates joining together in the risky struggle for dignity and freedom, both personal and social, in Christ.

The authors also chose to ignore, formators need to note, one of the single most valuable sources of papal teaching on the theology of the body, on sexuality, and on chastity: John Paul II's famous general-audience addresses of 1979 to 1981. They do, indeed, refer to 'the nuptial meaning of the body', one of his themes. But they leave aside some keenly relevant discussions of original innocence, the meanings of nakedness and of shame, the human significance of solitude and the divine significance of the impulse to self-donation, and a great deal more.¹⁵ So much more, in fact, that the authors of this brief document would only have been able to point to the teaching and suggest its broad outlines. How could they not have done at least that?

The role of human love

Perhaps one reason lies in their great stress on the divine love. The authors speak out of a Christology 'from above' and their spiritual

theology also seems 'from above': 'Those who make profession of the evangelical counsels should seek and love above all else God, who has first loved us' [17]. Yet, though Christian revelation teaches us that we are not to separate this love from love for one another, the authors emerge chary of human love. Here is their first explicit mention of it: 'An instinctive tendency of the human person leads to making an absolute out of human love' [13].

Presumably, the authors mean here nothing scientific by *instinctive*, and are speaking loosely about the consequences of original sin. They correctly show concern about selfishness, possessiveness, exclusiveness, and the need for human maturity in relationships. But their concern brings them to understate the crucial role of human relations in the lives of the vast majority of maturely chaste celibate men and women, and consequently in the formation of the young.¹⁶ Formators will hardly find the word *friendship* used in this document and should not expect reflections from world-wide, and centuries-long, experience of the beauty and grace of spiritual friendship.

This is an egregious lack. It is as though the authors concurred with the excessive opinion of one writer who believed friendship 'a luxurious virtue reserved for an élite', and thought that 'real friends belong to a rare species'.¹⁷ As one remarkable consequence, while the authors call for 'ample room for responsible initiatives and decisions' in formation for obedience [15], the authors make no such call in formation for chastity. The warnings and admonitions may even prove an obstacle to initiatives and decisions in friendship.

Can anyone, in active ministry or in cloistered life, achieve sound formation in chaste celibacy who has taken no initiatives in affective communication, friendship, and even intimacy? The young today need to learn the subtle gradations between sexuality and genitality, between sexual yearning in personal relationships and the proto-social, false relationship which is lust.¹⁸ It is true, as one established author observes, that 'the grandeur of virginity is completely supernatural and really exists only where this state is embraced out of an excess of a love of God'.¹⁹ But this *state* unfolds and matures in a complex dynamic of affectivity, of sexuality, and sometimes even of genitality. It is not helpful to have left unexplored this vast middle ground between unitive or marital chastity on the one hand and on the other a selfish and self-centered purity. The broad middle ground of affectivity is where most religious work out our salvation.

In general, the authors' treatment of affectivity is a bit perplexing. Speaking of 'the evangelical radicalism' characterizing the religious

life of the counsels, they affirm that the vows 'touch the human person at the level of the three essential spheres of his existence and relationships: affectivity, possession and power' [12]. The vows bring about an 'anthropological uprooting', which leaves the religious in great freedom. The uprooting of the vow of poverty means the renunciation of possessions. Are we to understand that the uprooting of the vow of chastity means the renunciation of affectivity? The authors almost surely do not mean this, but what they do intend about human affectivity remains difficult to sort out, whether they address chastity itself, sexuality, community life, or asceticism.²⁰

Chaste celibacy and asceticism

When the authors speak of asceticism, as they properly do more than once, they speak of austerities undertaken for the sake of purifying the individual's heart for love of God. No one can cavil at that, but celibates in community also need austerities of another order. They embrace *social austerities* as well as *personal*, in order to live as friends in the Lord and to mature as human lovers.

The authors correctly observe that 'the paschal peace and joy of a community are always the fruit of death to self and the reception of the gift of the Spirit' [26]. This fruit and this gift, however, mature in the practice of humble austerities not evoked by the document's code-words: the selfless interest in another's works and days, the creative co-operation in community meetings and discernment, the willingness to set aside one's own even urgent needs to see to the needs of another or of the community, the humiliation of having to name things in the community as aggravation or even temptation, and so on. This is the austerity plainly implied in the community life described in the Benedictine Rule [72], full of humanity, warmth, hope, simplicity, concern, forbearance, and the like. All who live in community need this social austerity.

The authors are aware of this in a way. 'Education for chastity', they write 'will therefore aim at helping each one to control and to master his or her sexual impulses, while at the same time it will avoid a self-centredness that is content with one's fidelity to purity' [13]. They know that, as one theologian put it, 'the vow of chastity is often reduced to the observance of mere moral purity'.²¹ In repudiating this view, however, they lean toward making both community life and human friendship instrumental, less gifts in themselves than a help to each individual to stay faithful to the personal commitment to chastity. Thus, they list community along with the sacrament of

Reconciliation and regular spiritual direction as means to chastity [13]. Although they use phrases such as 'a means of formation' and 'with the help of friendship and dialogue', the authors are aware that community 'has its own requirements' and 'deserves to be lived and loved for what it is in the religious life, as the Church conceives it' [26 and 27].

Any instrumentalism in friendship or in community life must be carefully hedged. It is consonant with the utilitarian individualism identified by Robert Bellah in North American society and recognizable in other cultures.²² Such 'friendships' really mean using others and readily reach the level of vice. They take a subtle revenge on the celibates who attempt them in surprising and shattering eruptions of autoeroticism and of lust. The document condemns possessiveness and domination but could have been clearer on the less obvious failures that have emerged since Vatican II in approaching friendship and religious life.²³

Moral purity belongs to the virtue of religion and is practised by Buddhists as well as Christians. Christian chastity functions altogether in the order of divine charity. God our Creator, in redeeming us from our sin, has determined that we shall share the divine charity in the order of human love. True chastity, therefore, whether in marriage or in celibacy, is embraced for the sake of love of God and of others. Neither community nor friendship—nor marriage—is for the sake of chastity; it is the other way around, and nothing must be allowed to obscure that.

Masculine and feminine sexuality

In light of the authors' consistent approach to chastity from above through divine charity, their clear call for formation in sexuality comes as a surprise [13]. They point more than once to the connection between 'maturing in the relationships between the two sexes' and 'the observance of perfect chastity' [39]. They require that the young religious have 'basic notions of masculine and feminine sexuality' based on a 'penetrating and accurate consideration of the anthropological foundation for masculinity and femininity', so that they will arrive at a clear sexual identity [41]. The authors intend that religious grow to a full awareness of sexuality and gender. This is a strong achievement in a document intended for religious in every culture, from Zimbabwe to Canada, from Sri Lanka to Brazil.²⁴

As might have been anticipated, the authors directly address gender differences only in passing. One way they do it consistently is

by presenting the Virgin Mary as a model to religious women. For instance, they include in a section on *Sexuality and formation* a treatment of the specific character of the feminine religious life [41]. They end it with this sentence from John Paul II's *Redemptoris Mater* [46]:

In the light of Mary, the Church sees in the face of women the reflection of a beauty which mirrors the loftiest sentiments of which the human heart is capable: the self-offering totality of love; the strength that is capable of bearing the greatest sorrows; limitless fidelity and tireless devotion to work; the ability to combine penetrating intuition with words of support and encouragement.

Now the fact is that the faces of women and men alike reflect the loftiest sentiments and limitless fidelity, as the pontiff knew, and both women and men do tireless work and can combine intuition with encouragement. It shed no further light on masculinity or on femininity to list these achievements as gender specific characteristics in place of saying how women and men endure, labour, intuit, and support, differently.

The matter is very pertinent to male religious who look for instruction in this document, since the *Directives* hold Mary up to them, too. How long will men continue learning how to feel from women, even if the woman in question is the nonpareil Mother of God? When will Christian men rediscover the fierce rabbi from Nazareth? When will we again feel the fury of Paul's zeal? the passion of Thomas's thirst for truth? the determined idealism of Matteo Ricci's quest? the boldness of Camillus de Lellis's love?

The imitation of Christ

This raises an extraordinarily telling omission in the document: the imitation of Christ. The authors say that poverty is to be 'in imitation of Christ' and obedience, 'the following of Christ' [14 and 15]. Chastity, they consider simply 'assumed for the sake of the kingdom of heaven' [13]. This marks an unacceptable shift from the Church's more traditional view that Pius XII proclaimed the more traditional vision in *Sacra virginitas* [19]: women and men embrace chaste celibacy 'certainly for the reason that their Divine Master remained all His life a virgin'.²⁵ The authors of the *Directives* mention the Virgin Mary again and again, who 'advanced in her pilgrimage of faith and loyally persevered in her union with her Son unto the cross' [110]. They do not mention the imitation of the chaste celibate,

Jesus of Nazareth, or the masculine union postulated by Pius XII, of 'following the Lamb wherever He goes' to undertake the agonistic labour of establishing the Reign of God [18].²⁶

The authors are missing what the Church at large is missing, the broad sinews of a masculine spirituality. That requires reconstituting the hero, destroyed by males during this century. It means finding a way of stating ideals again, of eliciting the loyal commitment of men to one another in great enterprises under evangelical ideals, and more. The feminist movement has helped women recapture the spirituality that made great saints of grand women; perhaps it is now moving men to recover the spirituality that made heroic saints of ordinary men.

We have come to consider clarity about how the masculine and the feminine give characteristic shape and form to each virtue and vice.²⁷ The authors could not yet find these clarities in technical ecclesiastical documents, of course. But it might have been more instructive to have adduced these few clarities than it was to cite, as the first two of five saints mentioned in the document, St Anthony who fled the company of humans and Origen who handled sexuality by having himself castrated. A Benedictine effort, for instance, resulted in this lucid pair of sentences about maturing in masculine and feminine sexuality:

For a man, sexual maturity implies the integration of such supposedly feminine qualities as gentleness, intuitiveness, imagination, sympathy, patience, warmth, and receptivity. For a woman, it means integrating objectivity, rationality, strength and steadiness, the power to grasp the whole picture without getting lost in details, clarity, outgoingness, and other qualities usually associated with men.²⁸

These sentences say nothing definitive, but they bring the matter of femininity and masculinity into our concrete world, where it truly belongs. For the sake of our salvation, women and men must while we are in formation 'learn the difference between sexual excitement and the deep emotion with which interior sensitivity and sexuality itself react to the total expression of femininity and masculinity'. We will in this way 'master our instincts and rediscover the spiritual beauty of sexuality'.²⁹ This puts a properly larger meaning into the matter of mastering instincts and reaching self-control.

The *Directives* have begun the move toward a formation on this order. Its authors demand, in the language available to them, that

religious men and women envision a genuine sexual maturity and take means to grow into it. They emphasize the centrality of community life even though, in keeping with their purpose, they speak about it from a definite ecclesiological viewpoint. They plainly see the tensions that post-modern culture places on celibacy and take what account of it they can. And they have moved religious—not all of whom are eager or even willing—to the absorption of gender differences between feminine and masculine spiritualities. Their achievement should not be ignored.

NOTES

¹ Legrand, Lucien: *The biblical doctrine of virginity* (New York, 1963) is one of the classical statements of this understanding of consecrated chastity.

² Thils, Gustave: *Christian holiness, a precis of ascetical theology* (Tielt, Belgium 1961), p 534.

³ Gelpi, Donald L.: *Functional asceticism* (New York, 1966), pp 41–45.

⁴ Pius XII: *Sacra virginitas*, no 20 and no 21; 1 Cor 7, 32.

⁵ John Paul II: *Letter to the bishops of the United States*, April 3, 1983, no 2. This time, the document mentions the interior and the exterior fruitfulness in the same sentences.

⁶ Rees, Daniel, O.S.B., et al.: *Consider your call: a theology of monastic life today* (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1978), p 156.

⁷ Haughey, John C.: *Should anyone say forever?* (Chicago, 1975), pp 61–63.

⁸ Horney, Karen: *The neurotic personality of our time* (New York, 1937); Frankl, Viktor E., *Man's search for meaning* (New York, 1959).

⁹ Taylor, Charles: *Sources of the self: the making of the modern identity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), pp 53–90.

¹⁰ The authors cite Canon 220: 'No one is permitted to damage unlawfully the good repute which another person enjoys nor to violate the right of another person to protect his or her own privacy'. They protect individual rights, but not the rights of the community. This is difficult to explain when individuals' compulsive or simply irresponsible sexual activity has been doing grave damage to religious communities in more than one nation.

¹¹ Azevedo, Marcello, S.J.: *Vocation for mission: the challenge of religious life today* (New York, 1988), p 55.

¹² See Clark, Keith: *An experience of celibacy* (Notre Dame, 1981).

¹³ Nisbet, Robert: *The quest for community: a study in the ethics of order and freedom* (Oxford, 1953), O.F.M.Cap p 21.

¹⁴ *Christifideles laici*, no 5.

¹⁵ The allocutions, arguably as rich a twentieth-century source as any inside or outside of the Church, were published in *Osservatore Romano*. They are well summarized and commented on by Mary G. Durkin: *Feast of love: John Paul II on human intimacy* (Chicago, 1983).

¹⁶ Kiesling, Christopher, O.P.: *Celibacy, prayer and friendship* (New York, 1978), pp 133–51.

¹⁷ Colin, Louis, C.S.S.R.: *Love one another* (Westminster, Maryland, 1960) p 150 and p 157.

¹⁸ Unger, Roberto Mangabeira: *Passion: an essay on personality* (London, 1984) pp 174–193. In this and similar studies, important work is being done on human reason as it remains embedded in emotion and affectivity.

¹⁹ Thils: *Christian holiness*, p 533.

²⁰ Of homosexuality, the authors make only the passing remark that those who 'cannot overcome their homosexuality' ought not be incorporated into the community. They may fairly be assumed to refer here not to homosexual activity but to homosexual orientation, and to

adopt the opinion that a homosexual orientation is a 'metaphysical disorder'. They are promoting a policy, the rejection of the homosexually oriented, that has not proven altogether helpful. When the open and docile tell their formators of homosexual tendencies, they are asked to leave; those whose fear keeps them silent are incorporated.

²¹ Azevedo: *Vocation*, p 48.

²² Bellah, Robert N., et al.: *Habits of the heart, individualism and commitment in American life* (Berkeley and London, 1985) pp 32-35.

²³ An extraordinarily instructive reflection on this and on the 'social asceticism' to be mentioned below has just appeared. McDonough, Elizabeth, O.P.: 'Beyond the liberal model: quo vadis?', *Review for religious* vol 50 (March/April 1991), pp 171-188.

²⁴ The achievement is somewhat marred by sexist language and an occasional vaguely sexist judgement. Of formation in contemplative convents and monasteries, for instance, the authors say that 'the association of convents of nuns with institutes of men, according to Canon 614, can also be of advantage in the formation of nuns' [83]. Experience suggests that mutual association enriches the men as well as the women. The canon, in point of fact, is a little more embracing.

²⁵ Pius XII: *Sacra virginitas*, no 19.

²⁶ See Ong, Walter Jackson, S.J.: *Fighting for life: contest, sexuality, and consciousness* (Ithaca and London, 1981) pp 64-69, 99-103, and particularly 167-183.

²⁷ See as instances Gilligan, Carol: *In a different voice, psychological theory and women's development* (London, 1982); and Sanford, John A. and Lough, George, *What men are like* (New York, 1988).

²⁸ Rees: *Consider your call*, p 181.

²⁹ Durkin: *Feast of love*, p 175.