

The **MAST** *Journal*

The Journal of the Mercy Association in Scripture and Theology
VOL. 5, NO. 2 SPRING 1995

Preparing for the Chapter of 1995 Assessing the Institute Direction Statement

The Genesis of the Direction Statement—Amy Hoey, R.S.M.

Reflections on Conversion of Life—Katherine Doyle, R.S.M.

The Claim of the Institute Chapter—Mary Aquin O'Neill, R.S.M.

The Spirit's Fire and Catherine's Passion—Mary Sullivan, R.S.M.

Solidarity: Another Name for Mercy—Elizabeth McMillan, R.S.M.

The Burning Heart on Account of Creation...—Janet K. Ruffing, R.S.M.

Contemplation of the Works of Mercy—Kathleen McAlpin, R.S.M.

Unemployment Benefits:

Theological Reflection on Being Out of Work

—Marilyn King, R.S.M.

Mercy Values and Contemporary Culture—Mary Hembrow Snyder

**The Development of Mercy Tradition:
Reflections Borrowed from John Henry Newman**

—Mary Celeste Rouleau, R.S.M.

The Burning of the Heart on Account of Creation . . .

Janet K. Ruffing, R.S.M.

(This is a revised version of the 1994 Mercy Day Address at Hartford, Connecticut)

Isaac the Syrian describes the merciful heart in this way:

And what is a merciful heart? The burning of the heart on account of all creation, on account of people and birds and animals and demons, and for every created being. ...Great and intense mercy grasps the heart and wrings it out, for the one who is merciful is not able to bear or hear or see any harm or the slightest sorrow which takes place in the created world...¹

As a community of mercy we continue to reflect together on the present moment in religious life in the United States and in our Institute. Like other religious communities, we, too, are struggling with the process of personal and institutional transformation and with changes in our identity as women, as apostolic religious, and as members of the Institute. Each of us is unique and yet each of us is also part of a larger whole. None of us has been unaffected by the last twenty-five years of change in religious life and in our growing appreciation of the post-modern context in which we live. Each of us has appropriated these changes differently depending on our particular social context and personal experience.

Isaac's description of the merciful heart reminds us that religious life is ultimately a matter of vision and commitment. We who share the charism of Catherine McAuley are drawn together in a particular faith vision of mercy. The Original Rule claims: "Mercy, the principal path pointed out by Jesus Christ to those who are desirous of following him, has...excited the faithful in a particular manner, to instruct and comfort the sick, and the dying poor..."² This path of mercy is one of constant personal and communal transformation because we can only be merciful and do mercy in the measure with which we have experienced ourselves in need of such mercy and received this gift from a compassionate God.

The meaning of doing and living mercy changes in every historical period. But it always has to do with an ever deepening capacity to see, feel, act, and respond to misery wherever it appears. This ancient text from Isaac the Syrian reminds us that our merciful response extends to the entire created world, our care for the earth and all of its creatures. In today's context we more clearly understand how human choices have endangered the earth's capacity to sustain life on the planet. Thus, the doing and living of mercy extends beyond the personal to the earth itself.

In our own on-going journey of communal transformation, living mercy has meant redefining our charism to include acting on behalf of justice and linking Catherine's "special concern for women" with a

feminist consciousness shared by other women religious that "wherever there is poverty, women suffer more and bear more of the consequences."³ The more deeply we appreciate the reasons for women's poverty, we will begin to recognize that the neglect and despoilment of the earth is intimately related to the subjugation and oppression of women.⁴

All of us are to be transformed. This means that our own hearts must become capacious, deep wells of mercy, compassionate toward our own weakness and diminishment, compassionate toward one another in our struggle to renew religious life, compassionate toward all of creation, compassionate toward all people of the earth, compassionate toward all who suffer. If we are to claim this gift of compassion, we are at risk in many ways. We risk being changed by the suffering we share. We risk suffering the constant contrast between what is and what ought to be in ourselves and others. We risk finding ourselves as much in need of the very mercy we seek to offer others. And we risk being changed by the differing social locations and cultures we choose to enter.

**Only the compassionate
heart of Jesus united with
our own can open
our hearts in love
when we are confronted
with the worlds of pain of
this late twentieth century.**

To undergo this kind of change requires a profoundly contemplative stance. Only the compassionate heart of Jesus united with our own can open our hearts in love when we are confronted with the worlds of pain of this late twentieth century. Without this centering in God, our hearts harden or numb themselves against the pain. It is God's spirit in us, God's sustaining love, and God's enlivening energy that holds us steady on this path of mercy and which invites us to ever deeper intimacy with God and love for others.

As you read, try to become aware of that for which your heart burns. What energizes you? Where is your passion and for what? What pain can you not ignore? What is the particular misery you are compelled to relieve? Whose is the pain or the situation to which you must respond? Why do you continue to

choose to live religious life? Gently allow yourself to recognize and name not “oughts” or “shoulds” about your life, but to name what is—the present experience of God and of mercy community which grounds your reality. What is God calling you to now? More of the same? Or the same done differently? Or with different people? Or in different kinds of institutions? Who among your regional community are the women on the edges of the group and on the edges of new expressions of mercy? Are you able to hear an echo in your heart when you hear them speak about God’s mercy and vision? Can you dare to trust your deepest longings and visions to one another without fear?

Against the background of your passion for mercy and recent research and reflection on religious life, I will focus on several of the salient themes from the research in relationship to our Institute Direction Statement. These themes are: the transformation of religious life as an institution, identity and charism, prophetic interdependence, the influence of feminism, and Institute identity .

An Institution in Transformation

Both the LCWR Ministry Study and the Forus Study 5 clearly assume that religious life, especially apostolic religious life is undergoing a paradigm change. The Forus study clearly describes a working hypothesis that we are no longer in a process of adaptation to changed circumstances, but that religious life as an institution is in a process of transformation. Consequently, a larger, deeper vision is required for these times. This implies an openness to conversion, an openness to something new, something prophetic, something different. Yet whatever that might be can only issue from the movement of the Spirit in our midst. It emerges from a deep interior connection with a truth for ourselves and about ourselves emerging in our chapter preparation and process.

The LCWR Ministry Study offered six core challenges of the new paradigm emerging from leaders in religious life: prophetic interdependence, openness to change and being changed, inculturation, multiculturalism, boundary crossing, and a spirituality of reverence and contemplative openness. These core challenges were already in view by the time of our First Institute Chapter. No doubt you recognize some of these elements in our direction statement. We will, however, be struggling with their implications far into the future. We cannot ignore them. We perhaps do not even all agree that religious life is to be as prophetic, liminal, and radical as these documents assume. Religious life as it was when most of us entered was a stable institution, resistant to change, a well-regulated structure embedded in church and society. Role identity was clearly defined by the vows and by the specific works we did. Do you espouse in an operative way the need to confront the six core challenges identified in the LCWR Ministry Study which are certainly implicit

in our Institute Direction Statement?

Identity and Charism

The FORUS Study identified considerable role confusion among religious, especially apostolic women. Our role is understood differently by different constituencies in both church and society as well as among ourselves. When we are unsure about our identity, we feel defensive, uncomfortable, often frightened. But if religious life itself is in transformation to a more flexible and radical response to evangelical life, our identity, as apostolic religious women, will undergo change. For this conversion to proceed, we actively need to foster a process of personal and communal change—even choose to change in some particular ways. One way to do this is to embrace the kinds of experiences that induce change, such as boundary crossing. We see things differently if we change social location. Henry Nouwen refers to this kind of boundary crossing as “downward mobility” in his most recent book.⁶ We begin to see things from the perspective of the poor when we enter their world, live as they do, walk around in their shoes with them. But such experiences remain only experiments unless they are entered into in a discerning way, attentive to the pulls of the spirit toward conversion, toward response in new ways, an unfreezing of feelings, a reshaping of desire. Are there ways you can imagine boundary crossing — deliberately placing yourself in a different social location which could open up new possibilities?

**“Our social position
permits certain
views and activities,
and prohibits others.”**

In a book published more than ten years ago, which emerged out of a Brazilian context, J. B. Libanio identified social “position” as a source of inordinate affections. He suggests that we are incapable of engaging in discernment at any time our choices involve the concrete social realities of which we are a part and of which we are not critically conscious. This unconscious, privileged position of identification with middle class or professional culture, for instance, renders us inordinately attached to its comforts, biases, judgments, and interests. “Our social position permits certain views and activities, and prohibits others.”⁷

Libanio argues that religious who embrace a primary identification with the poor must also be committed to a social praxis of liberation. He describes three interrelated ways in which religious congregations can respond to this fundamental option for the

poor. The first level of response involves making choices which take into account the social interests of the poor and the oppressed. This may occur in situations which do not directly involve the poor themselves, but in which religious participate and can represent the interests of the poor. The second level is the experience of living close to the poor, being evangelized and affected by encounters with the poor. For some this experience will be intermittent; for others it will lead to a third level, that of a total commitment to living with and sharing the social position of the poor. For any genuine discernment to take place, Libanio asserts that minimally, members of a community must be predisposed to a generosity that knows no limits. What is helpful about his reflection on the personal and communal conversion implied in this option for the poor, which we so clearly embraced in our direction statement, is that it admits of a corporate choice. This may be embraced differently but not less emphatically in different ways by different segments of the group. As more members of a community acquire all three levels of experience, and communicate with one another, it is more likely the group will be able to embrace the conversion of life and ministries implied in the direction set by the first Institute chapter.

Much of the change already underway across the Institute has been a reclaiming, renewing, and reinterpretation of mercy charism.

Much of the change already underway across the Institute has been a reclaiming, renewing, and reinterpretation of mercy charism. We recognize that although the first generation of Sisters of Mercy were limited by their historical times, they were literally creating a new way of being religious—walking nuns, going about the streets and alleys of Dublin to where the poor were, beginning schools for those who had been deprived of all educational opportunity, creating new responses to concrete need. All apostolic women's communities are in a similar process of reappropriating both their unique histories and particular charisms. At the same time, religious life itself is evolving into some new form. When we look carefully at the founding myths and stories from the perspective of our own challenges, we often discover new things.

For instance, when the Burlingame Regional Community was struggling a decade ago with the decision about becoming a sanctuary community, voices from our annals from the Southwest during the Mexican-American War influenced our deliberations.

It seemed the sisters sheltered Mexican women and their children in the middle of a battle that surged around the convent compound. They also cared for both American and Mexican soldiers. This "wild," non-law-abiding slice of history helped sisters who could not imagine the risk of breaking an unjust law for the sake of a greater good consider this choice in the light of their retrieved history. This story was rarely recounted until it was rediscovered just prior to the pivotal meeting which dealt with the decision on sanctuary. For most of the community this story has been lost from our collective myth, but it offers clear precedent, enabling many to shift their positions in the present situation. Most likely each regional community has a similar, more fluid, less fixed history which might offer some sense of continuity in the change process. What changes would be more in continuity with a forgotten part of your own past?

Prophetic Interdependence

A second area related to charism and identity is the challenge of the prophetic character of religious life. In the present context, the LCWR Ministry Study links prophecy with the themes of interdependence and inclusiveness which emerge out of the post-modern context. The prophetic dimension of religious life functions in relationship both to the secular culture and to life in the church. The core reality of the vows, a choice for simplicity of life, inclusive love, and response to the spirit's impulse in interdependent community contrasts dramatically with materialism, consumerism, sexually exploitive relationships, and the dominating exercise of power. Although recent ecclesial documents expect religious to be prophetic in relationship to secular cultures, they attempt to tame the prophetic challenge religious make to the church itself. This challenge addresses ecclesial practices in relationship to finances, privileges, the exclusionary character of clerical relationships, and its own authoritarianism. The 1994 Synod Working Paper equates "charity" with subordination to hierarchy and denies that the prophetic role of consecrated persons can ever assume public opposition to the pope and bishops.⁸ This claim undercuts the perennial role religious have always played from earliest times, of criticizing, largely by their way of life, ways in which the church behaves contrary to the Gospel. This position toward the prophetic role of religious in the church is also historically inaccurate. Since the twelfth century, every new form of religious life has been resisted by the hierarchy, often for one hundred years or more before it was accepted and integrated into the church's understanding of religious life. In the present moment, we are profoundly ecclesial, attempting to live in fidelity to the Gospel and in fidelity to our experience of Jesus. We are also promoting an interpretation of the thrust and intention of Vatican II that is fiercely being resisted by much of the present hierarchy. The challenges

most deeply resisted by some of the hierarchy include the change in structure and discipline that would include women and laity as full partners in church membership, and the mission and option for the poor.

In a recent collection of essays, Cassian Yuhaus raises four questions which individuals or communities must be able to answer in the affirmative if they expect to embody the prophetic character of religious life. The first is: Have you heard the cry of the poor? This question implies careful social analysis, concrete choices made in the context of social realities in which the prophet hears the cry of the poor, the oppressed, and the marginalized and attempts to address the oppressing agencies and causes.

The second is: Can you read the signs of the times? This question implies on-going discernment—a finely honed capacity to distinguish between renewal and adaptation, the recognition that the events of life and history make concrete demands on our ministry and merciful response, and the recognition that the Gospel challenges many of our cultural assumptions while it is in harmony with other assumptions.

The following of Jesus is not an abstract fantasy, but an animating relationship with Jesus whose energy moves us toward mission, emboldens our speech, and fills us with the compassion we embody.

The third question is: Have you encountered Christ as liberator? This implies the contemplative dimension of prophecy. Has your understanding of Jesus expanded to experience Jesus as your liberator as a woman and the liberator of the poor and the oppressed? The following of Jesus is not an abstract fantasy, but an animating relationship with Jesus whose energy moves us toward mission, emboldens our speech, and fills us with the compassion we embody. It is interesting to note that Jesus is never named as liberator in the Working Paper for the Synod on Religious Life but only as Lord, Master, Teacher, and Bridegroom.

The final question Yuhaus poses is: Can you drink of the chalice? This fourth question implies that if we choose to live, judge, and act as Jesus did, some form of suffering will be consequent upon those choices. Jesus suffered and died for us not because he chose to do penance or to suffer, but because there were concrete social and political consequences which followed from his way of life. We can expect no less.⁹

Institute Identity

A third area related to identity is the change we are all involved in as a result of forming the new Institute. It began in a sense of shared charism. We had wonderful experiences of articulating mercy life and charism more clearly in the core constitution project than we were able to do in our regional communities. Yet most of us are only beginning to glimpse what belonging to the Institute is going to mean in action. Some of us are not used to receiving a direction statement or directives from beyond our regional communities. We have already made a choice for a new form of prophetic interdependence and have created a new relationship with one another that more fully actualizes it. The new world view tells us that literally, everything is connected to everything else. Isolationism or individualism is no longer a viable stance. Not only are we learning to become interdependent again in our regional communities, but we are now interdependent across regional boundaries.

Originally, this choice was taken in order to insure a future for mercy women in the Americas. But we are just at the beginning of having married into each others' families. We have poorer families and wealthier ones. We have twenty-five different community cultures, and we are suddenly feeling a multiculturalism among us we hadn't noticed, even as we notice not enough multiculturalism within individual regions. The founding event was thrilling, exuberant, hopeful and energizing. But all of our leadership teams and all of our regional chapters or assemblies are just now beginning to feel some of the effects of this change. At the grassroots level, many of us have not assimilated membership in the Institute as a primary aspect of our identity. We became Institute so we could do some things together we could not do alone. Now perhaps we wonder. Change toward Institute identity will engage us for the next several years. It will need to be actively fostered by maximum participation and identification. In Pittsburg last summer, our newer members startled many participants by introducing themselves as a member of the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas rather than as a member of their regional communities. How deeply do we identify ourselves, individually, as a member of the Institute?

Our ability to negotiate this particular form of interdependence is truly building for the future. The LCWR Ministry Study indicated that collaboration across religious communities of women is essential for the future of ministry. We need to continue to deal with the primary obstacles to collaboration: fears of loss of control and loss of identity. Overcoming these obstacles in relationship to Institute collaboration will yield returns far into the future.

Influence of Feminism

A fourth factor affecting both our identity and mission is the effect of feminism on religious life. The

Brookland Commission Study is the only one I know which directly examined the influence of feminism on religious life. The LCWR Ministry Study acknowledged a strong influence of feminism on member congregations but did not gather statistical information on this theme. Experientially, we sense that individual congregations differ significantly in the degree to which they have consciously espoused a feminist perspective. I propose that regardless of whether or not we consider ourselves to be feminists, we have all been more influenced by the effect of the women's movement in our own culture than most of us admit.

I find women religious are often deeply ambivalent about feminism and are reluctant to identify themselves as feminists.

In order to provide a context for this part of my reflections I want to recall Maria Riley's definition of feminism from *Transforming Feminism*. A feminist is "a woman or man, who believes in the essential equality between women and men and seeks to create social attitudes, policies, and structures that reveal and sustain that equality."¹⁰ Who among us does not really believe this? Yet many of us find it very hard to apply the "F" word to ourselves. It is no wonder since every recent magisterial document reacts with fear to the concept of feminism and characterizes it as dangerous, bad, unhealthy, or corrupting. In the Working Paper for the Synod it says: "...adherence to extreme present-day forms of the feminist movement has led to spiritual disorientation in the consecrated life in some countries."¹¹

I find women religious are often deeply ambivalent about feminism and are reluctant to identify themselves as feminists. Is it possible that what is labeled as spiritual disorientation is fundamentally an experience of Jesus as liberator and an experience of sisterhood with one another which is a deep source of hope and healing? In my recent work on issues of feminine and masculine spirituality, I continue to be amazed at how deeply wounded our feminine selves are as a result of growing up in a patriarchal culture and in a church which continues to devalue, denigrate, and render us invisible. In women's communities we have often done as much damage to our members' feminine selves as have men. As women, we all learned to pass on to other women what we received: the sometimes dubious skills of manipulation to avoid conflict; internalization and reinforcement of women's secondary place in church and society, and devaluation of one

another as women. Women religious did not significantly participate in the late nineteenth century phase of the women's movement and many of us were relatively late-comers to the contemporary women's movement, if at all. Yet despite this, most already espouse the essential equality of women. Some are increasingly more in touch with their own pain as women, and many are beginning to value themselves and their experience of other women.

The research gives us only a glimpse of where we are. The FORUS Study found that religious did not consider feminism to be a serious cultural threat to religious life. The Brookland Commission collected more nuanced data from a smaller sample.¹² Two thirds of the sample group were dissatisfied with the progress made on women's issues within American society while three-fourths were dissatisfied with progress on these issues in the church. Three-fourths felt their communities supported feminist attitudes and values and they found feminist attitudes and values, in accord with their own way of thinking. More than sixty percent supported the ordination of women and claimed to be articulate about women's issues in the church. However, thirty-six percent found it difficult to be a feminist and a practicing member of the church.

On the use of inclusive language and images for God there was considerable difference. While nearly three-fourths want inclusive language used in worship, only slightly more than half report feminine images of God as part of their prayer lives, while only one fourth are disturbed by masculine images of God, such as Lord or King in worship. These findings as a whole suggest that women religious are consciously aware of their oppression as women in the church. At the same time, there are real differences in the degree to which women religious are experiencing changes in their images of God and desire change in language in prayer.

These differences indicate that only one stage of feminist consciousness has occurred in many of us. We can name some experiences of gender discrimination but do not understand or appreciate how this discrimination is supported by language and symbol systems. The marked differences about preferred language for naming God increasingly create difficulties in our finding a common language for prayer. In addition, most women religious who embrace feminism do so through a feminist theological perspective. This is sometimes informed by feminist theologians but more often it is an intuitive sense of the incompatibility of the core of the gospel message and the experience of Jesus in our own lives that renders it impossible to believe that our oppression as women is in any way God's will. Maria Riley in her position paper in the Brookland Commission study further challenges women religious to be less church-focused and more societally focused in our feminist agenda, and to bring

a critical stance to secular feminist theory. We could contribute our rich social justice tradition to feminist thought as well as appropriate a theological perspective.

I remain concerned about the number of women religious who continue to be afraid of feminism and who continue to deny any conscious experience of sexism. The journey through a feminist awakening is not without its hazards or its pain. But our community life will continue to drain us rather than nourish us if we do not learn how to be supportive of one another precisely as women. We live in bonded community with one another and have a unique opportunity to heal the wounds of sexism and to nourish ourselves from the deep sources in Christian spiritual tradition which support the flourishing of women. We need to pay attention to the differences among us about feminism so that we do not further polarize ourselves in this part of the process of the liberation of ourselves as women. Despite the negative portrayal of Christian feminism in recent ecclesial documents, it is not an evil. Rather, it is a threat to the status quo which maintains the institutional subordination of women in the church. It is a harbinger of the community of co-equal disciples that the early Jesus community so clearly lived and which is our inheritance as disciples who share in the Good News Jesus announced and lived.

To promote women's issues is to promote ourselves, too, something with which we are less comfortable.

Our Institute Direction Statement implies a conscious feminist commitment in choosing solidarity with "women seeking fullness of life and equality in church and society." Social analysis continually makes a connection between poverty and gender. But it would seem highly unlikely we could embrace this direction from the Chapter without ourselves espousing some clear form of Christian feminism—namely, that "in Christ there is no Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female." (Gal. 3:28) Gender affects multiple aspects of our experience. We ourselves are women. To promote women's issues is to promote ourselves, too, something with which we are less comfortable. The fact that we may be experiencing problems with financial resources is directly related to gender discrimination in the matter of compensation and the exclusion of women from decision-making positions in the church. Embrace of any justice agenda, including justice for women, requires a liberation theology perspective, not only to link the various strands of oppression to one another, but to identify the theologi-

cal resources in Christian tradition which support resistance to such oppression.

This example of feminism illustrates several strands of reflection on religious life. Addressing the inequities resulting from gender discrimination requires consciousness, critical social analysis, collaboration with other groups, theological reflection, and internal change as we journey through the process of reflecting on our experience as women. Everything is connected to everything else. And multiple skills, including intellectual ones, are needed.

MultiCulturalism

Multiculturalism is no less a many-faceted challenge to who we are and who we are becoming. Why is it that our community's ethnic profile looks so unlike that of groups with whom we minister? A thorough-going multiculturalism requires very specific forms of education and experiences which enable one to learn "interpathy." Interpathy refers to a learned skill which enables us to suspend our own point of view and normal assumptions. We practice this in order to walk in another's shoes—to perceive life as another does, to recognize how different another's unconscious assumptions are about how to celebrate, how to show respect, how to relate, how to be family or community—all without judgment. As a group of educators, there is a two-pronged challenge here. Are we willing to learn from those who are culturally different from us? And how would this willingness concretely change our manner of ministry? And are we willing to welcome diverse ethnic groups into the family of mercy as genuine peers? Are we willing to change as a result? The Institute Direction Statement challenges us to be willing to embrace such multiculturalism both for the good of the institute and for the good of the regional community in both its apostolic work and its openness to expanding membership.

Among these multiple challenges confronting religious life today, which among them resonate with some desires in your hearts? Which capture your imagination? About which ones could you dream new dreams? In terms of our Direction Statement, which invite you to a deeper conversion of life-style and ministries? Which voices urge you to go deeper? Which challenges moved you to respond? Who have you met in the last few months who claims your compassion? Is there any consoling movement of joy, compassion, peace, or urgency which claims your attention? It is easy to become overwhelmed by both the complexity and the depth of the many challenges which confront us in religious life today, many of which I have neglected to highlight. However, it is imperative to hear these challenges against the life of the spirit, the challenge identified as a spirituality of reverence and contemplative openness. Ultimately, these are questions of discipleship. Are we willing to enter more deeply into the mystery of God and God's

limitless compassion for us? Are we willing to allow God to live in and through us? Are we willing to be transformed by the very discipleship we claim? I would like to conclude with this quotation from Henry Nouwen:

Discipleship in the Christian sense is the realization that without Christ compassion is indeed impossible, but that with, through, and in him it has no limits. Just as the moon depends for its light on the sun so all of our compassion is dependent on God's compassion in Jesus. In Christ, there are no boundaries to our compassion. In Christ, we can carry the burden of the whole world. But his burden is a light burden.

Once we can see and experience this great mystery, our concrete work of every day changes dramatically. Because then we can see that the work we are doing is not "as much as we can handle," but a manifestation...of the great compassion which God has shown to our world in... Jesus. When we care for a lonely man, teach an ignorant child, spend time with a sad woman, offer food to the hungry, and work for justice and peace in our own house, city, state, country or world, we are in fact giving visibility to God's boundless compassion. In Christ, there is no place for guilt feelings or complaints. In Christ we can "do a little thing" while doing much, we can show care without being crushed and we can face the pains of the world without becoming gloomy, depressed.... As long as we act as if the task to save the world (or religious life, for that matter) rested on our own shoulders, we have to ignore a lot of pain or we become depressed. But when we begin to realize that we can do nothing ourselves but everything in Christ, our solidarity with our neighbor can be a joyful solidarity, a solidarity through which the great compassion of God can bring new life into the hearts of people.¹³

Footnotes

1. George A. Maloney, trans., ed. *Pilgrimage of the Heart: A Treasury of Eastern Christian Spirituality* (San Francisco: Harper, 1983), 163.
2. *Rules and Constitutions of the Religious Called Sisters of Mercy*, Ch. 3.
3. RSCJ Chapter 1988 cited in Janet Ruffing and Theresa Moser "An Option for Women?" *The Way Supplement* 74 (Summer 1992): 94.
4. See for instance, Elizabeth Johnson, *Women, Earth, and Creator Spirit* (Mahwah: Paulist, 1993) for an explicitly feminist treatment of this theme.
5. Anne Munley, *Threads for the Loom: LCWR Planning and Ministry Studies* (Silver Spring, MD: Leadership Conference of Women Religious, 1992) and David Nygren and Miriam Ukeritis, "The Religious Life Futures Project: Executive Summary" *Review for Religious* 52 (January-February 1993): 6-55.
6. Henry Nouwen, *Here and Now: Living in the Spirit* (New York: Crossroad, 1994).
7. Libanio, J.B., *Spiritual Discernment and Politics: Guidelines for Religious Communities*, trans. Theodore Morrow (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1982), 12.
8. "Consecrated Life's Role in the Church and the World:" 1994 Synod/Working Paper, 24 *Origins* (June 30, 1994):#67 and #72.
9. Cassian Yuhaus, "Religious Life: A Prophetic, Dynamic Movement" in *Religious Life: The Challenge for Tomorrow*, ed. Cassian Yuhaus (Mahwah: Paulist, 1994), 182-183.
10. Maria Riley, *Transforming Feminism*. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1989.
11. Working Paper, #20.
12. Schuth, Katerina. "The Intellectual Life as a Value for Women Religious in the United States: Brookland Commission Paper with appendix including the survey on Women Religious and the Intellectual Life. October, 1992.
13. Henry J. Nouwen, "Compassion: The Core of Spiritual Leadership," *Occasional Papers*, Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research, Collegeville, Minnesota, (March 1977), 5.