

COMMUNIO: A THEOLOGICAL JOURNEY

• Nicholas J. Healy •

“Catholic patience is the opposite of militant triumphalism. It is a eucharistic love that is willing to wait for the other as long as is needed.”¹

Introduction

In his essay, “The Person: Subject and Community,” published in 1976, Karol Wojtyła suggests that the nature of the person in relation to community is perhaps the central question of our time; it is a question that lies at the heart of human praxis, politics, morality, and culture. He writes:

Philosophy comes into play here in its essential function: philosophy as an expression of basic understandings and ultimate justifications. The need for such understandings and justifications always accompanies humankind in its sojourn on earth, but this need becomes especially intense in certain moments of history, namely, in moments of great crisis and confrontation. The present age is such a moment. It is a time of great controversy about the human being, controversy about the very meaning of human existence.²

¹A version of this paper was presented at “Glaubhaft ist nur Liebe,” an international conference commemorating the centenary of the birth of Hans Urs von Balthasar, 6–8 October 2005 at the Lateran University in Rome.

²Karol Wojtyła, *Person and Community: Selected Essays*, trans. Theresa Sandok (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), 220.

The crisis that Wojtyła seemed to have in mind in 1976 was the dominance of Marxist ideology throughout much of Europe. It is then perhaps surprising to read his analysis of the cultural situation in 1995, six years after the breakup of the Eastern Bloc, and just four years after the collapse of the Soviet Union. If anything, the crisis regarding the meaning of human existence has become more pronounced. The dominant ideology is no longer Marxism, but a form of liberalism that “exalts the isolated individual in an absolute way, and gives no place to solidarity.”³ Simultaneous with this individualistic understanding of the person is a reductive view of nature; creation is taken as dead matter and, in the name of scientific and technological progress, is subject to every kind of manipulation. The deepest roots of the crisis are described as follows:

We have to go to the heart of the tragedy being experienced by modern man: the eclipse of the sense of God and of man, typical of a social and cultural climate dominated by secularism . . . when the sense of God is lost, there is also a tendency to lose the sense of man, of his dignity and his life. . . . He no longer considers life as a splendid gift of God, something “sacred” entrusted to his responsibility and thus also to his loving care and “veneration.”⁴

John Paul II’s discernment in 1976 and 1995 of our current cultural crisis provides the setting for a reflection on the mission of *Communio: International Catholic Review*. According to the late Holy Father, the only adequate response to secularism (whether this takes a Marxist or liberal form) lies in a recovery of communion as the authentic medium of human existence and in some sense as the meaning of all worldly reality—a communion that originates in the Triune God and that is gratuitously given to us in the mystery of Christ and his Church. Similarly, the founders of *Communio* dedicated the new journal to the retrieval of authentic catholicity, which they understood to be God’s gift of universal communion, received in the Church as its sacrament, but radiating beyond the Church to reach the heart of the world in all of its dimensions. The purpose of the journal, as the founders intended it, was to serve God’s gift of universal communion, not just by writing about it, but

³*Evangelium vitae*, 19

⁴*Ibid.*, 21.

by cultivating and being a network of theological friendship held together by this commitment to catholicity.

Needless to say, the vision of catholicity, of God's gift of universal communion, that I have just sketched goes to the heart of the mission and theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar. In what follows, I would like to discuss the history and mission of *Communio* from a theological perspective that both sheds light on, and is illumined in turn by, Balthasar's thought, even as it considers the work of other founders of the journal such as de Lubac and Ratzinger. Now, the story of the founding of the journal *Communio* in 1972 is well known. Rather than retell that story, I would like to highlight three events that preceded the founding, which, taken together, help bring into focus the distinctive mission of *Communio*. I will then say a few words about Balthasar's essay "*Communio: A Program*." Only in this light will it be possible to offer some suggestions regarding the future of *Communio*.

1. Signposts

a. Henri de Lubac's Catholicism: les aspects sociaux du dogme

The first event was the publication in 1938 of Henri de Lubac's *Catholicism: The Social Aspects of Dogma*.⁵ Balthasar describes the book as "a work of genius that marked the breakthrough to new Catholic thought."⁶ Joseph Ratzinger is even more explicit:

[I]n late autumn of 1949 a friend gave me de Lubac's book *Catholicism*. For me, the encounter with this book became an essential milestone on my theological journey. For in it de Lubac does not treat merely isolated questions. He makes visible to us in a new way the fundamental intuition of Christian Faith so that from this inner core all the particular elements appear in a new light. He shows how the idea of community and universality, rooted in the trinitarian concept of God, permeates and shapes all

⁵Henri de Lubac, *Catholicism: Les aspects sociaux du dogme* (Paris, 1938). English translation: *Catholicism: Christ and the Common Destiny of Man* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988).

⁶Hans Urs von Balthasar, *In the Fullness of Faith: On the Centrality of the Distinctively Catholic* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988), 9.

the individual elements of Faith's content. The idea of the Catholic, the all-embracing, the inner unity of I and Thou and We does not constitute one chapter of theology among others. It is the key that opens the door to the proper understanding of the whole.⁷

Both in form and content the book signaled a rediscovery of an authentically universal or catholic theology. In her innermost essence, the Church exists not for herself but for the salvation of the world. In her dogma, her sacraments, her interpretation of Scripture, and her hope for eternal life, the Church expresses, and participates in, God's gift of universal communion. Two themes in *Catholicism*, both developed at length in de Lubac's later writings, have a particular relevance for the mission of *Communio*. The first is de Lubac's understanding of the relationship between nature and grace. Already in *Catholicism*, de Lubac shows how a certain kind of theology that claimed to safeguard the gratuity of the supernatural unwittingly prepared the soil for contemporary secularism: "the supernatural, deprived of its organic links with nature, tended to be understood by some as a mere 'super-nature,' a 'double' of nature. Furthermore, after such a complete separation what misgivings could the supernatural cause to naturalism?"⁸

Against the hypothesis of a pure nature and of a double end for man, de Lubac retrieved the patristic and high medieval doctrine, according to which human, indeed rational, nature naturally desires an end—intimate union with God—that it cannot achieve by its own power. As Thomas Aquinas had already pointed out, a being that can possess the ultimate end in the ultimate way, even though it needs outside help to do so, is nobler than one that is self-sufficient, but whose sufficiency does not extend all the way to communion with the absolute. Man's dignity is to be himself *in another*. So much so, in fact, that *the* archetypical realization of humanity occurs, not in a merely human person, but in the person of the Son of God made man. In a remarkable anticipation of *Gaudium et spes*, de Lubac writes: "By revealing the Father and by being revealed by him, Christ completes the revelation of man to himself."⁹

⁷Joseph Ratzinger, "Foreword," in de Lubac, *Catholicism*, 11.

⁸De Lubac, *Catholicism*, 313 [*Catholicisme*, 242].

⁹*Ibid.*, 339 [*Catholicisme*, 264].

Now, de Lubac does not, as he is often accused of doing, collapse the order of grace into the order of nature. The last—the order of grace—discloses the inmost being of the first—creaturely nature—but the last is not an automatic unfolding of the first; rather, it comes down from above as an unmerited, incalculable surprise that only as such satisfies the striving of nature. Only on this basis can we understand the second of our two themes: the Eucharist as the sacrament of unity.

In an essay published in the first issue of *Communio*, de Lubac establishes that the original meaning of the term *communio sanctorum* is “communion in holy things,” particularly communion in the Eucharist. The divine and human gift of the Eucharist is the source and the form of the communion that is the Church and the proleptic communion between the Church and the world. The Eucharist is the concrete “place” where the Church and the Christian receive catholicity as a gift and a task. The Eucharist is a “school” of catholicity, which teaches us to look for the whole of God in the whole of the creation, and the whole of the creation in the whole of God, without separation or confusion.

As we will see, de Lubac’s vision remains the background against which the other signposts along the journey to the founding of *Communio* make sense. The key, once again, is catholicity: God’s gift of universal communion embracing all people and illuminating all features of reality from the height of specifically Christian revelation.

b. *The Community of Saint John*

The second signpost was the founding in 1945 by Adrienne von Speyr and Hans Urs von Balthasar of a secular institute or world community. As is well known, Balthasar considered the *Johannesgemeinschaft* the true center of his life and mission. He describes the basic idea of the new community as follows: “to follow the counsels of Jesus in the midst of the world, without abandoning one’s post.”¹⁰ “As a structure [the world communities] are beyond doubt the unifying midpoint of the Church; they constitute the link between the lay state and the life of the vows and show not only the

¹⁰Hans Urs von Balthasar, *My Work: In Retrospect* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 43.

existential unity of the Church but also her perennial and most ‘up-to-date’ mission in the world.”¹¹ The idea of a secular institute represents an existential living out of the catholicity of the Church as understood by de Lubac. At the same time, Adrienne von Speyr has given us a new understanding of the Church’s presence in the world—indeed, a new understanding of the world’s locus within the love between Father, Son, and Spirit. Not only is the Christian sent to the world from outside, but he or she is called to bear witness to Christ’s love from within the heart of the world itself and thus to recover the original meaning of the world as a gift from God *and for God*. As expressed in the statutes of the Community of Saint John, “the laity, in their secular professions, do not separate obedience to God’s call in the Church from their calling in the world, so that, by a discernment of Spirits (1 John 4:1), they can bring the secularized mentality, in a healing way, back to the true Logos.”¹²

At this point it is helpful to recall that the founders of the journal *Communio* did not intend to start simply another journal of conventional academic theology. “[I]t was our conviction,” writes Joseph Ratzinger, “that this publication was not to be exclusively theological. Since the crisis in theology had emerged out of a crisis in culture and, indeed, out of a cultural revolution, the journal had to address the cultural domain, too, and had to be edited in collaboration with lay persons of high cultural competence.”¹³ To say that *Communio*’s mission has a cultural dimension does not mean, however, that the journal dabbles in art or “current events,” occasionally publishing “lighter” pieces on film or on the Internet. “Cultural” is not an alternative to “theological” in this context, but is an index of the catholicity that the founders of *Communio* thought was intrinsic to the theological task as such. This does not mean, of course, that the journal rashly rushes to pontificate on problems in areas of secular life that can be addressed more competently by others. What it does mean, however, is that the journal refuses to separate theology and culture, theology and holiness, and thus addresses itself, not only to the academic theologian, but also to the intelligent lay specialist, offering him help to deal with the specific

¹¹Ibid., 58.

¹²*General Constitutions of the Community of Saint John*, 8.

¹³Joseph Ratzinger, *Milestones: Memoirs 1927–1977* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1998), 144.

problems of his discipline from a radical Christian perspective. The point is to help the laity discover how and where the mystery of trinitarian love is present within the specific horizon of concern for which they are most immediately responsible; or, to borrow an image from Balthasar, to help the layman discover the watermark of Christ in every aspect of creation. Without indiscreetly imposing the form of life of the secular institute on the reader who may have an entirely different vocation, the journal *Communio* is nonetheless called to show that the secular institute's theological content is relevant to all lay Christians living in the world.

c. The Second Vatican Council

The next signpost in our theological journey is the Second Vatican Council. In his important essay, "The Council of the Holy Spirit," Balthasar summarizes the council's renewed image of universality or catholicity in three interrelated areas: (i) it is the will of the Creator that all should be saved; (ii) as the sacrament of Christ, the Church is the effective instrument to carry out God's will; and (iii) the Church is called to imprint the love of Christ on all worldly order. All three themes converge on a renewed understanding of the Church's mission: "the being of the Church is (as mission) inseparably her activity, and the love of God proclaimed and lived by her is the principle of the unification of humanity in the spirit of brotherhood."¹⁴

The council, then, represents the confirmation of the first two points—de Lubac's theology of catholic communion and

¹⁴Hans Urs von Balthasar, "The Council of the Holy Spirit," in *Explorations in Theology*, vol. 3: *Creator Spirit* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 246. In his own way, Joseph Ratzinger summarized the teaching of the council under the heading of a eucharistic or *communio* ecclesiology: "Henri de Lubac made it clear in a splendid work of comprehensive scholarship that the term 'mystical body' originally meant the Holy Eucharist and that for Paul as for the fathers of the Church the idea of the Church as the body of Christ was indissolubly linked with the idea of the Eucharist in which the Lord is bodily present and gives us his body as food. Thus there now arose a eucharistic ecclesiology which people liked to term an ecclesiology of communion. This ecclesiology of communion became the real core of Vatican II's teaching on the Church, the novel and at the same time the original element in what the Council wanted to give us" (*Church, Ecumenism and Politics: New Essays in Ecclesiology* [New York: Crossroad, 1988], 7).

Balthasar's theology of the secular institute. For this reason, there is a special relation between the journal and the council's work. But, in order to clarify the nature of this relationship, we need to counter a widespread belief that *Communio* was founded to offset the influence of the journal *Concilium* after the council. This "legend" is misleading, insofar as it gives the impression that the original impulse behind the founding of the journal was reactive, if not reactionary. It suggests, wrongly, that *Communio* was a conservative counter-strategy, whose meaning is entirely exhausted by the horizon of the ecclesial politics of the immediate post-Vatican II era.

It is true, of course, that Balthasar, de Lubac, and other founding members of *Communio* sounded the alarm regarding certain trends in theology that emerged in the years immediately following the council. If before the council de Lubac had opposed a certain kind of theology that claimed to be traditional but that in fact had lost its living contact with patristic and medieval sources, in the years after the council he saw the danger of a superficial rejection of the tradition in the name of progress. In particular he noted a

false idea of "openness to the world," shamelessly preached as if it were the thought of the Council, which takes away from the mass of the faithful that which was always the strength of Christians no matter how immersed they were in the world: i.e., the awareness of their obligation to be the world's vivifying soul.¹⁵

What is the significance of such statements? The best answer, it seems to me, is that, anticipating in many respects certain trends in recent theology, the founders of *Communio* were concerned to preserve the authentic message of the council from a capitulation to that feature of modernity that Alisdair MacIntyre and David Schindler identify as "liberalism," a capitulation that would rob the gift of universal communion carried in the Church of its distinctiveness and, therefore, of its power to be a light to the world. At the time, this capitulation went under the name of "progressivism," but it should be noted that it can also appear in a "conservative" version, when, for instance, prominent American Catholics argue that American-style liberalism is essentially compatible with Catholic

¹⁵Henri de Lubac, *Mémoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits* (Namur: Culture et Verité, 1989), 153.

anthropology. But that is just the point. *Communio* did not arise primarily as a conservative reaction to progressivism, and even where it was intended as a reaction—against capitulation to secular reason—this reaction was sustained by an entirely positive aim: the preservation of the council’s recovery of the Church as the sacramental vessel of the gift of universal communion.

2. “Communio: A Program”

It is fitting to recall that the decision to begin *Communio* was made in Rome. According to Balthasar, it was in a café on the via Aurelia in 1969 that several members of the newly formed International Theological Commission decided to start a new review. The original plan called for a French and a German edition. The French edition was delayed, but in the meantime, Balthasar had a providential encounter with members of *Communio and Liberation*. Thus in 1972, a German and an Italian edition of *Communio* were launched. I would now like to address briefly Balthasar’s essay “*Communio: A Program*,” which outlined the guiding principles of the new journal.

Balthasar begins with a question: “What standpoint is our new review to adopt to scan the turmoil and confusion of battling ideologies and the clash of philosophies of life at the present day? What vantage point is there from which to flash its guiding signals?”¹⁶ An adequate answer has to be both universal (catholic) and unique; more precisely it has to be universal because of its uniqueness. The answer, Balthasar suggests, is hidden in the word “communio—communion.” The distinguishing feature of communion is that it is both a gift gratuitously bestowed and a task for the future. Regarding the former, Balthasar writes:

Those who are in “communion,” therefore, do not enter into such a social relationship solely on their own initiative, each of his own private accord, determining its scope by the stipulations they make when they establish it. They are already in it from the start, already mutually dependent a priori. . . . Community can

¹⁶Hans Urs von Balthasar, “Communio—Ein Programm,” *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift: Communio* 1 (1972): 5. English translation, “*Communio: A Program*,” *Communio: International Review* 33 (Spring 2006): 153–169.

only be striven for because it has already been bestowed by God in Christ and in the infusion of the Holy Spirit.¹⁷

Only when we realize that communion is a grace that has already been bestowed in Christ can the true drama and inexorable demands of living this communion begin. What is required above all is an openness of heart. Here I quote at length from the conclusion of Balthasar's essay:

In the body of the Crucified, God "killed enmity" (Eph 2:16), so that, strictly speaking, from a Christian point of view there is no love of enemies anymore: the supposed enemy does not know that (in what is in truth the only valid sphere) he is no longer an enemy. Now, of course, a Buddhist or a Stoic can subscribe to this proposition taken literally. The difference is in the attitude of heart. Buddhists and Stoics train themselves to enter a sphere without suffering and hate; the impact of contradictions does not affect them, for they communicate with the enemy in a supra-personal absolute. The Christian, however, must open his heart and allow himself to be most intimately affected, challenged, hurt. God in Christ went to the place of the loneliest sinner in order to communicate with him in dereliction by God. Christian community is established in the Eucharist, which presupposes the descent into hell (mine and yours). No flight into an abstract unity is permitted there. It demands the courage to penetrate into another's best defended fortress and, in the knowledge that it is, fundamentally, already conquered and surrendered, to contact its very center. That may provoke the other to the most savage resistance, and this must be endured. But it can only be done by completely humble faith in what God's love has already done, and without any kind of triumphalism, even of love. There will not even be any time left for anything of that sort, for I must of course side with the other in his imperviousness if I am to prove to him that there is community even in the loneliest, and somewhere to turn even for the most alienated. Communion is established on Good Friday, *after* the cry of dereliction, and *before* the tomb is burst open; in the wordless silence, beyond speech, of being together in the alone.¹⁸

Clearly, then, Balthasar did not conceive of *Communio* the review as just another conventional academic journal. Rather,

¹⁷Ibid., 7, 12.

¹⁸Ibid., 21–22.

Communio the review was meant to be an instrument of *communio* the theological reality. It was meant to be a witness to the catholicity of the Church as recovered by de Lubac, confirmed by the Second Vatican Council, and incarnated in new forms of life in the Church and the world. *Communio* would help readers rediscover holiness in the following of Christ as the form of intelligence, not only in theology, understood as an academic discipline, but in all spheres of life.

3. The future of Communio

Balthasar always insisted that *Communio* is not “a uniform review, mechanically translated into several languages, but . . . a living association of reviews that choose and discuss their themes in the same spirit of catholicity; according to need, they exchange articles and so realize, across nations, cultures and continents, what I have tried to do at a more restricted level.”¹⁹ And, in effect, the review has, in its more than thirty-year history, grown to sixteen editions that, while bound by a common spirit, are also marked profoundly by the theological dialogue with the culture of their own countries and linguistic domains. There is no other journal I am aware of that has permitted such a diverse theological exchange between countries and continents. *Communio* is distinctly international. Particular thanks are due in this regard to Bishop Peter Henrici, who assumed responsibility for international collaboration following the death of Hans Urs von Balthasar.

At the same time, the question “whither *Communio*?” cannot be avoided, partly because the theological landscape is changing and partly because of internal difficulties such as individual editions’ particular situations. As for the change in the theological landscape, thanks to which the most innovative theologians see “progressivism” as a spent ideology with no future, it does make certain post-conciliar debates irrelevant, but it does not make the authentic message of the council, as articulated by thinkers like de Lubac, Ratzinger, and Balthasar irrelevant. The challenge will be for the international editors of *Communio* to engage in a serious, common discussion of the new situation in the Church and the world, post-Vatican II and post-John Paul II, and to use that discussion as an

¹⁹Balthasar, *My Work: In Retrospect*, 109.

opportunity to see the legacy of the council in a new light and in a deeper way.

Needless to say, it is not my place to anticipate the details of this discussion in the present forum. Most of what needs to be said is best left to the common deliberation of the international editors, who, like those entrusted with any charge, must test their fidelity to the task they have been given in a new situation. Let me, then, speak of the future of *Communio* in a more general sense, at the level of theological principle.

First, a few more words about today's theological landscape. As I noted just now, "progressivism," while still in control of many ecclesiastical institutions, is finished ideologically. If "progressivism" was a capitulation to modernity in the sense that modern self-consciousness was taken as the bar at which Christianity had to prove itself, some of the most interesting and innovative theologians today are outspoken critics of what English theologian John Milbank calls "secular reason." This "post-secular" theology intersects at certain points with a rediscovery of tradition among younger Catholic theologians, which is a particularly strong trend in the United States. Both of these developments are, in themselves, positive. A healthy skepticism about the claims of modernity combined with a return to the great tradition is as such a promising formula for good theology. That having been said, there are dangers on both sides: the temptation of post-secular theology is ecclesial rootlessness—as one colleague of mine put it, it is often a theology "in search of a Church"; the temptation of the new interest in tradition is a kind of traditionalism with strong clericalist traits. What is needed is an ecclesial rootedness that, at the same time, is saturated with an awareness of the Church's catholic mission, to embrace both all people and all things—not, however, in the spirit of progressivist accommodation, but in the spirit of a love that overcomes error and sin through what we might call a "catholic patience" of the sort sketched in the long passage from "Communio: A Program" cited above.

With that, I come to the theological principles I believe should guide the discussion of the future of *Communio*. I would like, then, to say something about *communio*, with a small "c," as the future of *Communio* with a large "C." Or, in a different and perhaps better formulation: I would like to speak of eschatology as the *raison d'être* of *Communio*. This may seem rather grandiose, but, as "Communio: A Program" indicates, it corresponds to Balthasar's understanding of the journal's purpose. Although

Balthasar refuses to follow Origen in holding that everyone will be saved as a matter of course, he also refuses to follow Augustine in limiting God's saving will to anything less than the whole of humanity. God earnestly wills that all men be saved, and he does everything he can to make sure that they are, even as it remains possible for men to damn themselves. Balthasar's eschatology is universal, not in a spirit of certainty that, no matter what, everyone is going to heaven anyway, but in an awareness of the dramatic character of the question of salvation, which consists in the mysterious, incalculable clash of divine and human freedoms. So much is well known. What is less known, or at least less remarked upon, is that, for Balthasar, the universality of eschatology concerns not just humanity, but, in some sense, the cosmos, too. What does this mean and why is it important for understanding the mission of *Communio*?

Modern theology tends to be deferential to a fault towards the natural sciences. Whereas a Thomas Aquinas could consider reflection on nature to be part of the theological enterprise, modern theologians tend to leave such reflection to the scientists, in the conviction that they alone really understand the secret of nature. Theologians tend to content themselves with the observation that theology can shed light on the "why" of nature, but that it cannot say anything about the "how" of nature. The problem with this is that, according to the main self-understanding of the modern natural sciences, the "why" is precisely irrelevant to the explanation of how nature works on its own terms—think, for example, of evolutionary biology, which tries to explain life solely in reference to what it takes to be a-teleological mechanisms. The implication of this is that theologians acquiesce in their own irrelevance when it comes to the inner intelligibility of the natural world on its own terms. The cosmic dimension of Balthasar's eschatology challenges this acquiescence, inasmuch as it implies that eschatology is the concrete "realization" of the analogy of being itself, not only for man, but for all things other than man as well. The failure to perceive that being unveils its final countenance as love in the death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ is doubly regrettable. The result is an eschatology that has little pertinence to the intrinsic meaning of worldly reality, and a sense of worldly reality that is devoid of real mystery—a world that thereby becomes irrelevant to our final union with God.

Needless to say, this affirmation raises a whole set of thorny issues, which I cannot enter into here. I would simply like to underscore that the universality of Balthasar's eschatology is quite literally "cosmic" in its scope, and that this cosmic range challenges the "irrelevance" of theology to the understanding of the cosmos. Let me clarify that I am not just recommending more dialogue between "science" and "religion," much less rehashing proposals for a facile concordism between a theology that explains "why" and a science that explains "how." No, the point is rather that theology intrinsically affects how the intelligence comes to grips with the world around us, even in supposedly "purely secular" subjects. The cosmic universality of eschatology, then, is not just a hope for the future, but also a mandate to reclaim the *logos* of the world for God. Not, of course, violently from the outside, but gently from the inside—in just the attitude of that Catholic patience which Balthasar describes in the long passage from "*Communio: A Program*" that I cited above.

Balthasar's words about Christ's solidarity with lost sinners, then, are not just beautiful words about the beyond, but are also an invitation to us, and also to the journal *Communio*, to be, with our whole being, including our intelligence, a light for the world *from inside the world itself*. This connects with an observation I made earlier regarding Balthasar's theology of the secular institute: *Communio* is meant to be "cultural" in a sense that is far from conventional. *Communio* is meant not just to have occasional articles about art, but, rather, to help the laity reclaim the *logos* of their professions for God—from within, in the Catholic patience mentioned just now. Let me stress that this Catholic patience is the opposite of militant triumphalism. It is a eucharistic love that is willing to wait for the other as long as is needed. "You must not save your soul as you save a treasure," writes Charles Péguy, "you must save it as you lose a treasure, by squandering it. We must save ourselves together. We must arrive together before the good Lord. What would he say if we arrived before him alone, if we came home to him without the others?"²⁰ □

NICHOLAS J. HEALY III is director of the Ave Maria Austria Program in Gaming, Austria.

²⁰Charles Péguy, *Le Mystère de la Charité de Jeanne d'Arc*, in *Œuvres poétiques complètes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 392.