

The Church As *Communio*

+ Walter Kasper

A sharp-witted analyst of the church's contemporary situation once said: No previous council spoke so extensively and so profoundly about the Church as the Second Vatican Council. After no other council was there such great confusion over the question of what the church is and which form it should take. Church is, as Luther said, a blind, vague word. Indeed it is not easy to say what we mean when we speak of Church.

For one thousand five hundred years the church has lived out its existence and often enough suffered to sustain it in adversity. But not until the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries did the church begin *expressis verbis* to reflect on its nature. This reflection originally took place against a background of conflicts: conflicts between the papacy and the up-and-coming nation states, conflicts centred around John Wyclif and Jan Hus and above all against the background of debate and argument in the Reformation era. Yet, although the quarrels of the Reformation were not only concerned with individual ecclesiological questions, but much more with the general understanding of what Church is, the sixteenth century did not get as far as reflecting on what the Church's teaching on the term 'church' should be. Not until the nineteenth century, in the wake of Romanticism, did the understanding of the church as such become the subject of consideration. It was Friedrich Schleiermacher who determined the direction of the Protestant Church. On the Catholic side the thoughts of Johann Adam Möhler, the theologian from Tübingen, led the way. But it was not until the new Biblical, liturgical and theological approaches of the first half of this century that these ideas came to fruition. A century of the church was declared. As Romano Guardini put it: "The church is awakening in men's souls."

In the Catholic world, the first fruit of these movements towards ecclesial and theological renewal was the Second Vatican Council. Here, for the first time, a general council asked itself the question: Church, what are you? Church, what do you have to say for yourself?

Communio—A Popular Term

One of the central ideas of the Second Vatican Council, perhaps even the leading idea is: *communio*. In the post-conciliar reforms, the

impulses of *communio*-ecclesiology have been readily taken up. But only in recent years have dogmatics and canon law succeeded in raising awareness of “*communio*” as a central structural concept in the Council’s documents regarding the essential form and nature of the Church. Since the Extraordinary Bishop’ Synod, which met in Rome in 1985, *communio* has become a much discussed ecclesiological concept.

However, the concept of *communio* not only plays a central role in Catholic ecclesiology, it is also increasingly becoming a focus of attention in other Christian churches, especially in the Orthodox churches and in the Anglican community. It is therefore not surprising that “*communio*” is growing in relevance in the ecumenical debate and in two different ways at that. Firstly, the idea of *communio* is a point of mutual concern which is suitable for a joint quest for an understanding of the nature of the church. Secondly, *communio* seems to offer a suitable model for the unity sought among the divided churches. For *communio* means a community made up of various different communities and thus stands particularly close to the ecumenical model of reconciled diversity.

It was more or less in this spirit that in 1964 Patriarch Athenagoras, when asked by a French journalist if he believed that there would soon be a reunification of the orthodox and Roman Catholic churches, answered : “We were never united.” By way of explanation he added: “We have lived alongside one another in community and we will live together in community once again.” Three years before, the World Council of Churches had taken up the concept of *communio* in order to give a more precise explanation of the “unity formula” of the general assembly which took place in New Delhi in 1961. In the seventh general assembly of the World Council of Churches which was held in Canberra in 1991, a continuation of this approach was confirmed by widespread consent. In bilateral talks the concept of *communio* is also of central significance. Above all in the reports of the-Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commissions (ARCIC), from the Final Report of the First Commission (1982) to the report “Church as Communion” (1990), *koinonia/communio* is the central idea throughout. For many, *communio* has become something of an ecumenical “magic formula”. Through the understanding of church as *communio*, ecclesiological problems within the ecumenical dialogue which had previously appeared insoluble, suddenly seem to become soluble.

Yet no matter how pleasing and welcome it is that this concept, derived from the New Testament and the early days of Christianity, has become the focus of interest again, and no matter how helpful the concept of *communio* may be for the ecumenical debate, it is necessary

to pay heed to just what is actually meant when “Communio” is mentioned in a given context. In a statement published in 1990 the “Centre d’Études œcuméniques” in Strasbourg enquired after the Biblical and Early Christian meaning of *koinonia/communio* and the way the term is currently being used in the various churches. There proved to be, above all, “Differences in the understanding of ‘communio’ especially when there is a question of determining the constitutive elements of community or church community and how these elements are to be related to one another” (III/3).

In May of last year the Roman Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith felt it was necessary to send a letter to the bishops of the Catholic church “Regarding certain aspects of the church as *communio*”. The purpose of this letter is to clarify the Catholic understanding of “*communio*”. Above all the document rejects interpretations of *communio* which, in the opinion of the congregation, reduce church unity to an outward amalgamation of autonomous churches. However the letter caused annoyance in non-Catholic churches. On occasion it has even been evaluated as a set-back for the ecumenical movement.

The more recent discussions about the correct interpretation of *communio* should prompt deeper thought on the nature of the church as *communio*. The following considerations are an attempt to clarify, as a follow-up to Vatican II, what church as *communio* means from a Catholic perspective. The ecumenical aspect is thereby not omitted, but should remain confined to remarks concerning the talks between the Roman Catholic church and the Anglican communion.

Communio as the Mystery of the Church— Communion with God

The concept of *communio* integrates various different levels of meaning. Primarily it has nothing to do with structural questions. The questions which have so greatly determined Catholic ecclesiology during the last three centuries, namely regarding the institutional form of the church, the organisation of positions of office, duties etc. are secondary for the concept of *communio*. *Communio* refers primarily to the essence “thing”—(res) in which the church has its roots and for which it lives. It refers to the essence of the Church, its mystery and the transcendental reality of salvation which is revealed for all to see and becomes a reality through it.

“*Lumen Gentium*”, the Constitution on the Church, describes the mystery of the church from three standpoints as the mystery of *communio*:

1. **Communio means participation in the divine life to which we are called by the eternal father. This participation is nothing other than the personal communion of humanity with God; it is in this relationship that the dignity and truth of humanity are rooted.**
2. **The communio which is the aim of the entire history of salvation is uniquely personified in history through Jesus Christ. He is true God and true man in one person. Jesus Christ is thus the epitome of all communio between God and man.**
3. **What happened once and for all in Jesus Christ is continued and spread throughout the world through the Holy Spirit, who lives within the Church and the hearts of the faithful. Through the Holy Spirit, the Church is therefore united in communio with God and the fellowship of all the different parts of the church with each other.**

By way of a summary we may say: the mystery of the church consists in the access we have to the Father in the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ, so that we may share in God's divine nature. This communio of the church is made possible and sustained through the trinitarian communio of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Finally, the church as communio, as Vatican II said following up what the martyr bishop Cyprian said, is participation in the trinitarian communio itself. The church is in the same way the icon of the community of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

The idea of communio therefore puts ecclesiological questions in perspective. Questions regarding the Church are closely connected with, but obviously subordinate to questions regarding the existence and nature of God. It is clear that the church is not the most important thing. The aim of faith is God alone and communion with him. The church itself is not God and may under no circumstances be deified. Where this viewpoint gains ground, the question of the Church's structure ceases to seem an end in itself, as was the case both before and after the council in the eyes of many.

This understanding of communio is also reflected in the findings of the Anglican-Roman Catholic commissions. For example, it is stated in the Final Report of 1982: "Union with God in Christ Jesus through the Spirit is "the heart of Christian Koinonia" (No. 5). Here the main concern is also not structure but sharing in the one and the same divine reality which is the basis for fellowship among men. "Koinonia with one another is entailed by our koinonia with God in Christ. This is the mystery of the Church."

In ecumenical dialogue it is also important to emphasize the vertical dimension of church *communio*. For it is only in this way that we learn to understand true fellowship as a gift which we have received from God through reconciliation in Jesus Christ. It is clear that the ecumenical movement must strive towards deeper fellowship with God and then make this fellowship a reality in the Church community.

Communio as Sharing in the Life of God through the Sacraments

From the Catholic perspective, a second level of understanding of the word *communio* can be distinguished from the first. Here, it is still not a question of the community of Christians or local churches among themselves. For originally *communio* did not mean community but "participation. The word *communio* more closely denotes sharing in the wealth of salvation given by God: sharing in the Holy Spirit, in a new life, in love, in the Gospel and, above all else, sharing in the Sacraments, especially in the Eucharist.

It is this fundamental definition of *communio* which gives rise to the original meaning of the article of faith of the *communio sanctorum* (communion of the saints). However *communio sanctorum* can be interpreted in two ways and the original meaning was doubtless "communion in holy things" (*sancta = sacramenta*), which then accounts for the communion of the saints (*sancti*). It is no surprise that "communion" is the most common expression used to denote "receiving the Eucharist".

The foundations for this meaning of *communio* are to be found in the apostle Paul. According to 1 Corinthians 12, 13, we become part of the body of Christ through baptism. Baptism is therefore the gateway to and the foundation of Christian *communio*. Thus baptism is a bond between Christians of different confessions which is stronger than everything which separates them. The contradiction of one baptism yet a divided Christian community calls us to overcome the divisions and testify to the fellowship we share which has its roots in baptism.

Accordingly, contemplation of our joint sharing in salvation through baptism is usually the starting-point in ecumenical debate between the divided churches. A further reason for beginning here is that the understanding of baptism is more or less unproblematic. The salvatory significance of baptism and its meaning for the constitution of the church is testified to so clearly and explicitly in the Holy Scriptures that there is no controversy about it among the churches.

However, in Catholic terms, baptism is only the beginning, the starting-point of Christian life. The *communio* which is founded in

baptism finds its highest and most profound expression in the joint celebration of the Eucharist. In 1 Corinthians 10,16 Paul says: "When we break the bread, is it not a means of sharing in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, though many, are one body; for it is one loaf of which we all partake." It is for this reason that Saint Augustine described the Eucharist as a "symbol of unity and bond of love". The Second Vatican Council took up these words of Augustine in the Liturgical Constitution "Sacrosanctum Concilium". In the constitution on the Church it is expressly stated: "In breaking the bread of the Eucharist we share the life of the Lord and are raised up to communion with him and with one another" (LG7).

The Eucharist is therefore the high-point of Christian communion. It is thus gratifying that, in recent years, remarkable progress has been made towards a consensus in the understanding of the Eucharist in Catholic-Anglican dialogue. This is without doubt an important step towards a full community of the Church.

Communio as the Sign of the Participation and Responsibility of All Those who have been Baptised

So far we have spoken of communion as fellowship with God and sharing in his life through Word and Sacrament. This is, as it were, the "vertical" dimension of "communio". The communion of man with God now lays the foundation for the fellowship of mankind with one another, thus for the tangible community of the Church. Thus we come to the "horizontal" dimension of the concept of communion. This horizontal dimension also has various layers of meaning. On a "higher" level it means the unity of the church within the diversity of local churches. On a "lower" level it means the unity of the faithful in the *communio fidelium*. Firstly, a few brief remarks on the *communio fidelium*.

In the first letter of Peter we read: "But you (that is the entire church and all its members) are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a dedicated nation, a people chosen by God for his own, to proclaim the glorious deeds of him who has called you out of darkness into his marvellous light" (2,9). All Christians are therefore Church, not only the Pope, bishops and priests. All those baptized share in the universal priesthood. Accordingly, we all have a share of responsibility in the Church and for the Church.

Closely related to the teaching on the universal priesthood of all those who have been baptized is the teaching of the *sensus fidei* or *sensus fidelium*. This means that, through the Holy Spirit, all believers have an inner feeling for the essentials of faith and its correct interpretation. Thus bishops and priests should listen to what the laity

has to say when making their judgements on questions of doctrine.

The conception of the Church as *communio fidelium* overcomes the idea of the Church as a *societas inaequalis*, a fellowship of so called unequals, which prevailed for centuries. Baptism and confirmation assure a fundamental equality for all. This does not entail denying the essential difference between priests and the laity. The aspect of equality and brotherhood which comes to fruition through the *communio ecclesiology* is not contradictory to an inner structure within the fellowship of the Church. According to the Apostle Paul there are many different-charisms, positions of office and ways of serving in the Church: one can serve by teaching, by helping others, by being in charge of a community. The Church as *communio* is a differentiated whole, a body or organism in which the diverse organs work together for the good of the whole. Everyone bears responsibility for the church in his own way and in his own place in the spiritual body.

The rediscovery of the importance of the *sensus fidelium*, which resulted from Vatican II, led to a considerable "reevaluation" of the importance of the laity within the Catholic Church. As a result of this it becomes clear that the laity have an active rôle to play in the salvatory mission of the Church. The laity is no longer merely the object of the Church's salvatory mission, but simultaneously subject. The laity's growing awareness of its participatory role and its willingness to share in responsibility are perhaps the most valuable and most important results of the post-conciliar era.

Nevertheless, the idea of the *communio fidelium* has often been misunderstood. This has often been because of a false understanding of what is meant by the democratisation of the Church. Certainly, the idea of Church democratisation, even when it is misunderstood, can be used to express something which is itself legitimate, namely a kind of democratic approach which includes among its points of reference the transparency of opinion-forming and decision-making and the joint participation of all involved. A positive atmosphere where open discussion and argument are possible can also be meant. However, if the democratisation of the Church is synonymous with the demand that the various charisms, positions of office and modes of service become undifferentiated and uniform, then the theological greatness of the "People of God" has been confused with a more political greatness. In referring to the "People of God", Vatican II does not talk of the laity or those at grass roots level as something different from or even in opposition to the "official Church". The "People of God" means, rather, the organic and structured whole of the Church, the people gathered around the bishop whom they view as their shepherd, as Cyprian of

Carthage said. This meaning is best summarized by Johann Adam Möhler: "Not everybody can be everything, only all can be all and the unity of all is a whole. That is the idea of the Catholic Church."

Church as the Unity in Communion of the Local Churches

The communion of the faithful with one another, which is based in the communion with God, is primarily realized in each individual local church. But because each individual local church is the church of Jesus Christ, and because Jesus Christ is only one (unique) the individual local churches must be related to one another in communion. To make this clearer: they are all a part of the comprehensive communion of the Church. In this sense, the unity of the Church is in the form of the communion-unity of the local churches. The universal Church consists "in and of" local churches. With this meaning of communion to express the unity of the local churches, we are touching on a structural question which is presently being discussed at length.

The understanding of the Church as a communion of local churches is still relatively alien to many Catholics. Nowadays, when a Catholic Christian speaks of "Church", his first, spontaneous thought is of the world-wide Catholic Church, with its centre in Rome, and with the Pope at its head. But during the first millennium after Christ, the word "Church" meant first and foremost the people gathered together around the bishop, thus the local church. The identification of "Church" with the church in its entirety is the result of an often one-sided ecclesiology of unity which has developed during the last thousand years. In the first millennium, the Church as a whole was understood as the community of local churches.

The question of how communion is to be more closely understood as the unity in communion of the local churches and the consequences arising from this has, in recent years, opened up an internal church debate, which also throws up ecumenical questions regarding the relationship between the local and the world-wide church. Closely associated with this is the question of the relationship of each individual bishop to the college of bishops, especially to the bishop of Rome.

Two extreme positions form the outward markers of the field of discussion. One extreme lies in the view that the Church as a whole is the "product" of the local church communities and is therefore, as it were, only the sum of the local churches and the relationships they have to one another. According to this view, the Church as a whole comes into being through the mutual acknowledgement and acceptance of the local churches. This point of view could be defined as a "federalist"

interpretation of *communio*. The other extreme is based in the attempt to see the local churches as mere secondary manifestations of the Church as a whole. This is the centralist view of the Church. In their purest, most extreme form, both positions are supported by practically nobody. Yet there is no doubt that there are tendencies to a one-sided interpretation of the idea of *communio* on both sides.

The “federalist” interpretation overlooks the fact that, according to *Lumen Gentium*, the Church’s existence is not only formed out of the local churches but that the Church exists within each local church, just as, vice-versa, the local churches only exist within the Church as a whole. The Church as a whole is represented by the member churches, it is within them that it becomes a tangible reality. The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, in its article “On certain aspects of Church as *Communio*”, rightly reminds us that the Church as a whole is “the very body of which the churches are a part”, and that the understanding of the universal church as the amalgamation of its member churches does not do justice to the nature of the Church itself.

This explanation can, unfortunately, give the impression of aiming in the direction of a centralist view of the Church. Yet to accept this would overlook the fact that, although each local church does indeed only exist within the community of the Church as a whole, it is not merely a small part, branch or administrative district of the Church, but the real Church of Jesus Christ in one particular place, such that each church acquires a certain autonomy and responsibility for itself. In each individual locality the Church must fulfil itself and its role taking into account the language, culture, mentality and customs of the inhabitants.

This understanding of church unity has consequences for the definition of the relationship of each individual bishop to the episcopate as a whole, and to the Pope. The Council describes this relationship as one of collegiality. Just as the individual local churches can only exist in *communio* with one another, so too the bishop must live in hierarchical *communio* with the episcopate as a whole and especially with the Bishop of Rome as the centre of unity. Each individual bishop is therefore not only responsible for his local church, but also for the universal Church and its unity.

At Vatican II the renewal of *communio*-ecclesiology is in fact closely associated with the doctrine of the collegiality of the episcopate. This collegiality is, so to speak, the official outward sign of the sacramental *communio*-unity. A key concept for the understanding of this inter-relation is the concept of *communio hierarchia*. An individual bishop can exercise his sacramentally founded pastoral power only in communion with the whole episcopate and especially with the Pope.

Yet, in the end, the concept of *communio hierarchia* is, in its very wording, a compromise. It attempts to establish a connection between the sacramental *communio*-ecclesiology of the first millennium and the juridical ecclesiology of the second. The compromise inherent in the wording of the concept means that adopting the ideas of the Council is problematic: there is a need to clarify how this synthesis can be put into practice in the practical life of the Church. Here there are still several points to be clarified. This is the reason for the present discussion between the local church and the world- wide Church and, respectively, between each individual bishop and the college of bishops and the Pope.

The report of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on certain aspects of the Church as *communio* might here have a clarifying function. However it does not bring the discussion to an end. The report rightly warns against particularist tendencies. However the statement regarding the opposite position, the one-sided centralist interpretation of the compromise formula, seems to have turned out less clearly. This makes the text rather unbalanced. The primacy of the Bishop of Rome and the position of the College of Bishops as essential parts of the Church as a whole cannot be seen as products of the particularity of the churches (compare No. 13); nor can the local churches be seen as derivations of the Church as a whole. Unity and diversity in the Church are equally fundamental. The universal Church and the particular churches are incorporated in one another. Each is an integral part of the other. It is therefore inherent in the structure of the Church that, like the two focal points of an ellipse, it is *iure divino* both papal and episcopal. Neither pole can be seen as the root of the other. Just as the three-in-one of the trinity neither cancels out nor produces the unity of nature, thus, by analogy, we can justifiably say that the church only exists both in and of the local churches.

The Church's communal nature must also find expression in its concrete life. This has practical consequences which primarily affect the concrete realisation of the collegiality of the episcopate, the rôle of the Bishops' Conferences and pluralism in the Church in general. Even today, these consequences have only partly become reality.

In the contemporary practice of appointing bishops, in particular, the *communio* structure of the Church should be perceptible. If we compare the Church's old way of appointing bishops with present practice, we can see historically that there is a wide degree of variation. The way in which bishops are appointed is not dogmatically regulated. In general, though, we can say that the appointment of a bishop should correspond to the nature of the office and its relation to the universal Church, the college of bishops and the local church. The appointment

should therefore be a joint act of the relevant local church, the fellow bishops in the district (or, today, more likely the Bishops' Conference) and the universal Church i.e. the Pope as the head of the College of Bishops. Such a combined system would be more faithful to the intention of the *communio*-ecclesiology of Vatican II than the current practice of appointing bishops through Rome.

Despite all attempts to make the *communio*-unity of the Church more tangible, it is significant that the implications of the term "plurality", alternate between a plurality of wealth and fullness and a plurality which dissolves and destroys unity. This, of course, also means that it is necessary to differentiate between a unity which allows an inner plurality and a centralist uniformity which nips the diversity of the life of the Church in the bud. As Pope John Paul II said: "The universality of the Church means, on the one hand, solid unity, and on the other hand variety and diversity, which not only do not stand in the way of unity, but, on the contrary, give it the character of 'communio'."

Communio—A Model for Catholic-Anglican Fellowship?

The relationship between the local and world-wide Church, particularly the unity of the bishops *cum Petro et sub Petro*, forms the as yet unsolved problem in the dialogue between the Catholic Church and the Anglican community. Here, serious differences are still evident between the Catholic understanding of *communio* and the Anglican model of community.

No other church family has such a deep sense of being communion as the Anglican community. Realising a plural unity is, for Anglicanism, a task which is not only confined to doctrine. In its structure Anglicanism also constitutes a unity formed out of the diversity of independent church provinces, each with its own different character. Against the background of a common historical past, these provinces developed independently with regard to doctrine and how they are led, but remain linked to one another. Ecumenical attitudes are the binding, unifying principle of the Anglican Church to the extent that it is unable to preserve its inner and outer unity without simultaneously having an effect on the unity of all Churches.

As is the case for the Catholic Church, the *communio* within the office of bishop is especially important for Anglicans. But problems still arise through differences in the evaluation of the importance of the Petrine ministry as a service to the unity of the Church. The Final Report of ARCIC I gives reason for hope but does not go as far as providing a full comprehension of the Petrine ministry as understood by

the Catholic Church. According to Anglican understanding, communal unity *cum Petro et sub Petro* is indeed desirable for each local church. However the member churches lose nothing of their essential being as churches through lack of it. In contrast to this, the Catholic point of view states that fellowship with the Church as a whole, as represented by the successors of St. Peter is not an additional extra for each local church, but one of its fundamental elements.

Finally, the question of primacy cannot be solved in isolation; it is one aspect of the comprehensive question of authority in the Church. Who has the final say in determining the one faith of the Church? Alongside the collegial, conciliar and synodal responsibility for the Church, personal responsibility is an essential requirement. For, just as each individual local church could not exist if the bishop did not serve the unity of the Church, the unity of the universal Church also needs to be ministered to. Inherent in the office of bishop is a duty towards the unity of the Church, which is performed within the local church, but is also invested with an authority from beyond the local church. This dynamic "within yet beyond" in the relationship between office and church is now seen by most churches as being constitutive and *ius divinum*. Yet, as the Church also realises itself as the universal Church and not just as the parish church, the same structure applies for the universal Church. This is the reason for the view of Catholic doctrine that the Petrine ministry has an essential and inalienable significance for the Church.

On the Catholic side, it must of course be seen that the concrete form of the Petrine ministry has changed throughout the centuries and could change again in the future. One-sided centralism betrays both the *communio*-understanding of the Church, and the needs of the present world. The concretisation of the Petrine ministry ought, therefore, in the future, to be more closely associated with the requirements of conciliarity, synodality and subsidiarity. If unity is to be furthered, legitimate freedom in the Church must also be furthered. One must more clearly distinguish between the rights befitting the Pope as primate (*Primas*) of the Latin Church and those befitting him as the bearer of the Petrine ministry for the whole Church. In this way, we could ensure that the wealth of legitimate Anglican tradition is not suppressed, but preserved and further enriched.

Understanding the Church as *communio* more deeply, living it in a better way and fulfilling it anew is more than just a reforming programme within the Church. Church as *communio* is a message, a promise for the people and the world of today. The Church does not exist just for its own sake. Especially in present times, in which

traditional social forms—not least the family—are threatening to disintegrate, in which a worrying trend of individualism is threatening to spread out and take root in the Western world, churches are challenged to make their *communio* established by God tangible and effective in a word which is threatening to fall apart. More than ever before, in the future Christians will only be heard when they raise their voices together. Only together can they contribute in forming a more just and more peaceful world and to fellowship among nations. Church as *communio* is more than a programme of the Church; it is an offer for the world—for a more peaceful world.

Catherine De' Ricci

Part I

Domenico di Agresti

I have devoted a good thirty years of my life to the study of Catherine de' Ricci, from the early 60s, when the *Collana Ricciana* began to appear, up to the two volumes of the *Breviario Ricciano* which appeared in 1990 to mark the opening of the sixth centenary of the saint's death. Here I have nothing new to add to all that I have said already, only a brief synthesis of how over the years, I have come to see this extraordinary woman. But any synthesis involves a choice, and any choice involves excisions and gaps and is inevitably wide open to criticism. The risk is real and I have accepted it; I ask for the reader's understanding. This present essay seeks only to present a simple and clear picture, unburdened by an excess of scholarly apparatus. In it I will try to highlight, often in the saint's own words, three crucial points in her spirituality: love, which is its source and gives it its scope; obedience to the will of God, which is the golden rule by which this love is lived; and the joyful human and supernatural equilibrium which results from it.