FURTHER REFLECTIONS ON IGNATIUS’ “MEDITATION ON THE TWO STANDARDS”

Ignatius:

Lucifer (Satan): riches \(\rightarrow\) honor \(\rightarrow\) blind pride \(\rightarrow\) every other vice

Jesus: poverty \(\rightarrow\) powerlessness, \(\rightarrow\) true humility, \(\rightarrow\) every other virtue
marginalization,

neglect or even

contempt

truth to self,
a sense of self-
worth in Jesus
and God

A Christian Womanist Critique of Ignatius (M-E Rosenblatt based on V. Saiving and others):

The pattern that Ignatius lays out may well fit men, but for many women, "it is not pride that must be counteracted but too little confidence in one's loveliness and acceptability in the eyes of God and others." Rather than being tempted by "riches, honors, pride," they already experience...

poverty of some kind \(\rightarrow\) a greater or lesser powerlessness & marginalization, but rather than leading them

neglect, being put down or
even treated with contempt
to a true sense of self; true

and violated humility and self-worth,

these harsh experiences too

often lead to a sense of victimhood and self-hatred.

What they need to experience from the Jesus of the gospels, then, is care and unconditional love, positive images of woman and woman’s empowerment (see, for example, Luke 10:38-42—“Mary has chosen the better part” [than Martha]), leading to a sense of personal hope and possibility and to actions of appropriate self-assertiveness and a true humility that includes a sense of self-worth.

A Modification of the Womanist Critique:

Perhaps the critique overstates the otherwise well-made case. A more nuanced case might say that the Ignatian pattern of “riches > honor > pride” fits some people (perhaps more men than women), but not others (perhaps more women than men).