

GOD'S AMAZING MERCY: 4TH SUNDAY LENT B

Brian Gleeson CP

All through his days on Earth Jesus shows pastoral care for all sorts of people. But he shows a special affection for poor persons, and even for extortionists and prostitutes. His opponents sneer, '*This man welcomes sinners and eats with them.*' (Lk 15:2)

The warmth and generosity of his human caring and welcome says that in the eyes of God they are not '*rejects*', '*outcasts*', '*losers*' and '*no-hopers*'. On the contrary, God wants to put them back together again. So in and through Jesus, those labelled the '*lost*' come to meet the God of the lost. It's for their sake and in their defence, that Jesus speaks his famous parables of the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the lost son.

The story of the lost son, the most famous shared today, has been called '*the greatest short story in the world.*' It's not really the parable of a prodigal, i.e. of a spendthrift, as it's usually called, but the parable of an incredibly generous father of two sons (see v.11) who, in different ways, have both lost their way in life.

The parable tells us a great deal about Jesus himself. His own way of acting is the starting-point of the story. He's explaining why he '*welcomes sinners and eats with them.*' (v.2) They're the lost ones, the ones he's bringing home to God. For Jesus, any person who has strayed from God is not truly himself/herself. In the midst of his failures and mistakes, the lost son comes to understand that he will be happy again only in the company and home of his father. Meanwhile his father is longing for him to return, and as soon as he catches a glimpse of his son returning, he starts running out to embrace him and bring him home (v.20).

When they reach the house, the father cuts short the son's prepared speech. There's no reprimand, not even a small dose of '*I told you so ...*' There's no pay-back, no penance, no punishment and no recriminations. Instead the father is so glad to have his son back with him again that he gives him the robe of honour, the ring of authority, and the sandals of a son.

The Pharisees, to whom Jesus was telling this story, would have been shocked to the core at how Jesus was keeping company with people who were not only outsiders but *'sinners'*, contact with whom would bring defilement. In a sadistic way they were looking forward not to the saving but to the destruction of those whom they so easily and so self-righteously labelled *'sinners'*.

At the sound of music and dancing the eldest son comes in from the fields. His father goes out to him and pleads with him to come to the party (v.38). This eldest son believes he has done everything *'right'*, and has spent his whole life slaving away on the family farm. His attitude to his wayward brother is one of utter contempt. He even refers to the prodigal not as *'my brother'* but as *'your son'*.

In the details of his story, Jesus is saying that our God is not a mean book-keeping God at all, but a warm, gracious and generous Father who never stops loving, simply because he never stops wanting to save. No matter how often we may turn our backs on God and go away to do our own thing, God, like the father in the story, waits patiently for us to come to our senses and return home. The moment we begin to admit that our selfishness has brought us only frustration and misery, shame and guilt, God comes running to hug us and take us back. There he treats us not as our mistakes and sins deserve, but with tenderness and compassion. In the Eucharist he even throws a party and lavishes *'welcome home'* gifts upon us – Christ himself in his body and blood.

In conclusion, let me share with you a variation on the story Jesus told. Once there were two priests in the same diocese. One of them drank too much, he was often late for appointments, the parish was deep in debt and his bookwork was a mess. Yet the people loved him. The other priest was a very capable and careful manager. He was very meticulous and exact in everything. His book-keeping was impeccable and he always treated everyone according to all the rules and regulations of the diocese. His parish had no debt. In fact, it owned substantial investments. Yet his people didn't think much of him or warm to him at all.

That seems unfair. It begs the question: *'What did the first priest have going for him that the second one lacked?'* Figure that one out for yourselves!

bgleesoncp@gmail.com