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a word from the editor…

Ready for another myth?

*We are not monks.* Fr. Jerome Nadal (1507–1580), the man whom Ignatius entrusted to teach Jesuits about the Society and its way of proceeding, wrote this in a lecture to Jesuits in Alcalá de Henares in 1561.¹ But he seems to have written it once. Only once.²

When I searched Nadal’s letters, lecture notes, and commentaries, for more appearances of the saying, I found nothing. Of course, it is always possible that I missed something. If readers know of other examples, I welcome being corrected. The closest thing I found was this, which Nadal wrote in 1572: “So it is, that our religious institute is not a form of monasticism” (*Quo sit nostram religionem, monachismum non esse*).³

The one passage where Nadal did write *we are not monks* is quite significant. It appears in a lecture on Jesuit poverty:

You see here how in everything perfection is obtained, and how the Society is aided from its beginnings, which I proposed at the start [of my presentation]: by God our Lord and by his special grace whereby the Society is principally governed. And after that follows the way of perfection provided by the church, by which the Society is guided so

---


particularly. Our entire institute is guided by that which is common and ordinary \([\text{común y ordinario}]\) in the church; all that remains for us is to include the perfection found in this. And so we are not monks \([\text{nosotros no somos monjes}]\), nor do we have the particularities [e.g., additional ascetical practices and observances] that the monastic orders possess in all holiness. We are religious clerics, assistants to the bishops, with the perfection that comes from our institute.\(^4\)

Several points are notable about this passage. First, Nadal meant “we are not monks” in the sense that Jesuits should not, as a general rule, take upon themselves ascetical practices that go above and beyond what the church asks of secular clergy and perhaps laity. Ignatius addressed this point in detail in the earliest draft of the Formula of the Institute, written in 1539:

One [thing that we have learned from experience] is not to impose on the companions under pain of mortal sin any fasts, disciplines, baring of feet or head, color of dress, type of food, penances, hairshirts, and other torments of the flesh. These, however, we do not prohibit because we condemn them, for we greatly praise and approve them in those who observe them; but only because we do not wish Ours either to be crushed by so many burdens together or to allege any excuse for not carrying out what we have set before ourselves. But everyone can exercise himself devoutly in the practices he deems to be necessary or useful for himself, provided the superior does not forbid him.\(^5\)

Second, the above passage from Nadal sheds considerable light on a line from Ignatius, found in the General Examen, the interpretation of which was greatly debated among Jesuits in the

\(^4\) Nadal, *Comentarii*, 413; my translation. By “assistants to the bishops,” Nadal did not mean that Jesuits answer directly to bishops. Rather, like Theatines, Barnabites, and other clerks regular in the sixteenth century, Jesuits undertook any and all pastoral ministries that were the purview of the bishops’ secular clergy.

twentieth century: _la vida es común_, or, _the manner of living is ordinary._ Some Jesuits argued that it was a criterion for poverty—in other words, that Ignatius wanted Jesuits to adopt the “ordinary” lifestyle of people living in the surrounding area. Others argued that it meant that Ignatius wanted the Society to be something more akin to a secular institute. But this passage from Nadal—as well as other relevant texts—make clear that the word _común_ denoted, more narrowly, the church’s universal norms for the faithful regarding austerities and observances.⁷

Why is all this important? If anecdotal evidence is any indication, some Jesuits are fond of using the rejoinder _we are not monks_ in a much wider variety of contexts, whenever conversations turn to the nature of Jesuit life. For example:

“Are Jesuits practicing enough formal prayer?” Someone responds, _We are not monks._

“Should Jesuits characterize community life as itself mission?” _We are not monks._

“Are Jesuits making international trips too frequently and frivolously?” _We are not monks._

“Should Jesuits situate novitiates in the country, for silence and introspection, or in urban areas, for the sake of apostolates?” _We are not monks._

---


“Has the time come for a serious discussion about the drinking culture in the Society?” *We are not monks.*

You get the idea. A supposed refrain of Nadal becomes a very real refrain of contemporary Jesuits. And instead of shedding light on nuanced problems, it stifles conversations before they really begin. In this vein, Fr. Michael C. McCarthy (uwe) noted in an earlier issue of *Studies:*

Unlike early monastic orders, communities such as the Jesuits have represented a more apostolically oriented form of religious life than existed in the first millennium. For most Jesuits, the clearest and perhaps first motivation for celibacy is ministerial, and we are quick to assert, “We are not monks.” While that is certainly true, what is interesting to me is how frequently we seem to say it in a defensive posture to protect our own religious culture.8

Perennial tensions about the proper place of monastic emphases in the life of the Society of Jesus—silence, formal prayer, simplicity, daily ordo, fraternal correction, asceticism, and mortification—hum just beneath the surface of this essay by Fr. John W. O’Malley (umi app mar) about life in a Jesuit novitiate before the Second Vatican Council.

At first glance, Fr. O’Malley’s subject is simple enough: he leads readers on a guided tour through an experience of the Society that most Jesuits under age sixty can hardly imagine. Only someone who has experienced it can put flesh on the bones of the written sources. Indeed, on that note, I like to tell my students that reading the Rule of St. Benedict does not really tell us much about life in medieval monasteries, any more than reading the custom book of the Faber Jesuit Community at Boston College tells us how that community’s men really live and interact among themselves.

But Fr. O’Malley offers readers something more. By admission, he refrains from making any judgments about past practices, and this

---

approach, at least for me, made it easier to contemplate the scene and even to imagine myself there. I found myself asking new questions about formation, past and present. I suspect that this is Fr. O’Malley’s desire for all his readers. If true reform means selectively bringing the best of the past into the present, then what might a four-hundred-year-old novitiate tradition have to say to Jesuits today?

In part 3 of the *Constitutions*, Ignatius describes a lifestyle for novices that is far more monastic than the lifestyle he later describes for scholastics and formed Jesuits: novices should minimize contact with the outside world (244), not leave the house alone or without permission (247), keep silence in the house (249), refrain from academic studies (289), and wear shabby clothing relative to scholastics and the professed (297, 577–78). Was Ignatius unconscious of the inconsistency of these norms with the apostolic thrust of the Society? Or perhaps, considering his experience in Manresa, he believed that in order to make contemplatives in action, he first had to make contemplatives.

*Barton T. Geger, SJ*

*General Editor*
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How We Were: Life in a Jesuit Novitiate, 1946–1948

John W. O’Malley, SJ

The author leads readers on a tour of daily life in a Jesuit novitiate before the Second Vatican Council—a life that, until the council, had remained largely unchanged for four centuries. The call that Vatican II issued to religious orders to return to the original charism of their founders in a way that remained faithful to present needs prompted a radical restructuring of the novitiate experience. This restructuring in turn was influenced by advances in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the study of the early Society’s history and spirituality.

Introduction

Some years ago, I directed a friend of mine, a professor in the History Department of Harvard University, to the archives of the New York Province of the Society of Jesus. She needed documentation for a research project. She and Fr. Peter Schineller (une), the archivist, hit it off, and at a certain point their conversation drifted to how Jesuit novices had been trained fifty years earlier. She was fascinated, and she wrote me saying that “somebody” should put pen to paper, because the story was interesting and in danger of being lost.

She made an impression upon me in part because, over the course of the years, I had noticed younger Jesuits being subjected to anecdotes about “how it used to be.” I also noticed that, along with their boredom at hearing the same tales told time and again,
they were often incredulous that the novitiate could really have been so different from their own.

Now, many years after my friend’s urging, I have finally gone to work, trying to reconstruct a historical reality of which I was a part. In so doing, I study only one institution, Milford Novitiate in Milford, Ohio, during the years when I was a novice there, 1946–1948. What I attempt in these pages is not, however, a personal memoir but a case study of a program that, with considerable local variation, was in operation throughout the Society at the time, and even centuries earlier. It was, in fact, a program that in its fundamental contours had been in operation since the sixteenth century.

Considerable documentation survives from Milford during my years there. It is now housed in the new Jesuit Archives and Research Center (JARC) in Saint Louis. When I visited the JARC in 2018 and 2019, I received splendid assistance from the director, David Miros, and from Ann N. Knake, the associate archivist for research services. As far as possible, I base what I write on those and other historical sources. Nonetheless, my experience at Milford is essential for interpreting what the sources write. In the first place, I know the meaning of the jargon (Latin and English) of which the documents are full. I

---


know, for instance, that *manualia* means performance of such household tasks as sweeping the corridors and cleaning the bathrooms.

Furthermore, although the documentation undergirding the story is ample, it is far from sufficient for reconstructing a full picture of life at Milford. I have to rely on my memory to reconstruct the reality we lived. My memory of those days is still vivid—much more vivid than my memory of what happened just a few weeks ago. But, as we all know, memory plays tricks on us and needs confirmation.

In that regard, I have been very fortunate. Two of my contemporaries from Milford—Fr. Robert M. Deiters (*JPN*) of Sophia University, Tokyo, and Fr. John J. O’Callaghan (*UMI*) of Loyola University, Chicago—read drafts of my text, which they confirmed, corrected, and amplified. During those years, Fr. John W. Padberg (*UCS*) of Saint Louis University was a novice at Florissant, Missouri, the institution whose overflow supplied the first novices for Milford and thus provided the basic traditions that were operative there. He also read a draft and offered valuable comments.

Although in a piece like this one the personal element is unavoidable, I try my best to keep the focus as objective as possible. The years I spent at Milford were happy, and I look back on them with fondness. They confirmed me in my Jesuit vocation and benefited me profoundly in other ways. I am at the same time acutely aware of their shortcomings. In this piece, however, I am not engaging in a critique of them, either positive or negative. All I hope to do is provide a sketch of “how we were.”

### I. Entering the Novitiate

In those days, the procedures for entering the novitiate of the Society of Jesus consisted of two steps. The first was the presentation of four documents: a baptismal certificate, a letter from one’s pastor, the results of a routine physical examination, and transcripts from one’s high school or college. The second was interviews by four Jesuits who were officially designated for that task by the provincial. Three of the interviews lasted only fifteen or twenty minutes, but the
fourth was more searching, and might last an hour or so. The Jesuits questioned the candidate about his family, his reasons for wanting to enter, and his religious practice. In a delicate way, the principal examiner asked whether the candidate knew what the vow of chastity entailed. At the end, the results were sent to the provincial, who in time sent the candidate a letter admitting him or not.

Like myself, most candidates in those days entered just a few months after graduation from high school, most often from a Jesuit high school, and were therefore about seventeen or eighteen years old. I entered in 1946, the year after World War II ended, which meant that half of the entering class of about forty were veterans in their early twenties. We younger novices tended, at least for a while, to defer to them as older and wiser.

We arrived at the novitiate with only the most basic articles of clothing, according to a list that we had received with the letter of admission. Shortly after passing through the novitiate door, we surrendered our wallets and watches, which were kept for us intact in case we decided the Society of Jesus was not for us. There was no need for a wallet because there was nothing for us to buy—everything was provided for us. There was no need for a watch because our lives were entirely regulated by bells.

After a week segregated from the rest of the novices, during which we were introduced to the basic routines and led through some simple meditations, we received our cassocks, met the rest of the novices, and began in earnest the basic training that after two years would enable us, if all went well, to pronounce our vows and formally enter the Society of Jesus. At that point, we could proudly append “S.J.” to our names. Even as novices, however, we were for the most part treated as if we were members, and we tended to think of ourselves as members. Unlike real members, however, we knew that we were free to walk out the door at any time.
When the door closed behind us on entrance day, a central aspect of our training immediately went into effect. We said good-bye to the outside world for the next four years—four years, because, with only slight mitigation, the same discipline was in force for the *juniors*: Jesuits who had pronounced their vows after two years as novices and were now doing their first studies in the Society at Milford.

During those four years, we never took a meal or slept in a bed outside the community. We would not see a newspaper or magazine or hear the radio. Television was in its infancy, and therefore was not an issue. We were expected to write to our parents once a week—no more, no less. That was the extent of our correspondence, except by special permission. Although such control could not be exercised over incoming correspondence, our friends and relatives—except for our parents—soon got discouraged when they received no response or, at best, a tardy and inevitably bland one. We had very little to report.

Parents were welcome to visit a total of six days a year—either for two days three times a year, or for three days twice a year. They could arrive on the grounds as early as 9:30 and had to leave no later than 4:30. At noon, dinner was served for them and their son in the parlors, after which the master of novices stopped by for ten or fifteen minutes to chat with them.

These visits took place on the premises of the novitiate. During them, we never left the grounds. I speak for myself when I say that, as much as I looked forward to them, I was always glad when they were over, because after a few hours we began to run out of topics for conversation. Outside these visits, which along with our mothers might include a sister or two, we had no contact with women for four years.

My sudden and virtually complete break with family and friends came as a shock to them. My Catholic relatives found the break extreme, but soon accepted it more or less as a matter of course. My Protestant relatives found it outrageous, and were not shy in making their opinion known. When later in my training in the Society I was able to renew contact with them, I got an earful.
The tight isolation from the outside world was symptomatic of the intense indoctrination of the novitiate program. It said to the novices that they had broken with the life they had known and had begun an altogether new one. Like the first disciples of Jesus, they had “left all things and followed him” (Luke 5:11). We soon learned, therefore, that our lives as Jesuits were meant to replicate as much as possible the ideals and patterns of life and ministry of those disciples. That was the ideal upon which the training was built, even when the program sometimes seemed to inculcate the virtues of a recluse rather than of a minister living an active life in the church.

II. The Setting

By 1925, the Missouri Province of the Society of Jesus, with headquarters in Saint Louis, numbered some 1,200 members, and extended from the Ohio River to the Rockies: too many members and too many miles for one provincial to handle. Plans were already advanced to divide the province by forming a new one out of its northeastern section. The new province would have its headquarters in Chicago and comprise the states of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio.3

The novitiate of the Missouri Province, located in Florissant, just north of Saint Louis, was overflowing with 107 scholastic novices—that is, novices destined for ordination. Besides them, there were thirteen novice brothers—that is, novices who would become members of the Society but not be ordained.4 One novice master supervised both groups—a task far too heavy.

The situation absolutely mandated another institution, which would become the novitiate of the new Chicago Province. In early June, 1925, the Jesuits paid $94,000 to close the purchase of an extensive estate of 83 acres on the banks of the Little Miami River, just outside Milford,

---

4 Catalogus Provinciae Missourianae Societatis Jesu (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1924), 32–5.
a small town about fifteen miles from Cincinnati. On the extensive and well-kept grounds were the mansion, a pavilion, and a small swimming pool. By the time I was a novice, the Jesuits had turned the mansion into a facility used for weekend retreats for laymen in the Cincinnati area.

Immediately after the purchase, a temporary residence for the Jesuits was hastily constructed on the grounds. On August 20, 1925, thirty-one scholastic novices, one novice brother, the master of novices, and his socius (assistant) arrived from Florissant. Besides their luggage, they brought with them traditions and practices of the institution that they had left behind. Two priests and a brother had come a few days earlier to outfit the building and make it ready for occupancy.

Ground had already been broken for a large permanent structure that could hold some 150 Jesuits. It was ready by August, 1927. The handsome, red-brick building became the home for me and my contemporaries for the next four years after our entrance in 1946.

During the years I was at Milford, the official catalogue for the Chicago Province listed some sixty to seventy scholastic novices, eight or so novice brothers, about fifty-five juniors, about eighteen priests, and twenty brothers. About fifteen novices left the novitiate before completing the two years. The other numbers were stable.

These five categories of persons observed a strict separation from one another. Each had its own recreation room, and, insofar as possible, each had no contact with another except for inevitable matters of business. We novices associated only with other scholastic novices. On five or six great feast days during the year, the novices and juniors had recreation together for about two hours in the afternoon, but other than that we kept strictly apart. They stayed on their side of the house, and we stayed on ours.

---


6 See Novice Diary, August 21, 1924, opening page verso, JARC Chicago, Milford Novitiate, Box 3.0047.
Only four of the priests were on the novitiate staff: the novice master, his socius, and two Latin teachers. Of the other priests, four were house officials (rector, minister, treasurer, and spiritual father), seven were faculty for the juniors, and the rest were retired. The rector had oversight of the whole house. The minister was his assistant, in charge of the physical well-being of the community, which included supervising the kitchen and dining room.7

The brothers filled a variety of tasks that allowed the community to function as a virtually self-sustaining institution. Four acted as electricians, plumbers, and general handy-men to keep the large building in good running order. They made sure it was well heated in the winter, but, at a time when air conditioning was a luxury of the wealthy, they could do nothing to relieve the sometimes suffocating heat and humidity in a southern Ohio valley during the summer.

Two brothers were the cooks and were assisted by a baker, who was one of only two laymen employed by the community. A brother was in charge of the dining room, another in charge of the laundry and supplies room, and yet another in charge of the community infirmary. Two brothers tended the grounds, which were filled with beautiful trees and shrubbery. A brother worked in the tailor shop with the other layman on the staff; the shop made cassocks for the community and for the province at large.

The novitiate had its own farms—dairy, livestock, and vegetable—which supplied most of the food we ate. Six or seven brothers worked on the farms, which were located outside the novitiate precincts. Theirs was a hard lot, and the provincial in his correspondence with the rector expressed concern that they were overworked, noted that the farms were losing money, and suggested that they be sold, which happened a few years after I left Milford.8

---

7 Catalogus Provinciae Chicagiensis Societatis Jesu, Ineunte Anno MCMXLVII (1947), 52–8.

The building had been designed to sustain and promote the independence from one another of the different categories of people who made up the community. It was H-shaped, with the left wing (as one faced the main entrance) reserved for the novices, and the right wing for the juniors. On the third floor on the novices’ side was a small chapel reserved for them. On the second floor on the juniors’ side was the library reserved for them. The library was small but a with judiciously chosen collection, especially strong in the Latin and Greek classics.

The novices and juniors lived in large dormitory rooms, ten on the novices’ side of the house and nine on the juniors’. Each dormitory was divided into six cubicles separated from one another by white curtains, which were always to be kept open except when one was sleeping or changing clothes.

Each cubicle contained a bed, a shallow wardrobe for one’s cassock and outerwear, and a washstand with two drawers for clothes, on top of which was a pitcher, a basin, and a soap dish. Along the windows were our desks, each of which had underneath it a small wooden kneeler. About every two or three months we moved to another dormitory as assigned by the socius. I was never altogether clear on why we did this, since the dormitories were identical; but I suppose it was to teach us that we had to be ready as Jesuits to pull up stakes and move to wherever we might be needed.

The priests and the brothers had actual bedrooms, which were on the second floor in the front half of the right and left wings respectively. The rooms were small. They had running water but no bathroom, and the priests’ rooms had to serve also as their offices.

On the first floor, the wide corridor connecting the two wings contained parlors, bathrooms, and classrooms. On the second were offices, bathrooms, and the faculty’s recreation room and library.
And on the third were, besides bathrooms, the tailor shop and the infirmary, which had a kitchen and several bedrooms.

In the same connecting corridor in the basement were storage rooms and the laundry—operated, as mentioned, by a brother, who was also in charge of an adjacent clothes room stocked with socks, underwear, and other basic articles of clothing that members of the community might need. In the two wings in the basement were showers and recreation rooms.

On the first floor, in the front half of the novices’ wing, was their library, which consisted exclusively of books on Jesuit history, the lives of the saints, and treatises on prayer and the spiritual life. Further down that wing was a large assembly room that served as a classroom and as the novices’ recreation room.

In the corresponding place in the juniors’ wing was the community chapel, where every evening at 6:15 the entire community gathered for the recitation in Latin of the Litany of the Saints. In the morning at 6:30, the novices and juniors assembled there for Mass, celebrated in Latin by the rector, without homily or music. We followed the Mass in silence with hand-sized copies of the *Missale Romanum*—a text identical with the celebrant’s.

Opposite the chapel was the refectory, where the community gathered every day for breakfast at 7:15, dinner (main meal) at noon, and supper at 6:30, right after the Litany of the Saints. Each category of persons had its designated set of tables: scholastic novices, along with a separate table for novice brothers, on one side of the room, juniors on the other, priests along the entrance wall, and brothers farther into the room on the juniors’ side. Seating in those areas was according to the order in which persons happened to enter the refectory, and was therefore random. The rector, minister, and novice master, however, had assigned places.

Meals were taken in silence and served family-style by novices or juniors, who took turns a month at a time. Except for breakfast, the meals began with a standard-formula grace and ended with
a similarly standard prayer of thanksgiving, both read in Latin by the minister, to which the assembled community responded.

During dinner and supper, a novice or junior read a book from the pulpit. In alternating months, the task fell to either the novices or the juniors, and in the course of our two years as novices, each of us had about two turns in the pulpit, a week at a time. It was an intimidating experience but excellent training in the use of one’s voice and in projecting it over a large room without the help of a microphone and without shouting.

The priest in charge of the reading corrected mistakes in pronunciation on the spot with a cry that rang across the refectory: “Repetat! (Let him repeat!) That word is ___. “ He had, in fact, held practice classes with us before our week began. In them, he taught us how to articulate distinctly, how to get volume by projecting our voice from the diaphragm, and how to read according to the punctuation as given in the text. These sessions, rarely easy or pleasant, turned out to be excellent training in the basics of the art of public speaking.

The books were generally interesting, often about a prominent Catholic, an aspect of church history, or even a recent best-seller on some topic of general interest. The reading began, however, with about ten verses from the Latin Vulgate edition of the Bible and at supper also by a few verses in Latin from The Imitation of Christ, the fifteenth-century spiritual classic.

Dinner ended when the rector saw that all had finished eating and called for the reading from the Martyrology of the entry for the following day. Supper ended simply when called by the rector. On Thursdays, which was the weekly holiday, and on other holidays or feast days, the rule of silence was lifted at dinner—but never at supper and only on the rarest occasions at breakfast.

---

The food was ample, fresh, well-prepared, and seasonally varied. Water and milk were the drinks, except on major feasts, when bottles of ginger ale appeared on the tables. No alcohol at meals or at any other occasion. The “custom book” for the Jesuit houses in the United States laid down in detail what was to be served, which included specifications for holidays and feast days.\(^\text{10}\)

The fare at dinner on an ordinary day consisted of a soup, followed by the main course of meat, potatoes, a vegetable, and salad, which was followed by fruit or a sweet. On a major feast day, such as Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and several others, the meal began with an appetizer and a soup. On those occasions, the main course was to have a meat of superior quality, and, in houses other than the novitiate, a good wine. Those meals ended with nuts, cheese, fruit, a sweet, and—although not at Milford—a cordial.

The Chicago Province, like all other provinces, had a special fund (\textit{arca seminarii}) to sustain the houses where Jesuits were trained. At Milford, income from the tailor shop and the honoraria that the priests received for ministries performed on weekends and in the summer modestly supplemented the money that the novitiate received from the province. In addition, the farms produced a surplus of foodstuffs, which was sold in the vicinity; but, as mentioned, they operated at a loss and were in that regard a liability rather than an asset.

\textbf{III. The Daily Order}

E
each assistancy of the Society of Jesus had a custom book that prescribed procedures and routines for all the Jesuit communities in that assistancy. The custom book for Jesuit houses in the United States prescribed, for instance, the hours for rising and retiring, the outfitting of the chapel, the quality and quantity of items of clothing a Jesuit might possess, and many other things as well.\(^\text{11}\) The stipulations for the American custom book were scrupulously observed, and provincials during their

\(^{10}\) Consuetudinarium, pp. 23–32.

\(^{11}\) Consuetudinarium, pp. 1–4, 20–23, 33–36.
annual official visits to their communities made sure measures were taken to correct any lapses.

The daily order for novices at Milford followed the custom book’s prescriptions exactly, but it went beyond them in such full detail that we had precious little time to call our own. It replicated almost exactly the daily order in force at Florissant. Although in a general way it also replicated the order found in other novitiates of the Society at that time, it was tighter than most of them. Our order went as follows:

5:00 a.m. Rise to the sound of a bell and the greeting from the lead novice in the dormitory, *Benedicamus Domino* (“Let us bless the Lord”), to which we replied, in a loud voice, *Deo gratias* (“Thanks be to God”). This was a pious way to greet the day, but it was also a sign that we had woken up. Once we were dressed, we made our way in haste to the bathroom to fill our pitchers with hot water for washing and shaving in our cubicles. Once we had performed those tasks, we shot back to the bathroom to empty the wash basin. We returned it to our cubicles, donned our cassocks, pulled the curtains, and went to the novice chapel for a brief visit, careful to be back at our desks by 5:30, when the bell sounded for the recitation in Latin of the Angelus, led by the head novice in each dormitory. In this routine, not a moment could be wasted.

5:30 a.m. Meditation on “points” (topics) that had been prepared the night before. We knelt, sat, or stood at our desk while meditating.

6:25 a.m. Bell calling us to Mass, which lasted almost precisely a half hour.

7:00 a.m. Thanksgiving in the chapel after Mass.

---

12 For the daily order and variations on it for holidays and special occasions, see Novice Diary, 1945–1948, JARC Chicago, 3.0048, pp. 2–4.
7:15 a.m. Breakfast. We were free to leave the refectory as soon as we had finished.

7:50 a.m. Reflection upon one’s meditation and, if one wished, writing in one’s spiritual diary.

8:00 a.m. *Manualia.* The novices had the major burden for keeping the house clean. Each of us had tasks assigned to us for several months at a time. The tasks had to be completed by about 8:50.

9:00 a.m. Rules class. The master of novices explained to us the ideals and way of life in the Society.

9:35 a.m. Reading in private of *Practice of Perfection and Christian Virtues* by Alonso Rodriguez (1538–1616), a seventeenth-century spiritual classic. 13

10:05 a.m. *Gymnicum.* Calisthenics, led by a novice and performed outside, weather permitting.

10:20 a.m. Free Time.

10:30 a.m. *Exercitium memoriae* (memory exercise). Time to memorize Latin prayers that we said daily, such as the Angelus, the Apostles Creed, and several long psalms.

10:40 a.m. Class or study. On class days, novices who had had a rigorous training in Latin in a Jesuit high school had Greek class. The rest of us (like me), Latin.

11:30 a.m. Free time.

11:45 a.m. Examination of conscience according to the method laid out in the *Spiritual Exercises* of Saint Ignatius. At noon, the bell rang for the midday Angelus, recited in

---

the dormitory as in the morning. This was also the bell summoning us to the refectory.

12:00 p.m. Dinner.

12:45 p.m. Recreation, which was an assembly of all the novices together, first for conversations in English. At 1:15, we broke from the others in predetermined groups of three and tried to carry on a conversation in Latin. This was known as separatio (“separation”). Except for the two periods of recreation each day, the novices observed silence. Any necessary talking was to be in Latin, as best we could. By the end of the two years, most of us had attained a crude proficiency.

1:30 p.m. Free time, when it was possible to catch a brief nap.

2:00 p.m. Manualia.

3:00 p.m. Study or Latin/Greek class.

3:50 p.m. Haustus, Jesuit jargon for a snack. Novices were free to go to the refectory for coffee and a piece or two of bread, taken of course in silence. If any pastry was left over from breakfast, that was also available, but it disappeared fast. If you chose not to avail yourself of the coffee break, you had free time.

4:25 p.m. Spiritual reading. Although the master of novices recommended certain books and authors, we were free to choose whatever we wanted from the collection in our library.

4:55 p.m. Rosary. Weather permitting, we gathered outside and as a group recited the beads together, some days in Latin, some days in English, as we walked through the grounds. If the weather was bad, we gathered in the novices’ chapel.
5:15 p.m.  *Flexoria*, Jesuit jargon for the novices’ afternoon meditation, done at our desks as in the morning. We spent the first seven or eight minutes reading in Latin or English a passage from *The Imitation of Christ* and the next seven or eight minutes preparing material for the meditation that was to follow at 5:30.

6:00 p.m.  Free time.

6:15 p.m.  Litany of the Saints in the community chapel with the rest of the community. Jesuits had daily recited this litany together since the earliest days of the Society.¹⁴

6:30 p.m.  Supper.

7:15 p.m.  Recreation, as at midday. At 7:45, we broke into the same groups of three, but this time for conversation in English instead of Latin.

8:00 p.m.  Free time.

9:00 p.m.  Points—that is, preparation for the next morning’s meditation. This was usually done in private, at our desks; but before important feasts, we assembled and the master of novices proposed material for us.

9:15 p.m.  Examination of conscience, at the end of which the head novice led us in Psalm 130 (129), *De profundis*.

9:30 p.m.  A final visit to the Blessed Sacrament in the novices’ chapel, which could last just a minute or two or somewhat longer, as the person wished.

10:00 p.m.  Lights out.

This was the basic structure of our day. Although the periods between 5:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., between 11:45 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., and from 5:15 p.m. until lights out, were almost inviolable, the other parts of the order were often changed. Thursday (not Saturday) was the weekly holiday: at 9:00 a.m., we gathered outside for a long walk on roads through the countryside in pre-assigned bands of about fifteen, with a leader who had a watch for the occasion and who determined the route. Each band was broken down into pre-assigned groups of three. We left through one of the back gates directly into the countryside and returned no earlier than 11:15 a.m. and no later than 11:30 p.m. In the afternoon, we played baseball, touch football, or other games.

On Sundays, we followed the Thursday schedule for the afternoon, but in the morning we had more free time than usual. Probably as often as every other week, a feast day occurred, which meant a modification of the daily order along the lines of the Thursday or Sunday schedule. Between June and September, classes were suspended, which resulted in more free time, more study time, somewhat more recreation, and more manuallia.

The most unusual period was Christmas. In the days immediately before it, we gave the house a thorough cleaning and then set about decorating it. We also had time to write and address the ten Christmas cards that we were allowed to send. The celebration began with midnight Mass celebrated by the rector. As on other truly major feasts, the Mass was accompanied by a choir made up of juniors, but it was not a high Mass. For the next week, we entertained ourselves with games and skits, and were treated to one special meal in the dining room. At both noon and evening recreation, candy was in abundance—the first and only time it appeared during the whole year.

On an individual basis, each of us deviated from the order that the other novices were following when for a month we did our experiment. This was a domesticated version of certain experiences that the Constitutions laid down for novices. At Milford,
the experiences consisted in assisting, more-or-less full time, the brothers, in the kitchen, the refectory, or on the grounds. We had to work hard, but our experiment was hardly a test of our suitability for an active life of ministry, which was what Ignatius intended the experiments to be that he had prescribed in the *Constitutions*.

Of those original experiments, we underwent only one as it was intended by Ignatius. That one was, however, the most important of them all: making the full thirty-day program of the Spiritual Exercises. For novices in their first year at Milford, the month of October thus entailed the most radical change in the order of the day. In theory and in fact, this experiment—or, better, *experience*—was the critical point in our training as Jesuits. It was meant to lead us into deeper touch with ourselves and with God and thus to provide us with the motivation that was to inspire our lives.

Four times a day, the master of novices briefly presented points for meditation as laid out in the *Exercises* according to the four-week structure indicated by the book. After each presentation, the novices spent about forty minutes in meditating upon the points. In the late morning, the master also delivered a short talk on some aspect of the spiritual life.

Our master of novices made it clear that he was available if a novice wanted to see him. But when I made the long retreat, I made it with almost forty other novices. Only with the greatest difficulty could he possibly see every one of us even once during the retreat. Like most of the others, I did not avail myself of the invitation, even though I was deeply moved by the retreat.

The discipline of the novices making the retreat affected the whole community. There was no talking at table, even on Thursdays and feast days. The reading at table for the month often came from the sermons of John Henry Newman (1801–1890) pertinent to the subject of our meditations for the day. A break-day after weeks one
and two of the Exercises briefly interrupted this routine. On those days, the novices making the retreat followed a schedule very much like the normal schedule for Thursdays. The novices in their second year, who had made the Exercises a year earlier, enjoyed more free time and recreation than usual.

IV. The Master of Novices

For the novices, everything of real importance revolved around the master of novices. Insofar as the master was a member of the larger community, he was subject to the decisions of the rector regarding the general management of the house. Regarding the novices, however, he was responsible only to the provincial. His authority and the scope of his oversight was, therefore, considerable.

He was assisted only by his socius, who was responsible for the mundane issues of housekeeping and general decorum as it pertained to the novices. The novice master usually delegated to him the correction a novice might need. The socius had nothing to do with the novices’ properly spiritual training. That was the master’s exclusive domain.

The master also chose a second-year novice, called a *manuductor*, to act as his channel of communication with the other novices for routine items of business, such as modifications of the daily order. The *manuductor*, who checked in with the master every morning for a few minutes, had a watch and rang many of the bells that punctuated our day. He was in charge of the bulletin board, which we were required to check briefly every morning, and he kept a diary to serve as a guide for following years for the same day or occasion. The diary was also an invaluable source of information for a historian like me.

Only later did I realize how fortunate we were in having William J. Young (1885–1970) as our master, or how important his publications were in the early development in the United States of what is now known as Ignatian spirituality. During his own training as a Jesuit, he spent 1919–1921 in Spain at Sarria (province of Lugo) for part of his theological program before ordination. He spent the next year at Paray-le-Monial in France for his tertianship, the year of final
spiritual training required of Jesuits once they have completed their course of studies. After Paray-le-Monial, he went to Cambridge University for a year, where he read English and classics but did not take a degree. Then, at the end of 1924, he was in Rome, associated there in some way with the American Academy.\textsuperscript{15}

When he returned to the Chicago Province in 1925, he became dean of the juniors at Milford, and in 1934 novice master. He brought to his office a wide experience of the Society of Jesus and of two prestigious academic institutions. While novice master, he continued to act as librarian for the juniors’ library, and was the person principally responsible for the high quality of the collection.

In his years abroad, he had become aware of the newly critical historical approach that the Jesuits, especially in Spain and France, were taking to the spiritual heritage of the Society—an approach of which the American Jesuits were largely ignorant. At a certain point, he decided to call upon his knowledge of Spanish and French to do his part to remedy the situation. We novices were the unwitting beneficiaries of his decision.

In 1949, he published his translation from the French of Fr. Paul Dudon’s (1859–1941) life of Ignatius.\textsuperscript{16} Dudon, a respected and well trained historian, broke new ground in his biography by basing it solidly on the new critical editions of Ignatius’s writings published in the series \textit{Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu} initiated by a group of Spanish Jesuits at the end of the nineteenth century. Dudon’s book dispelled hagiographical myths that until then had enveloped the saint.

Once Dudon was in press, Fr. Young went to work, while we were novices, translating works by Ignatius himself. In 1956, he published, under the title \textit{St. Ignatius’ Own Story}, the first English translation of Ignatius’s personal memoir or autobiography. Today, it is difficult to fathom how and why such a pivotal work

\begin{footnotes}
\item[15] Personal Record, File William J. Young, JARC Chicago, Box 2.0075.
\end{footnotes}
had remained out of circulation since the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{17} He included in the book his translation of a small number of Ignatius’s letters. Three years later, he published a larger collection of Ignatius’s letters—the first sizeable collection to appear in English based on critically edited texts.\textsuperscript{18}

While we were novices, Fr. Louis J. Puhl (1888–1971) spent his summers at Milford while he worked on his new translation of the \emph{Spiritual Exercises}. He and Fr. Young conferred together on the proper way to translate words and expressions in the autograph text. This informal collaboration meant that Fr. Young helped give birth to a translation of the seminal Jesuit text that still ranks as one of the best.\textsuperscript{19} Even after he left the office of novice master, he continued to translate and publish works on Jesuit spirituality that were new on the English-language scene. His translation of Joseph de Guibert’s (1877–1942) history of Jesuit spirituality is especially important.\textsuperscript{20}

As novice master, Fr. Young exercised his responsibility in three principal ways. First, as mentioned, he explained to the novices in Rules Class what it meant to be a Jesuit. He did this by commenting on the rules of the Society as he understood them from his own experience and from his study of new works on Jesuit spirituality being

\begin{quote}
Although as excerpts the rules suffer from being torn out of context, they had the great pedagogical advantage of highlighting some of the most important ideals and crucial elements of “our way of proceeding” in the Society.
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}


\end{footnotes}
produced in Europe. I think we all looked forward to these classes for their substance, but also for the humor and personal anecdotes with which he presented the ideals of the Society. He pounded into us his mantra that a Jesuit was a man of “learning and virtue.”

Second, he led us, by his five talks per day, through the thirty-day retreat. In accordance with the program of the Exercises, most of his talks dealt with episodes in the life of Jesus as related in the four Gospels. Jesus’s life of service to others springing from his deep love for the Father was the model upon which we were to fashion our lives. The “interior life” of our relationship with God was, we learned, the real life.

His third major responsibility was meeting with us individually about every three or four weeks. He asked a few basic questions. How are things going? Any difficulties in your prayer? What are you reading? The conversation was longer or shorter depending upon the answer, but it rarely exceeded ten or fifteen minutes. It bore only the vaguest resemblance to the sophisticated practice of spiritual direction as it developed in Jesuit circles a few decades later.

Inadequate though these sessions may have been in some regards, Fr. Young’s common sense stood us in good stead in the intense atmosphere of the novitiate. If, during a regular conference, a novice raised a major issue such as volunteering for the foreign missions or leaving the novitiate, Fr. Young scheduled for him a time when they could engage in a longer conversation.

V. Rules, Regulations, and Routines

Rules played a big role in our lives as novices. Indeed, “keeping the rule” sometimes seemed to be the essence of religious life and the sure path to sanctity. The custom book for the United States prescribed that, in every house of the Society, the Rules of the Summary and the Common Rules be read from the pulpit at the be-

21 See, as mentioned in note 1 above, the set of instructions for novices by the novice master in Paris in the seventeenth century, in Ranum, Beginning to Be a Jesuit, 44–201.
beginning of every month.22 Besides those rules, the Society had a set of rules for almost every office or category of persons in the Society, such as the provincial, the rector, the librarian, the scholastics, and the cook, up to a total of forty-four such compilations.23 And the novitiate of course had its own rules and regulations.

The term rule stood for three very different things: ideals, job-descriptions, and prescriptions for behaviors to ensure a smooth, considerate, and appropriate mode for our common life together. The Rules of the Summary fall into the first category. They were verbatim excerpts, authored by Ignatius and his executive secretary, Juan Alfonso de Polanco (1517–1576), from the Constitutions of the Society. By the second decade of the Society’s history, Jerónimo Nadal (1507–1580), Ignatius’s trusted roving envoy and best interpreter, provided such excerpts to the communities that he visited around Europe to instruct them in the basic ideals of the brotherhood they had joined. His selections provided the elements standardized in the Rules of the Summary that we read every month.

Although as excerpts the rules suffer from being torn out of context, they had the great pedagogical advantage of highlighting some of the most important ideals and crucial elements of “our way of proceeding” in the Society. Hearing them every month, year after year, worked them into our memories and, it was hoped, into our souls.

The first rule provided the interpretive framework for all the rules that followed:

As it was our Creator and Lord in his sovereign wisdom and goodness who deigned to begin this least Society of Jesus, so it is he who will preserve, govern, and foster its growth in his divine service. On our part, the inner law of charity and love that the Holy Spirit traces and engraves upon the heart will contribute to this end more than any written constitutions. Yet, divine

22 Consuetudinarium, p. 89. On the origin of these two set of rules, see O’Malley, First Jesuits, 337–39.

23 The rules were published in Regulae Societatis Iesu (Rome: Curia Praepositi Generalis, 1935).
providence requires our cooperation. Moreover, since the Vicar of Christ our Lord has so ordained, and the example of the saints and reason itself so teaches us in the Lord, we judge it necessary to draw up Constitutions that will help us advance in the way of God’s service upon which we have entered.

Many of the Rules of the Summary concerned observance of the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, but others ranged more broadly. The third rule, for instance, established the international and mobile character of the Society: “It is according to our vocation to travel to various places and live in any part of the world where there is hope of God’s greater service and the help of souls.” The fourth: “For good reasons, our manner of life is ordinary and should always be regulated with a view to God’s greater service.” Rule 30: “In the taking of bodily refreshment, care must be had that temperance, refinement, and good manners be observed inwardly and outwardly in every detail.” Rule 46: “Excessive care for one’s health is to be reprehended, but a moderate care to preserve our health and strength of body is praiseworthy and should be exercised by all.”

This sampling of the Rules of the Summary suggests, I hope, their special character. They formed the substance of the materials the novice master treated in Rules Class. They provided him with excellent talking points to explain the ideals for which the novices should strive as members of the Society. They at the same time allowed him to explain to them the manner and the restraints of the life the novices had chosen.

The rules for the different categories of persons were, as mentioned, essentially job-descriptions, some of which originated in the early decades of the Society, but which were modified and expanded as the years rolled on. The only rules in that collection that affected us directly were the rules for the master of novices, of which a version had been formulated as early as
They spelled out in considerable detail his duties in our regard, but we were barely aware of their existence.

We were, however, very much aware of the rules that directly affected our behavior on almost a daily basis. Among them, the Common Rules held pride of place because they in substance represented the rules Ignatius himself drew up for his community in Rome. The first rule insisted that everybody should spend the time prescribed for meditation, prayer, reading, and examination of conscience, and the second that everyone should be present at Mass daily. Rule 12 specified that “no one should leave his room without being properly clad,” and rule 13 insisted that personal cleanliness was expected of all. And so they went.

Although not prescribed in the custom book, at Milford the Rules of Modesty were also read at the beginning of the month. They were a set of counsels authored by Ignatius as a Jesuit version of the many books of etiquette produced in the era. The eleventh rule sums up their purpose: “In a word, the way we act and bear ourselves should be such as to make others better for having met us.”

Read from the pulpit in the refectory at the beginning of every month along with the three sets of rules was Ignatius’s famous “Letter on Obedience.” As was true with other important documents in the spirituality of the Society, the letter was never relativized for us by being placed in the context of the serious crisis in the Society that originally occasioned it or in the context of Ignatius’s other writings that bore on obedience. Although the importance of the letter for an understanding of the Jesuit vocation is incontestable, the emphasis shortchanged other aspects of Ignatius’s vision for the Society.

Reading the letter in almost the same breath with the rules enhanced the dignity and significance of even the Common Rules and,

24 See Regulae Societatis Jesu, 194–220, for the novice master, and 221–24 for the socius. For a transcription of the 1553 version, see Ruiz Jurado, Origines, 216–21.

25 For the context, see O’Malley, The First Jesuits, 329–33.
indeed, of all other rules and regulations. It at the same time tended to reduce obedience to observance of rules.

At Milford, there were many rules for the novices that were much more specific than the Common Rules. During these two years, for instance, we did not use our first names, but referred to ourselves and to each other as Carissime: Latin, vocative mood, for the biblical expression, “dearly beloved.” I was Carissime O’Malley. Only after we had pronounced our vows and moved to the juniors’ side of the house did we resume using first names.

We wore the cassock at all times in the house, except when doing manualia. Outside of the house—on the Thursday walks, visits to the doctor, etc.—we wore our civilian clothes, jacket, and tie. No eating between meals except for the afternoon haustus. No touching one another, which included handshakes and pats on the back.

On our Thursday walks and during separatio, we faithfully observed being together in threes. No one ever explained to us the reasons for this rule, but it accomplished three purposes. First, it helped prevent the formation of cliques, which in fact did not develop among us. It also forced us to get to know every one of the other novices by the regular turn-over of the three members. Finally, it was meant, as we later figured out, to forestall the development of “particular friendships.”

The ideal held up to us was to be equally friendly with all and especially friendly with none. Particular friendships violated the norm because they implied an exclusivity that was improper in community life. In those more innocent and discreet times, most of us had no idea that, for those in the know, the term had romantic connotations. We would have been shocked to find that out.

We each had another novice as an “admonition partner,” who was assigned to us on a rotating basis. In the late afternoon once a week in the first few minutes assigned for reading The Imitation of Christ, we met in the dormitory or in the hallway to tell the other anything we noticed that was amiss in his behavior. Perhaps he ate too fast or needed to wash his cassock more often. This was the level of comment that was expected. During these encounters, laughter was often heard.
Also, once a week during the academic year, we participated in the *Exercitium Modestiae*—the Latin jargon for one of the several traditions borrowed directly from the monastic tradition. We all assembled in a semi-circle in the large assembly room. The master of novices sat at a desk facing us. Three novices, one after the other, knelt in the center of the floor facing Fr. Young, while the rest of us had a chance to mention anything improper or annoying in their behavior.

Most often novices simply passed when it came their turn to speak. The whole *Exercitium* generally lasted about fifteen or twenty minutes. Fr. Young made sure the comments remained on the level of observable behavior and did not devolve into character analysis or anything similar. Even so, for the novice on his knees, the experience was anything but pleasant.

If we so wished, we had the opportunity to confess to the whole community something improper or embarrassing that we had done, such as speaking out of turn or breaking something through carelessness. The minister of the house stood at the door of the refectory as we entered for dinner. If a novice wanted to make such a confession, called a *culpa* (Latin, "fault, failing"), he simply asked him, "*Culpa?*" If the minister nodded, the novice knelt before the priests’ table, extended his arms, and, after the grace, said the formula:

> Dear Fathers and Brothers, I say to you my *culpa* for all my faults and failings in the observance of our holy Rule, and especially for [whatever he had done]. For the same, holy obedience has imposed on me the slight penance of declaring to you my fault and kissing the feet of a member of the community.26

The novice then stood, went to a nearby table and kissed the feet of a novice, and then took a place at table. With that, the reader began the passage from Scripture, and the servers went to work serving the meal.

At most dinners, two or three novices or juniors "took *culpas,“ which made it a routine feature of life at Milford that we casually took

---

26 This was a slight variation on the formula prescribed in the *Consuetudinarium*, appendix 2, p. 65, n. 250; see also p. 31, n. 132.
for granted. On extremely rare occasions, the novice master or, more often, the socius, ordered a novice to take a *culpa* for something he had done. The formula in such cases was slightly different, and when it was heard it resulted in a few indiscreetly lifted eyebrows.

On Fridays, the minister could also give permission to eat dinner at *parva mensa* (Latin, “small table”): a table from which the chairs had been removed. If the minister nodded, the novice or junior could take one of the places and eat his meal on his knees. For us who spent hours keeling every day, this penance was less uncomfortable than it seems, but it did require a new skill-set for managing the knife and fork at that unconventional angle.

One of the innovations of the Society of Jesus in its founding years was the absence of any austerities binding by rule, but Jesuits were of course free to make use of fasting, the discipline, and other traditional forms of bodily penance. One of the rudest shocks that I experienced in my first few days at Milford was learning from Fr. Young that, although it was “voluntary,” we were expected to wear the chain two mornings a week and take the discipline two evenings a week, just before going to bed.

The chain was a kind of belt made of light wire that had blunt edges turned inward. On the specified mornings, we fastened the chain around our waist against our skin as we dressed. We took it off only when we returned to our cubicles after breakfast. We were warned not to fasten it so tight that it punctured the skin. It was of course uncomfortable; but, unless fastened tightly, not really painful.

The discipline was a little whip made of rough twine. It measured about two feet, half of which was the handle and the rest was four tails. On the specified evenings, as we were undressing for bed, the lead novice in the dormitory struck his pillow hard. That was the signal for us to put the discipline to work, beating ourselves with it over the shoulder as hard or as lightly as we wished. After five or ten seconds, the novice struck his pillow a second time, the signal to stop. It was impossible to harm oneself; but, if one got carried away with a sudden burst of fervor, it could really hurt. If a novice felt inspired
to practice a penance beyond the chain and discipline, such as fasting, he required the permission of the master.

A Jesuit friend of mine who had been a novice at Milford a few years after me told me years later the he had refused to do these penances. Since they were voluntary, he told the master of novices at the time, he chose not to do them. The master tried to persuade him but to no avail. And that was the end of it—yes, the penances really were voluntary!

Besides our stints reading from the pulpit during meals, we once during our second year had to ascend the pulpit during supper on a Saturday evening and deliver a sermon that we had composed on the Virgin Mary—a Marianum. The socius oversaw this exercise. His major task was to ensure that we did not make complete fools of ourselves. Delivering our Marianum was for us novices even more intimidating than our weeks in the pulpit as readers.

The major non-scheduled events of the novitiate were the departures of those who decided that life in the Society of Jesus was not for them or who were told by Fr. Young that it was not for them. We were, from the moment we entered, made fully aware that the novitiate door swung open for anybody who wanted to walk out it, and we certainly expected that some in our number would take that option. Nonetheless, each departure jolted us into a sharp confrontation with the reality of our own decision to stay.

Departures happened in the blink of an eye. All at once, a cubicle was empty, with all signs of the previous tenant gone. No goodbyes were said, no explanations given. At recreation that day, novices whose cubicles were in the same dormitory with Carissime Jones or Carissime Smith of course saw that he had left, and they spread the word. That was it. This was a neat and clean way to handle departures, but exceedingly strange.

Towards the end of our second year, those of us who stayed awaited hearing from Fr. Young that the provincial had approved us for vows. Once that happened, a day was set for the extremely simple ceremony. During the regular community Mass at 6:30
a.m., we each in turn, kneeling in front of the rector, pronounced our vows in Latin just before we received Holy Communion. The only other distinctive feature of the Mass that day was the singing by members of a choir made up of a few juniors. There were no guests. Our families read about it in the letters that we sent to them.

But it was a great feast day for the Milford community. The rector gave permission for talking at breakfast, and hilarity followed. Then came recreation or free time for the rest of the morning. At noon, an especially festive meal was served, after which the novices and juniors spent several hours together in games and conversation. By that time, those who had pronounced vows that morning had moved their belongings to a cubicle identical with the one they had left, but on the juniors’ side of the house. The novitiate was over, but life at Milford continued for another two years.

VI. The Spiritual Culture

As must be clear by now, monastic traditions, especially seclusion from “the world”, framed our experience at Milford. Grounding that framework, however, was a spirituality more proper to the Society of Jesus, especially as articulated in the Spiritual Exercises and the novice master’s classes on Jesuit life.

In between these two defining traditions lay a number of others that were presumed to be appropriate for training novices for their future life in the Society of Jesus. Implicit in some of these traditions was a formalism and even a moralist legalism inculcating precise observance of rituals and regulations. In keeping with the popular Catholic culture of the day, certain prayers and practices related to the Virgin Mary and the other saints played a large role in our ideal of the devout life.

This mix of traditions, some of which might seem incompatible with one or more of the others, was a result of the remarkable capaciousness of Roman Catholicism to absorb traditions into itself without much regard for sorting them out. Two factors contributed to the capaciousness.

27 See Consuetudinaria, pp. 11–12.
The first was an unsophisticated historical consciousness that rendered permeable the boundaries between traditions that were distinctive products of certain times and cultures. The second—more difficult to describe—was the impulse to synthesis based on the persuasion that good things all worked together for the same good result.

The books that each of us novices had on his desk provide an entrance into the different aspects of this mix as found in the spiritual culture at Milford. We of course had a copy of the Exercises, which was meant to be the touchstone for our spiritual lives. The Exercises themselves reflected the Catholic impulse to borrow earlier traditions for one’s purposes. Ignatius drew most of the elements of his book from practices of late-medieval piety. However, he modified and transformed them to produce a book that, for all its cut-and-paste appearance, was new and original. From our experience of the Exercises, we learned with utter clarity that the focus of our spiritual life was Christ, despite the role that the saints might also play in it.

Almost as a companion piece, we had a copy of the Bible. In 1943, Pope Pius XII (1876–1958) published his landmark encyclical, Divino Afflante Spiritu, which, among other things, encouraged Bible reading among Catholics. While making the Exercises, we used the New Testament for the many meditations on the life of Christ, and we used it at other times during the year to prepare points for prayer. On one level, the Bible formed the very center of our spiritual lives. On another, it was simply one book among many.

More frequently in our hands, because it was a daily part of our late-afternoon exercise, was our copy of The Imitation of Christ, a book that enjoyed a venerable place in the traditions of the Society. Ignatius specifically recommends it for reading
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Although Rodriguez doubtless helped us get our bearings in the new life we had chosen, the stories that he adduced to confirm a point often struck us as naïve or outlandish.

---

during the Exercises (n. 100), and the Jesuits of his and later generations promoted the book in almost every place they found themselves.²⁹

The *Imitation* was redolent of monastic values. It extolled the solitary sweetness of the monk’s cell. It never mentioned ministry as a constitutive element of the Christian calling. When the author affirmed that “those who travel much seldom achieve holiness” (1:23), he was practically contradicted by the Jesuit *Constitutions*, which state that “our vocation is to travel through the world and to live in any part of it where there is hope of greater service to God and of help of souls.”³⁰

Despite such discrepancies, the Jesuits, reading it less with an analytical and critical mind than with the hope of utilizing what was congruous with their spirituality, found in it a great deal that was, in fact, congruous. In essence, the *Imitation* was a call to inwardness. The very title of its fourth book, “The Book of Consolation,” correlated with the Jesuits’ stress on inner consolation as a touchstone of the presence of God, as expounded in the “Rules for the Discernment of Spirits” in the *Exercises* (nn. 313–44). In any case, the *Imitation* was part of our daily fare, and we accepted it without question or analysis. It was a spiritual classic, and that was enough for us.

As mentioned earlier, we each had our copy of the *Missale Romanum*, which we took with us to Mass every morning and replaced on our desks when we returned from breakfast. However, there was an even smaller book, the *Liber Devotionum*, that most of us carried in the pockets of our cassocks and pulled out for private use probably several times a day.³¹ As the title page states, the *Liber*, “compiled

²⁹ See ibid., 264–66.


by an anonymous Father of the Missouri Province,” was specifically intended “for use by the scholastics of the Society of Jesus.”

The Liber contained about two hundred prayers, some in Latin, many more in English, crammed into its 453 little pages. It was divided into sections, such as morning prayers, evening prayers, prayers before and prayers after Holy Communion, prayers to the Holy Spirit, to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, to the Virgin Mary, to Saint Joseph, to the Holy Angels, to Saints Ignatius and Francis Xavier and to each of the canonized saints of the Society, prayers for a happy death, and so forth. In short, there was something in the Liber to meet everyone’s devotional preference—a perfect reflection of the general state of Catholic piety worldwide in those days.

To help us in preparing points for our meditation the next morning, we had on our desks the two volumes of meditations “for every day of the year” by Bruno Vercruysse (1797–1880), a Flemish Jesuit who first published the work in the middle of the nineteenth century. The two volumes ran to over 1,200 pages.

Every meditation contained three points or topics, each of which began with a consideration, usually a synopsis of a scene from the Gospels. Then came an application, which was a practical lesson derived from the consideration, such as “This is the way to secure ourselves from vainglory. Have we always done so?” The point concluded with a resolution, such as “To watch diligently over our words and actions.” At the end of the three points, the meditation concluded with a colloquy or conversation with Jesus, or Mary, or another saint. Although the meditations often worked to inspire sentiments such a love, hope, and generosity of spirit, they just as often moralized the subject and inculcated moral striving.

We were free to use the Vercruysse volumes as much or as little as we liked, but we did not have the same freedom regarding the three

33 Vercruysse, New Practical Meditations, 2.250.
34 Vercruysse, New Practical Meditations, 2.264.
volumes by Alonso Rodriguez, which also rested on our desks.\textsuperscript{35} For a
half hour every day, except Thursdays and Sundays, we slowly made
our way through the volumes of the English translation, reading the
entire work two, three, or more times in the course of the two years
depending on how fast we read. We were in fact encouraged to read it
slowly and meditatively in order to absorb its lessons.

Rodriguez himself was several times master of novices and
rector of Jesuit communities in Spain. The book was based on ex-
hortations he delivered to the Jesuit community at Córdoba between
1589 and 1595. It was first published in Seville in 1609 and was an
immediate success, as certified by translations into English (partial,
1612), French and Italian (1617), Latin (1621), German (1623), and
Dutch (1626). No later than 1685, it was required reading in the
novitiate in Paris, and I think we can assume that it had achieved
that status in novitiates of the Society much earlier.\textsuperscript{36} In time, other
religious communities adopted it for their novices.

Several features of the book account for its success. Rodriguez
wrote in a limpid and easily accessible style. He drew upon the main-
stream of the tradition of Christian asceticism and avoided contro-
versial matters. Most important, he provided in the first two parts
of the book a reasonably comprehensive treatment of the basics of
religious life, with chapters, for instance, on silence, mortification,
humility, recollection, prayer, temptation, and love of the Lord.

Although Rodriguez doubtless helped us get our bearings in
the new life we had chosen, the stories that he adduced to confirm
a point often struck us as naïve or outlandish. They provided us
with an almost inexhaustible source of mirth, as we recounted the
stories for one another during recreation.

\textsuperscript{35} See John Patrick Donnelly, "Alonso Rodriguez' Ejercicio: A Neglected Classic,"
Louis Dupré and Don E. Saliers (New York: Crossroad 1989): 3–27, at 14–5; and the entry
in Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús, eds. Charles E. O'Neill and Joaquín M.

\textsuperscript{36} See Ranum, Beginning to Be a Jesuit, 93, 95.
Like Alice’s medicine in Wonderland, there were so many good things in Rodriguez’s pages that there was something to fit everybody’s needs. Rodriguez was strong on generalities, weak on analysis. The traditional counsels with which the book abounded were often irreconcilable with one another and lacked both theological foundation and historical discrimination. He drew heavily on John Cassian’s *Conferences*, an early fifth-century collection of monastic lore.

The first two parts thus reveal a remarkable phenomenon: how easily Jesuits from the earliest years of the Society saw their spirituality as consonant with much that was more proper to anchorite and monastic traditions. The third part, however, purported to treat the spirituality of the Society of Jesus itself, which it did under seven headings: (1) the end of the Institute of the Society, (2) the vows of religion, (3) the vow of poverty, (4) the vow of chastity, (5) the virtue of obedience, (6) manifestation of conscience, and (7) fraternal correction.

With a few exceptions, such as the manifestation of conscience, there is little in this part that is specific to the Society of Jesus. Strikingly absent are features that today we consider distinctive of the Jesuit tradition and proper to it. Rodriguez assumes, it seems, an experience of the Spiritual Exercises, but he never indicates how central the Exercises are to the ethos of the Society of Jesus. He explains the three traditional vows but bypasses the crucial “fourth vow” that “concerns missions”—the most pointed expression of the outgoing character of the Jesuit vocation.

For further grounding in Jesuit ideals, we had to look elsewhere. And, thus, also on our desk was *Commentary on the Rules of the Society of Jesus* by Fr. August Coemans (1864–1940), first published in Rome in Latin in 1938. Fr. Coemans intended his *Commentary* to support and supplement the instructions on the same matter given by the novice masters of the Society. In its
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methods and categories, his book reflects Catholic intellectual culture of the time.

Neo-Scholastic presuppositions structure Fr. Coemans’s approach. He then supports his explanations and interpretations with canon law, decrees of Jesuit general congregations, and letters of popes and fathers general of the Society, which give his comments a legalistic cast. He occasionally makes use in proof-texting fashion of primary documents from the founding years of the Society, at that time recently published by the Jesuit Historical Institute (IHSI) in Rome. Despite its methodological weaknesses, Fr. Coemans’s book did provide a basic explanation of what the rules were meant to achieve. I am fairly certain, however, that few of us ever bothered to read much of it, and I do not recall Fr. Young ever referring us to it.

Those were the books we had at our disposal. Just as important for understanding the spiritual culture at Milford were the books that were not at our disposal, but that are rightly central to the training that novices receive today. I am thinking, of course, of Ignatius’s “Autobiography,” the translation of the Constitutions by Fr. George Ganss (1905–2000), critical histories of the Society, and similar works.

It was principally on Fr. Young, therefore, that responsibility fell for teaching us the ideals of the Society and helping us interiorize them. I recall nothing specific from Rules Class. I kept no notes from them, and I have not found any of Fr. Young’s papers that might jog my memory. I can say, however, that his approach bore no resemblance to Coemans. His was humane, and made living the ideals that were underlying the rules seem possible, attractive, and satisfying.

Nor do I recall anything specific from his talks during the thirty-day retreat except that he did not present the retreat as an occasion for moral improvement, but as an encounter with God and an encounter with ourselves. He insisted that the retreat was not meant to be the occasion for re-examining our decision to enter the Society, but rather a life-changing experience confirming our decision and preparing us to live our Jesuit vocation to the full.
Although we acquired a clear idea of what our vocation as Jesuits was, we only in the most unformulated way realized that there was something like a distinctive Jesuit or Ignatian spirituality. Those categories came into focus and circulation later; and, in the English-speaking world, they did so at first due in good part, as I mentioned, to Fr. Young’s translations.

We returned to the Exercises again in June, when the entire community went into retreat for eight days, led by a Jesuit of the Chicago Province from outside the Milford community. This was our only sustained exposure to the spiritual life provided by somebody besides Fr. Young. With the other members of the community, we gathered several times a day in the community chapel following a timetable similar to that of the long retreat. The Jesuit leading the retreat invariably announced that he was available for anybody who wished to see him; but, with some hundred making the retreat, few could take advantage of the offer.

Along with the rules and routines, these books and experiences constituted the spiritual culture that we experienced for our two years as novices. We accepted them without question or complaint, and were convinced they were the best formula for helping us become ideal Jesuits. Helping us accept them was our assumption that they had always been and always would be.

Epilogue: Twenty Years Later

By 1968, the novitiate program that we had assumed to be everlasting had begun to change. It continued to change for a few more years until it received the basic forms that it has today. To account for this extraordinary happening, three questions need to be answered. First, why and how did the program we experienced come into being so early in the Society’s history and last so long? Second, what were the factors that in the first sixty years of the twentieth century gave rise to questions about the adequacy of the traditional program? Third, what are the salient features of the present program and what is the justification for having them?
By 1539, Ignatius and his companions had decided to found a new religious order. They intended that it would have certain features that distinguished it from the mendicant orders of the Middle Ages. But those orders served as the model for their new order in one crucial regard: like the mendicants, and unlike monks in monasteries, the Jesuits committed themselves to active ministry in a missionary mode.

The Jesuits’ commitment to ministry was different from the mendicants’, however, in that it was more clearly articulated in their foundational documents and, hence, more radical and self-defining. It consequently influenced more pervasively their ethos and, in ways great and small, their way of proceeding. Unlike the mendicants, for instance, the Jesuits would not chant or recite the Liturgy of the Hours in choir, they would not wear a distinctive religious habit, and they would retain their family names. Such features, which seem almost inconsequential to us today, raised a storm of outrage against this new order and, in some influential quarters, won for it a reputation as an institution destined to destroy religious life in the church. The criticism put the Jesuits on the defensive and rendered them eager to show to the world that they conformed to the traditions that befit a religious order.

Plaza argued from his own experience that the greater need for those newly introduced to life in the Society was to tend to themselves rather than to others.

It was against this background that Ignatius and his colleagues gradually developed their model for the training of new recruits to the Society. They quickly came to see that recruits needed an intensive program of indoctrination in a setting reserved for them, as was true of the older orders. As Ignatius’s executive secretary, Juan de Polanco, studied the rules and constitutions of other religious orders in preparation for the writing of the Jesuit Constitutions, he learned of their programs for their novices, and his findings contributed to the construction of the profile of the Jesuit novitiate. By the time Ignatius died in 1556, Jesuit novitiates had in large measure come to resemble those of the mendicants, and a highly-regulated discipline for those institutions was already well on its way to codification.
But there were two key differences from the model then in possession. The *Constitutions* (nn. 64–79) legislated that novices undergo “six experiences” (*sex experimenta*) that were new, distinctive, and foundational.\(^{38}\) The first was the experience of the full thirty-day Spiritual Exercises. For us today it is difficult to realize how ground-breaking the Exercises were, and it is therefore difficult to realize how distinctive they made the Jesuit program.

Previous orders had nothing like them. Their novice masters surely trained their novices in prayer and devotion, but they had no program so intentionally and comprehensively designed to enable their recruits to take stock of themselves and, as the Jesuits put it, to foster in them a “personal” relationship with God.

The other five experiences were geared to prepare the novice for an active life of ministry and to test whether he was apt for it. They included, for instance, a month serving in a hospital, a month on pilgrimage, and another teaching catechism. But, symptomatic though the experiences were of the central feature of the Jesuit vocation, they began to disappear from the novitiate program even during Ignatius’s lifetime.

In any case, as Fr. Philip Endean (*br1*) has shown, their early devolution cannot be explained simply as reactionary. He cites the memorandum of Fr. Juan de la Plaza (1527–1602), novice master at Córdoba, sent to Fr. Diego Laínez (1512–1565) at the time of the First General Congregation in 1558. Plaza argued from his own experience that the greater need for those newly introduced to life in the Society was to tend to themselves rather than to others. The novices needed to be trained in recollection and prayer to such a degree that they could maintain them when later engaged in active ministry, and this is something that is achieved only with great difficulty if the person is busy in ministry from the start.\(^{39}\)

No matter the arguments and no matter their validity, the experiences soon became confined to the novitiate compound.
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Moreover, by the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, novitiates (especially in the United States) tended to be located in the countryside, sometimes because they were less costly, but also because they were well-isolated from city throngs.

Despite Plaza’s memorandum, we cannot assume that even the experience of the thirty-day Exercises always played the crucial role in the training of novices that Ignatius intended. In the late 1560s, for instance, Nadal discovered Jesuits in Germany who had never made any part of them.\(^{40}\) We have seen, moreover, the negligible role they play in Rodriguez’s text, and there is no trace of them in the set of instructions for novices that survive from the Paris novitiate later in the seventeenth century.\(^ {41}\)

Jesuits were consistently aware they had a “way of proceeding” and certain practices, such as the manifestation of conscience and the absence of communal recitation or chanting of the liturgical hours, that distinguished them from other religious orders. But they did not have a developed awareness that these and other features of their tradition provided elements of a distinctive spirituality. Only in the twentieth century did that awareness become sharp, as the result of a newly-keen historical perspective and the availability for the first time in history of the full range of the pertinent historical sources.

Even before Milford was founded, therefore, a new, more critical approach to the history and spirituality of the Society, to which I have several times alluded, was under way. It focused especially on the first generation—on Ignatius and his closest colleagues. This development provided much of the impetus and justification for the novitiate programs of today that differ so markedly from the earlier model. It also provided the impetus and justification for a related reality: the emergence of a distinctive spiritual and newly articulated profile for the Society of Jesus.\(^{42}\)

\(^{40}\) See O’Malley, The First Jesuits, 362.

\(^{41}\) See Ranum, Beginning to be a Jesuit.

The condition for the possibility of such developments was accessibility to the pertinent sources. That accessibility, well under way by 1925, the year of Milford’s founding, was provided by the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*. The *Monumenta* is the magnificent series of volumes containing critical editions of all the documentation that survives from the first Jesuits, and a great deal has survived—for instance, twelve volumes of Ignatius’s correspondence, seven volumes of Laínez’s correspondence, and five volumes of Nadal’s letters and lectures. Such documents provided the grounding from which almost everything later followed.

Spanish Jesuits founded the *Monumenta* at the very end of the nineteenth century, and had by the 1920s published most of the most important documents from the founding years. Spanish Jesuits such as Fr. Antonio Astrain (1857–1928) were among the first important Jesuit authors to apply critical methods to the interpretation of Jesuit history.

In 1929, the *Monumenta* moved from Madrid to the Jesuit Curia in Rome. Although Spaniards continued to dominate among the scholars associated with the enterprise, Jesuits from other parts of the Society became valuable collaborators. In 1932, they launched their semi-annual journal, *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*. The lead article in the first number, which was authored by the Italian Jesuit Fr. Pietro Tacchi-Venturi (1861–1956), was on the hospital experiment required of novices in the *Constitutions*. The article was a harbinger of today’s renewed attention to that document and to its implications for the present.43 It was, more specifically, a harbinger of the large role that the experiments play today in the training of novices.

Work on the *Monumenta* continued. Fr. Ignacio Iparraguirre (1911–1973) edited the volume dealing with the directories for the Exercises, which began with notes from Ignatius himself and continued until the publication in 1599 of the official edition. Fr. Iparraguirre quite understandably, therefore, turned his attention to the history of how the Exercises were actually given in those early years.
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Between 1946 and 1973, he published three volumes tracing the history in detail from 1522 into the seventeenth century.\footnote{Each of Iparraguirre’s three volumes has a slightly different title: \textit{Practica de los Ejercicios de san Ignacio de Loyola en vida de su autor} (1522–1556) (Rome: IHSI, 1946); \textit{Historia de los Ejercicios de san Ignacio} (1556–1599) (Rome: IHSI, 1955); and \textit{Historia de los ejercicios de san Ignacio: Evolución en Europa durante el siglo XVII} (Rome: IHSI, 1973).} This led him in 1954 to write a small book, \textit{How to Give the Spiritual Exercises: Practical Notes}. Although he did not explicitly call for a personally-guided form of them, he insisted that the director get to know the persons making the retreat and visit them in their rooms to inquire how they were doing.\footnote{Ignacio Iparraguirre, \textit{How to Give a Retreat: Practical Notes}, trans. Angelo Benedetti (Bombay: St. Xavier’s High School, 1959), especially 39–40 and 47. Spanish original, 1954.}

Thus, by the late 1950s, the development of the individually-guided retreat that is common today—and that differs so very much from the way that I and my contemporaries experienced the Exercises at Milford—was beginning to take shape.\footnote{See Tom Shufflebotham, “Ignatian Directed Retreats: The Dark Ages?” \textit{The Way} 49, no. 3 (July 2010): 109–20.} Fr. Paul Kennedy (1903–1988), tertian instructor at Saint Bueno’s in Wales from 1958 to 1974, was important for its diffusion in the English-speaking world. Of all the differences from those days, the individually-guided retreat must rank as among the most significant.

Long before Iparraguirre, French Jesuits began taking the lead in turning historical-critical methods to spirituality. Joseph de Guibert (1877–1942) was a pivotal figure.\footnote{See the entry, \textit{Diccionario Histórico}, 2:1839–1840; Maurice Giuliani, “Une histoire de la spiritualité de la Compagnie de Jésus,” \textit{Christus} 1, no. 3 (1954): 133–44; and John W. O’Malley, “De Guibert and Jesuit Authenticity,” \textit{Woodstock Letters} 95 (1966): 103–10.} In 1919, he founded the \textit{Revue d’Ascétique et de Mystique}, the first journal dedicated to the critical study of spirituality, and in 1932, he played an important role in founding of the magnificent \textit{Dictionnaire de spiritualité}, whose final volume appeared only in 1995, which is an indication of the mature and careful research characteristic of the entries.

In de Guibert’s history of Jesuit spirituality, published in French posthumously in 1953 and then translated by Fr. Young, he
showed that Ignatius was a true mystic, and he thereby broke a tradition of interpretation that saw the saint almost exclusively as a teacher of obedience, self-discipline, and self-abnegation. According to de Guibert, Ignatius drew his spiritual teaching from his own experience, and the result was a “mysticism of service.”

By the 1950s, French Jesuits were pursuing in earnest the study of Jesuit spirituality. When in 1954 they launched the quarterly journal *Christus*, their influential and highly-regarded journal of spirituality with special attention to the Jesuits, a great turning-point had been reached. Although the articles in the journal were based on solid scholarship, they were meant for a non-professional readership. A regular and particularly helpful feature of the journal was the publication in French of short, important, but forgotten texts from the early Society, such as the surviving remnant of Ignatius’s spiritual journal.48

Just four years later, in 1958, Fr. Young published his translation of seventeen seminal articles that had already appeared in the journal. In so doing, he unmistakably called attention to the journal’s importance.49 Among the articles in the book were two on the discernment of spirits, an indication of a new significance being given to this key aspect of the *Spiritual Exercises* and a key aspect in what was coming to be known as Ignatian spirituality.

In this way, elements of the developments in Europe filtered into the United States and helped stimulate new initiatives there. The American provincials entrusted to Fr. Ganss the task of supervising the publication of a new series entitled *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, the first issue of which appeared in 1969. The fact that the provincials saw to the creation of *Studies* when they did highlights the keen interest in the subject then taking hold. The title assigned to the series, we need to note, was not Jesuit spirituality or Ignatian spirituality but rather the spirituality of Jesuits, which suggests a

48 *Christus* 1, no. 3 (1954): 77–96.

certain indeterminacy. The title thus represents a step along the way in a situation that was fast evolving.

Fr. Ganss had also taken over editorship of the recently-founded Institute of Jesuit Sources (IJS), and began work on his English translation of the Constitutions, published in 1970. It was the first vernacular translation in any language, and a landmark work that almost single-handedly rescued the document from the obscurity in which it had languished for centuries.

Also in 1971, a group of Jesuits from the New England Province, headed by William J. Connolly (1925–2013) and William A. Barry (unen), founded in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the Center for Religious Development to train spiritual directors. Small though it was, the Center was the first such institution in the world offering a professionalized program. It was symbol and symptom of the turn in spiritual practice that was taking place. Similarly symbolic and symptomatic was the creation in several provinces at about the same time of centers to train non-Jesuits specifically as directors of the Exercises.

The Germans were also at work. Hugo Rahner (1900–1968) published a study of Ignatius’s spirituality that appeared in English in 1953. Among his brother Karl’s many writings that touched on the subject, his essay on obedience that originally appeared in 1956 in Stimmen der Zeit was particularly important. In it, he put obedience in a newly comprehensive human context and thereby reduced the perfervid rhetoric that often adorned it.

Karl Rahner (1904–1984) was a philosophical theologian, not a historian. In his essay, he does not mention a single historical document, not even Ignatius’s “Letter on Obedience,” but the essay provided a helpful lens through which to view such documents. When he described obedience as the commitment of oneself to an abiding
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way of life in imitation of Christ, he effectively countered the idea that “keeping the rule” consisted in perfect conformity to minute regulations of discipline. The essay had considerable impact.

No later than 1965, therefore, a new and more precise profile of the spirituality of Ignatius and other early Jesuits had begun to emerge. The four-hundred-year distance and the new historical methods had sharpened interpreters’ eyes. The new perspectives and methods enabled them to consider the early Jesuits in their historical context and thus provided the condition that allowed elements in their spirituality to emerge with a distinctiveness that escaped the early Jesuits themselves.

It was in fact in 1965 that over two hundred Jesuits from around the world met in Rome for General Congregation 31, which lasted from May 7 until July 15, and then from September 8 until November 17 of the following year. The meeting was required by the death of Fr. General Jean-Baptiste Janssens (1889–1964); but besides having to elect a new general, the congregation had to bring the Society into conformity with the decisions of Vatican Council II, which had concluded on December 8, 1965.

The council’s decree on religious life, Perfectae Caritatis, mandated first “a return to . . . the primitive inspiration of the institute,” and second, “adaptation to the changed conditions of our time” (n 2). These two steps were simply specifications of the council’s principles in dealing with all aspects of the Christian tradition: ressourcement (“return to the sources”) and aggiornamento (“updating”).

In the Society, the return to the sources had been under way for six decades; but the council’s decree gave the Society permission to put its findings into practice. The further task was to coordinate that undertaking with the updating that the council ordered and that many Jesuits were already convinced needed to be done.

These two steps were not as straightforward as they sounded, even though at the time few persons seem to have realized it. “Return to the sources” is always partial and conditioned by the culture of the persons making the return. The return is therefore, by definition, also an “updating,” by force of the simple fact of being formulated within
and being received by the contemporary culture. Reformers see in the sources only what their times allow them to see, and those who receive the reform interpret it and reshape it with their own concerns.

Updating is similar in that it perforce takes place through a process that is almost by definition creative, because it entails integrating a past reality into a present reality. The integrating process puts two things together, which perforce results in something that is at least somewhat new. No renaissance in history has ever perfectly reproduced the reality it purported to reproduce. Every renaissance has been creative.

In any case, in response to Perfectae Caritatis, the congregation issued several decrees that had a bearing on the training of novices; but decree 8, “The Spiritual Formation of Jesuits,” had a section dealing specifically with them (nn. 91–116). Although the provisions in that section are general and might today look innocuous, several of them significantly modified the regime we had experienced at Milford. For instance, the novices were to maintain appropriate contact with friends and family. Also, they were to be assisted in their spiritual growth by others besides the novice master. Furthermore, they were to undergo all the experiences specified in the Constitutions and, in general, were to be given responsibilities that would assist a growth in maturity. And number 107 ordered that, “as far as possible,” the novitiates should not be located in remote areas.

With that, provincials and novice masters set to work implementing what the council and the congregation had required. Although the results were different in different parts of the Society, novitiates worldwide developed regimens and programs that despite the fundamental continuities made the training at Milford between 1946 and 1948 look like an alien from a distant planet that had landed on earth.52
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LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Editor:

I would like to thank Studies for this wonderful issue on concelebration. I read it eagerly and was quite edified by the conversation. As someone who always feels a bit awkward asking to concelebrate whenever I visit a new Jesuit community, I appreciate Fr. James Conn’s contribution. I look forward to the day when I won’t feel so uncomfortable concelebrating in Jesuit communities.

I live in an unusual community where we all concelebrate together every day. It has been a tremendous blessing to me. My own anecdotal experience, like that of Fr. Conn’s, is that many Jesuits would like to concelebrate but feel uncomfortable asking because they end up feeling marked out or labeled as “conservative” Jesuits. Or, I am often told that this is not the “custom of the house”—a very inappropriate response, in my opinion. But of course, because I feel conscience-bound—and desire to—concelebrate Mass every day, I often end up participating in the congregation and then celebrating an individual Mass, which is very far from ideal, as both Fr. Conn and Fr. Baldovin agree.

However, I did not feel well represented by Fr. Conn’s arguments. He accurately relates the church’s position, but he does not provide a theology to support it, despite his avowal of the necessity of doing so (p. 36). The reason why I concelebrate every day is not only because I feel obliged by church law to do so, but also because I think that it is the most theologically appropriate thing for me to do.

On this point, I go back to a wonderful article by Yves Congar that I read while in theology studies. For Congar, the essence of the priesthood, both baptismal and ministerial, is not uniquely liturgical. Its essence is to offer spiritual sacrifice—to join with Christ in offering sacrifice to God. A lay Christian is *consecrated* to offer sacrifice, and a priest is *ordained* to offer sacrifice. A priest, even beyond his sacramental activity, has the priestly task continuously “to stimulate participation in the sacrifice of Christ within the Church.”¹ That is his mission in

conformity with Christ’s headship within the body.

Note that here, the goal of both priesthoods is “the sacrifice of human persons united to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ,” and this is a goal that is accomplished by ministerial priests in one way and by baptized priests in another way, both liturgically and non-liturgically. Nor does this place the ministerial priesthood above the baptismal priesthood. If anything, as Avery Cardinal Dulles (1918–2008) points out, “the common priesthood is more exalted, for the ministers are ordained for the sake of service toward the whole people of God,”2 a point that Fr. Baldovin also makes (p. 26).

But as a ministerial priest, my task within the liturgy is to stimulate “participation in the sacrifice of Christ” by always bringing with me an intention to offer at Mass—even when concelebrating. By doing so, I am carrying out my representative ministry on behalf of the body of Christ, with whom I worship and for whom I was ordained continuously to pray. Since, according to Congar, the “baptismal priesthood can only be exercised thanks to the ministerial or hierarchichal priesthood,”3 the baptized priest whose intention I represent at Mass has his or her own priestly prayer brought to liturgical completion through my ministerial representation. Such is the ordered nature of the Church.

Furthermore, I also think that my Mass intention has a different value than that of someone in the congregation, because the priesthoods are of different degrees. My activity in the Mass should always be representative of someone—which is why I always have an intention—and should represent that person according to my configuration to Christ within the body as head rather than to Christ within the body as member. I cannot offer this intention in the Mass according to my state if I celebrate in the congregation.

In terms of practicalities, perhaps an initial compromise could be something like what I witnessed in the Jesuit community at Marquette. Jesuits who wanted to concelebrate vested and sat at some chairs to the side of the main altar in the congregation, while the other Jesuits and externs sat in the middle of the chapel and on the

Press, 2010), 95.


3 Congar, 96.
other side. From their seats, the concelebrating Jesuits did all the gestures of concelebration without moving to stand around the altar. That format might be a good compromise for now. In the meantime, I hope the conversation continues.

Nathan W. O’Halloran (ucs app umi)
University of Notre Dame

Editor:

I am very glad that you have given us Jesuits the benefit of pondering Fr. Conn’s and Fr. Baldovin’s profound learning and thought concerning the issues associated with concelebration and stipended Mass intentions.

For me, a central point in the matter of concelebration is the theme of service; and a central point in the matter of stipended masses is the issue of justice.

Regarding Eucharists offered at a retreat house, I favor not having concelebration. I have this view because from my perspective, keeping the Mass simple and with one leader helps the attendees, most of whom are laity, to focus better in their prayer upon their calling—that is, what God is doing in their lives and how they will respond. Concelebration is somewhat unusual for them and less normal—that is, less what they will experience when they go back to their parish, in that the focus appears more clerical than usual. But really it is mostly because, in my experience, non-concelebration enables them to focus on their own heart and how God is working there that I favor non-concelebration in ordinary retreat house settings. (Arrangement can be made for priests whose devotion impels them to preside during retreat to celebrate in a separate chapel or in the main chapel at a publicized, set time.)

When I was teaching in a high school and there was a special mass for the whole school, I was glad that we concelebrated because I thought it served to say clearly to the students that we Jesuits are here together because we love and care about you. This I felt was an important message to give to our students. On the other hand, we had daily Mass with a very small congregation in a small school chapel and there we would not concelebrate, and that seemed to me to be appropriate because it helped the attendees to focus on their relationship with Jesus and the duties that they were facing that day. I don’t think they could do that as well with a concelebrated mass in such a small setting.
Currently, when our Jesuit community has its weekly community mass, I don a stole and concelebrate. I have somewhat ambiguous feelings because not all my brother priests there do the same. (Some do.) Also, I recognize that to some extent my garb is liturgically shoddy. I do think that concelebration at certain Jesuit community celebrations fosters a deeper sense of our Jesuit calling and is promotive of our fellowship especially in certain settings—ordinations, final vows, visitations of major superiors, and sometimes special local celebrations for a particular Jesuit community. (I think that at such celebrations an effort should be made by the major celebrant to make our lay brothers know that we recognize their part in promoting our Jesuit priestly ministry—that is, for example, at the prayer of the faithful.)

Regarding stipends and Mass intentions, knowing that masses cannot be bought, I do feel that when benefactors give us money and ask that a mass be said for a specific intention, and I say that I will, in gratitude, offer that mass praying for that intention, that I am bound in honor to do what I said I would do. I do this gladly and with gratitude to people who are our friends and are supporting our apostolic ministries. I don’t think God minds or thinks that my focus on the benefactor’s intention is venal or that others who attend that mass cannot pray for other intentions effectively. Is God more likely than not to hear and be glorified by such employment of stipended intentions? I could not say with absolute assurance that God is; but I think that it is highly likely that God is not displeased and honors the benefactor’s devout generosity and the presider’s devout compliance. I do also feel that as a Jesuit priest, I should be ready to be as compliant with the needs and wishes of people too poor to pro-offer a financial gift for such a service—that is, for example, the offering of a mass for a deceased relative—and where possible and appropriate, I should volunteer such a service.

Lucien F. Longtin (Mar)
Jesuit Center for Spiritual Growth
Wernersville, Pennsylvania
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