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The Formula of the Institute is the “Rule” of the Society of Jesus. What does that mean?

The Formula is a short document that describes the essential characteristics of the Society. Pope Paul III (1468–1549) orally approved it in 1539. In effect, this made the Formula a papal charter which permits the Society to exist and operate within the Catholic Church. For this reason, Jesuits cannot revise anything in it without the pope’s permission—unlike the Jesuit Constitutions, which general congregations can revise at their own discretion. In that sense, the Formula “belongs” to the pope and not to the Society.

Most institutes recognized by the Catholic Church—such as the Order of Friars Minor, Discalced Carmelites, or Theatines—have their own Rule which gives them permission to operate within the church. Historically, most institutes adopted one of four classic Rules: the Rule of Benedict, the Rule of Basil, the Rule of Augustine, or the Rule of Francis. And in fact, the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 required that all new institutes adopt one of these four Rules.

Jesuit writers often note that the First Companions sought permission from the pope to write their own Rule because they realized that they could not reconcile their emphasis on apostolic service with any of the classic Rules, all of which generally prioritized contemplative prayer, asceticism, and a regular daily order. That is certainly true as far as it goes. But these same writers often seem to imply, or at least presuppose, a little something extra—namely, that the Society was groundbreaking in this regard.

In fact, almost all the new institutes of clerks regular in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—of which the Society was only one—sought permission either to write their own Rules or to have constitutions take the place of a Rule. These included the Theatines, Barnabites, Adorno...
Fathers, Camillians, Piarists, and Marian Fathers. Only two adopted the Rule of Augustine—namely, the Somaschi Fathers and the now-extinct Clerks Regular of the Good Jesus.

Clerks regular, by definition, were institutes that emphasized apostolic service, the priestly nature of their ministries, and serving in a wide variety of ministries, including those that fell under the purview of the secular clergy. Obviously, this description fits the Society well.

Why do I mention this? I have noticed that when Jesuits contemplate the meaning of their charism for the present day, and when they reflect upon their history and early documents, they rarely take into consideration the charism, history, and documents of other institutes. Instead, they seem to take as their starting point that the Society was *sui generis*, so that any comparison with others would serve little purpose.

For example, during my formation, I frequently heard that the Society’s numbers surged in its first century—a clear indication, supposedly, of its uniquely attractive charism. However, the Dominicans surged from 15,000 to 30,000 during that same time period, and the Franciscans went from 50,000 to 110,000. Wrote John P. Donnelly (*umí*), “Contrary to a widespread assumption, the older forms of religious life, particularly the mendicants, remained the most popular throughout the Counter-Reformation.”

Studying the Society alongside other institutes helps Jesuits to recognize that what made the Society novel—*truly* novel—was not its emphasis on apostolic service per se, nor its adoption of a new Rule, nor its adoption of a fourth vow, nor its being under the direct auspices of the pope. Rather, it was the Society’s willingness to rethink its priorities, internal structures, and way of proceeding with a startling consistency and thoroughness that, for all their own innovations, even the other institutes of clerks regular had not dared to do.

---

Why did Ignatius engage in such a thorough restructuring of traditional religious life? It was all for the purpose of maximizing the efficacy of the Society’s apostolic labors—what he called the greater glory of God. As a case in point, consider the ad vitam term and monarchical authority of the Society’s superior general. No other institute, whether medieval or early modern, had dared to give that kind of sweeping discretion and authority to its head. These features arguably became the single greatest lightning rod for the Society’s critics.

In this issue of Studies, Fr. Henry Shea (uea) invites readers to view the Society’s spirituality and way of proceeding through the lens of its first friendship with another institute, the Order of Carthusians, founded in 1084 by St. Bruno of Cologne (ca. 1030–1101). Will readers dismiss as coincidence that the Carthusians are the only institute that Ignatius considers joining during his recuperation at Castle Loyola, that it is the only order for which Jesuits were allowed to leave the Society without a dispensation, and that Carthusians are the only institute with which Ignatius established a formal spiritual union? The sympatico so quickly sensed between Carthusians and Jesuits like Peter Faber (1506–1546) and Peter Canisius (1521–1597)—does it really say nothing about how early Jesuits understood themselves?

To be sure, to establish the historical influence of one group upon another can be notoriously tricky. Still, whatever Fr. Shea’s readers conclude in that regard, the mere fact that such remarkable parallels exist between such seemingly different institutes more than proves the author’s principal point, which he expresses so eloquently: that “neither any individual nor any charism is an island, but part of a reciprocal communion whose many variations of love together comprise the life of ‘one body, one spirit in Christ.’”

Barton T. Geger, SJ
General Editor
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I. A Historical Primer:
The Origins of a “Fraternal Compact”

Even in the beginning, the quiet presence of the Carthusians in the history of the Society of Jesus may be readily discerned. When Ignatius was convalescing at Loyola, there was only one religious congregation that he expressly considered entering. “Mulling over his plans and thinking of what he would do after he had returned from Jerusalem,” Ignatius relates in his autobiography, “he thought of entering the Carthusian monastery in Seville.”¹ While doubting that

Carthusian life would afford him the degree of penance he sought, Ignatius went so far as to request that a servant bring him “information about the Carthusian rule” from Burgos, and “the information obtained seemed good.” Of course, the *Vita Christi* that Ignatius read at Loyola had also been composed by a Carthusian. Ludolph of Saxony’s popular medieval text was markedly more prolix and scholarly than the succinct points of Ignatius’s *Spiritual Exercises*, and yet the influence of Ludolph on the structure and content of Ignatius’s text remains deep and pervasive. Although the spiritual practice of making oneself present to the events of the life of Jesus Christ by imaginative contemplation has myriad and diverse antecedents, it was from a Carthusian that the author of the *Spiritual Exercises* learned this way of prayer.

Carthusian influence upon the early Society nonetheless became even more direct when Ignatius and those men who would become the first Jesuits studied together at the University of Paris. Near the Latin Quarter of Paris where they lived was the urban Carthusian Charterhouse of Vauvert, whose monks were engaged at the intersection of academic and spiritual life. Both Nicolás Bobadilla and

---

4 Emily A. Ransom has carefully shown how the close relationship that Ignatius envisioned between the imagination and spiritual senses with the affect of the exercitant directly follows the intuitions of Ludolph of Saxony. See Ransom, “St. Ignatius in the Affective School of Ludolph of Saxony,” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 53, no. 3 (Autumn 2021).
5 When Ignatius first arrived in Paris, he enrolled in Latin grammar at the Collège de Montaigu, which had roughly one-hundred-and-twenty students under the direction of the Carthusian prior of Vauvert. Ignatius notes in his autobiography that, in seeking a ‘maestro,’ or ‘Magister,’ to teach him, he consulted a Carthusian who knew many of them (un frayle de los Cartuxos, que conoscía muchos maestros). In “Acta P. Ignatii,” 75 [MHSI 66], 466. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from sources are mine.
6 Perhaps most impressive was their literary output. Among the monks of the monastery, Petrus Sutor published his *De vita cartusiana* in 1521 and Jean Perceval his *Compendium divini amoris* in 1530. Vauvert likewise published Bruno’s *Opera omnia* in 1524 and, between 1535 and 1555, thirty-four volumes from the oeuvre of Denys the Carthusian. See Philippe Lécrivain, *Paris in the Time of Ignatius of Loyola (1528–1535)* (St.
Jerónimo Nadal tell us that they were accustomed to join “Ignatius and his companions” at this Carthusian monastery for confession, Mass, and spiritual conversation on Sundays. The gatherings initially included Ignatius, Faber, and Simon Rodrigues, and they were later joined by Xavier and others. It is difficult, if not impossible, to know what exchanges transpired between these companions and the Carthusians themselves. Yet Pedro de Ribadeneyra notes that the visits to Vauvert were so important to Ignatius that, when he and the others were threatened with punishment by the Collège Sainte-Barbe for missing its academic disputations due to the gatherings at the Charterhouse, Ignatius personally appealed to the principal of the college and finally persuaded him of their spiritual benefit.

Among all those who joined Ignatius at Vauvert, perhaps none had closer Carthusian connections than Peter Faber, whose uncle and cousin both served as prior of Le Reposoir, the Carthusian monastery

---

7 Bobadilla recounts: “I often went to the Carthusian monastery on Sundays and feast days to confess and receive communion with much frequency, along with other devout students, among whom were the companions and brothers of the Society of Jesus.” Nadal likewise relates how he would frequent “the devout meetings with the brothers”—that is, with Ignatius and his companions—“at the Carthusians on Sundays.” Bobadilla, “Autobiographia,” in Fontes Narrativi, vol. 3 (1960) [MHSI 85], 325; Nadal, “Chronicon Natalis iam inde a principio vocationis suae,” in Epistolae Hieronymi Nadal, SJ, ab anno 1546 ad 1577, vol. 1 [MHSI 13], 2.

8 Juan de Alfonso Polanco notes in his chronicle of the early Society of Jesus that its “Fathers gathered at the Carthusians on Sundays and feast days, where ours received the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist; and being moved either by their example or their encouragement, very many other students flocked there to receive the same sacraments, sometimes more than sixty.” In Vita Ignatii Loyolae et rerum Societatis Jesu historia, vol. 1, 442 [MHSI 22], 419. Among those who gathered at Vauvert was also Juan de Castro, who became a Carthusian monk in Valencia. When Ignatius visited him there in 1535, Castro reportedly “offered to re-join Ignatius.” Ignatius declined, instructing Castro to “honor his commitment to the Carthusians.” Barton T. Geger, A Pilgrim’s Testament (Chestnut Hill, MA: IJS, 2020), 155, n. 4.

9 Pedro de Ribadeneyra, “De actis Patris Nostri Ignatii (1559–1566)” 90, in Fontes Narrativi, vol. 2 [MHSI 73], 382–84; “Vita Ignatii Loyolae,” 2.3, in Fontes Narrativi, vol. 4 [MHSI 93], 220–27.
After the Society of Jesus was founded in 1540, it was likewise particularly through the friendship of Faber with the prior of the Charterhouse in Cologne, Gerhard Kalckbrenner, that the early Jesuits were drawn into closer comity with the Carthusians. Kalckbrenner, also known by his Latin surname Hammontanus, was uniquely impressed by Faber’s apostolate on behalf of the German Church. At the General Chapter of the Carthusians at the Grande Chartreuse in 1544, Kalckbrenner spoke enthusiastically about the newly founded Society of Jesus, providing other priors throughout Europe with the occasion to echo his praise. Such acclamation induced the General Chapter to seek a spiritual sharing with the Society of Jesus of “sacrifices, prayers, fasting, and other exercises,” and the Carthusian Prior General, Pierre Marnef, wrote Ignatius to propose the arrangement. His letter lauded the “exemplary way of life [conversatione]” and “salutary teaching [doctrina]” of the Society as a light “shining in the darkness of

10 Dom Mamert Favre, the brother of Peter’s father, was succeeded as prior by Dom Claude Périssin, the nephew of his mother. Mary Purcell recounts that Faber, as a young man, “had visited Reposoir and had seen the white-robed, silent monks. . . . More than likely he had preached a sermon to Dom Mamert and Dom Claude, and they, educated men, had fired him with the desire for learning.” She suggests that the mature Faber “could have passed for an itinerant Carthusian,” noting that his life was “sign-posted with Carthusian friendships.” The Quiet Companion, Peter Favre, SJ, 1506–46 (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1970), 6, 144–45.

11 On the friendships of Faber with Carthusians and on the collaborative rapport of Kalckbrenner with both Faber and Peter Canisius, see William V. Bangert, To The Other Towns: A Life of Blessed Peter Favre, First Companion of St. Ignatius (Westminster: Newman Press, 1959), especially 152–211.

12 Kalckbrenner himself continued to prove an outstanding benefactor of the early Society, not only in spiritual terms but also by welcoming Jesuits to Cologne and even sending financial support to Ignatius in Rome for the fledgling Roman and Germanic Colleges. On the details of his generosity and the personal gratitude of Ignatius and others, see Charles Van de Vorst, “La Compagnie de Jésus et le Passage à l’Ordre des Chartreux (1540–1694),” in Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu 23 (Jan 1954): 4–11.

our lamentable age,” and he gave thanks that God had “remembered his mercy” and sent such laborers into the vineyard of a church bereft of consolation.IGNACIOUS responded with similar gratitude, noting that “we are too unequal by ourselves [impares nimium sumus ex nobis]” to the task set before the Society, which was thereby in great need of the Carthusians’ prayers. He likewise promised them a participation in all of the “sacrifices, prayers, and works” of the Society of Jesus.\textsuperscript{15} Such collaboration between the two congregations continued in manifold ways in the decades that followed, reaching its fullest expression in Decree 26 of the Fifth General Congregation of the Jesuits (1593–1594), in which a “fraternal compact [societas fraternitatis]” with the charterhouse was officially ratified by “the enthusiastic agreement of all and with great veneration towards their holy institute.”\textsuperscript{16}

Understandably, it might strike many readers as strange that an order with as reclusive a reputation as the Carthusians would develop such a profound friendship with a congregation as apostolic as the Society of Jesus. The origins of the Carthusian way of life may be traced to the semi-eremitical monastic community founded in 1084 by St. Bruno and six companions in the total isolation of the Chartreuse mountains in southeastern France under the protection of the local bishop of Grenoble, St. Hugh of Chateauneuf. The Carthusian


\textsuperscript{15} “Patri Gerardo Hammontano,” in Monumenta Ignatiana: Epistolae et instrucciones 175 [MHSI 1], 526–28.

\textsuperscript{16} “Since the venerable institute of the Carthusians, in accord with its eminent piety and charity towards our order, not only in the time of our father Ignatius, of holy memory, but also in these recent days, has expressed in its general chapter the wish to enter into a brotherhood with us by granting us a share in their good works, the general congregation has decreed in the name of our entire institute, with the enthusiastic agreement of all and with great veneration towards their holy institute, that it expresses to them due gratitude and, by granting them a like sharing in the good works which the divine goodness deigns to accomplish through this slight instrument [that is, the Society], enters this fraternal compact with them in turn with full attestation of our love and dutifulness.” GC 5, d. 26; For Matters of Greater Moment: The First Thirty Jesuit General Congregations, ed. John W. Padberg, SJ, Martin D. O’Keefe, SJ, John L. McCarthy, SJ (St. Louis, MO: IJS, 1994), 193–94.
monastery frequented by the first Jesuits at Vauvert, like that which Faber had befriended at Cologne, was somewhat inconsistent with early and more recent Carthusian tradition, which has been grounded in more remote locales.\textsuperscript{17} Vauvert, by contrast, was founded when King Louis IX invited monks from the Grande Chartreuse to establish a monastery outside the walls of the city of Paris in the 1250s, and it soon became the first of many urban charterhouses established throughout the high and late medieval period.\textsuperscript{18} While retaining a contemplative focus, such urban monasteries became more actively engaged than their more geographically isolated forerunners and counterparts,\textsuperscript{19} which still remained relatively predominant in Carthusian rolls.\textsuperscript{20} This

\textsuperscript{17} While myriad factors were involved, James Hogg suggests several practical reasons for the movement to establish charterhouses “near towns” as opposed to “the original sites in remote alpine valleys.” It was “partially due to the wishes of founders” who were desiring closer access to their foundations. There were “motives of general security,” as “isolated monasteries” were “repeatedly sacked by bandits and marauding troops.” Also, “the total rejection of all ecclesiastical benefices” by early Carthusians had become “less absolute and estates outside the boundaries of the original Carthusian ‘deserts’ were accepted periodically to assure the economic stability of various communities.” Hogg, “The Carthusians: History and Heritage,” in \textit{The Carthusians in the Low Countries: Studies in Monastic History and Heritage} (Peeters: Leuven, 2014), 31–56, at 42.

\textsuperscript{18} Following the founding of Vauvert, urban charterhouses were also established, for instance, in Bruges (1318), Cologne (1334), Prague (1342), Avignon (1356), London (1370), and Dijon (1383). See Stephen J. Molvarec, “\textit{Vox clamantis in deserto}: The Development of Carthusian Relations with Society in the High Middle Ages,” in \textit{A Fish Out of Water? From Contemplative Solitude to Carthusian Involvement in Pastoral Care and Reform Activity} (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 13–49, at 48.


\textsuperscript{20} Hubert Jedin described the move toward urban locales as a “Copernican shift” in the Carthusian world. Others remonstrate that this characterization is “deceptive” given that rural charterhouses continued not only to operate and grow but also to exercise universal governance, as from the Grande Chartreuse. It is only in the “half century between 1350 and 1400” that the number of new “suburban-urban foundations”
centuries-long urban phenomenon ultimately proved passing: by the late sixteenth century, the urban charterhouses had begun to wane, and they disappeared during the French Revolution.

It was nonetheless through early Jesuit encounters with urban Carthusians in cities like Paris and Cologne that the unique amity of the two congregations was effectively realized. The extensive historical contacts of the early Society with urban charterhouses raises several questions: might the Jesuit tendency to commit to cities have been influenced by the familiarity of the first Jesuits with Carthusians in Paris? Their visits to Vauvert would certainly have provided an example of how an engaged contemplative life in the city could be lived. Might there even be deeper, enduring reasons for the special fraternity that developed, as by the winding paths of providence, between the Charterhouse and the Society through such historical intersections? Several decades ago in this same journal, Michael J. Buckley (1931–2019) suggested that the friendship that arose between the Jesuits and Carthusians corresponded with an “overriding similarity” in their charisms. Buckley likewise argued that “many of the radical departures which Ignatius was to exceed that of their new rural counterparts. By the end of the fifteenth century, new rural foundations surpassed the suburban-urban variety by a ratio of nearly three-to-one. See Dennis Martin, “The Honeymoon was Over: Carthusians Between Aristocracy and Bourgeoisie,” in *Die Kartäuser und Ihre Welt* I:68–99; at 83, 99. Martin chronicles how even in urban settings, a “more traditionally Carthusian attitude” opposed to “involvement outside the monastery” perdured. Cf. Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, 4 vols. (Freiburg: Herder, 1949–1975), I:115; Martin, *Fifteenth-Century Carthusian Reform: The World of Nicholas Kempf* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 230–39, at 236.

21 I am indebted to Stephen Molvarec for this insight. In elaborating on Faber’s numerous Carthusian connections, Michel de Certeau speculates how all the “first companions” would have “nourished themselves on this [Carthusian] tradition” in their visits to Vauvert. Speaking specifically of Faber, Certeau suggests that “the continual desire to reconstitute in the world the cloister and monastic liturgy, the incessant search [recherche] for this interior ‘purity’” was a manifestation of “the religious impulse awakened in him [le signe de l’élan religieux éveillé en lui]” first by the Carthusians at Le Reposoir. Michel de Certeau, *Mémorial* (Paris: Brouwer, 1960), 28–40, at 29.
institute within religious life” may be better understood “if the major influence upon him is counted as the Carthusian.”

Admittedly, the latter thesis is more difficult to establish. It is near impossible to assess the extent of such historical influence with precision, and the lives of both Ignatius and the first companions were indisputably marked by myriad and diverse sources of inspiration. But while the question of principal influence may ever prove somewhat elusive, Buckley aptly identified a profound correspondence between Carthusian and Jesuit ways of life. In this light, the historical connections between them may effectively set the stage for a more systematic and theological exploration of the perhaps surprising concordance of the Jesuit and Carthusian charisms. That is the principal focus of this essay, which proposes that a comparison of these two forms of life evinces a deep and paradoxical mutuality between them, as by an inverse parallel. Or as in a fugue, the melodic structure remains similar while harmonizing with itself in another voice and location; and even, as in Bach’s masterful, unfinished *The Art of The Fugue*, by a contrapuntal inversion. However distinct the cloister and the world may be, the Carthusian and Jesuit charisms that inhabit them not only exhibit shared patterns but also seem to belong together as to compose a uniquely powerful, symphonic effect.

---


23 See a recently translated piece written by Hans Urs von Balthasar and first published in 1928, “The Art of the Fugue: Paralipomena to a Performance,” *Communio* 48 (Summer 2021): 420–28. “For just as a person . . . [is] facing every other and inexorably yoked to the unbroken array of its essence, so in the fugue the voice is no longer submerged in the exclusively subservient position of harmony. Rather, it becomes invaluable as part and mirror alike of the whole, harnessed to the order of the development and all the while itself affecting, commanding, and developing” (422).
II. Theological Underpinnings: The “Exquisite Mutuality” of the Body of Christ

Although the complementarity of charisms in the church has long been recognized and celebrated, they are more typically studied in isolation. Yet neither any individual nor any charism is an island. This is not only because every founding member of a religious congregation has tended to draw on the traditions of others in developing his or her own. There is also a perpetual interdependence between the diverse gifts of the Spirit within the church, especially between the contemplative and the apostolic. Prescinding from the relation between the Carthusians and Jesuits, perhaps the most celebrated recognition of this came in 1927 when Pope Pius XI, despite opposition from his curia, insisted on naming St. Thérèse of Lisieux co-patron of the missions alongside St. Francis Xavier. At first glance, the lives of these two figures, a cloistered Carmelite nun and a peripatetic international missionary, could not have seemed more different. Yet the intuition that they belong together has aptly endured.

At its root is the broader paradoxical partnership of the contemplative and apostolic dimensions of the Christian life, as conjoined in Thérèse and Francis by their shared devotion to a common mission to which they each in their own way gave themselves entirely.

When placed beside the other, each of their lives in fact becomes more intelligible, as by a distinct complementarity. A Christian life may be lived within the stable rhythm of an enclosed contemplative community and in a band of dispersed apostles perpetually on the move from continent to continent until death. Yet neither of these forms of life would suffice for the full embodiment of the church in the world. While the contemplative life more readily provides a “well-spring of heavenly graces” for all, as the Second Vatican Council noted, the apostolic life more directly embodies that “holy service” and “love of one’s neighbor” that “contributes to the salvation of the world and the building up of

---

24 In 2004, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, then superior general of the Society of Jesus, followed suit by naming Thérèse of Lisieux along with Francis Xavier a copatron of the Apostleship of Prayer, an organization of which Thérèse herself had been a member since the age of twelve.
the Church.” Insofar as these two kinds of activity are distinct, each ultimately entails the other, and so every religious community is called to unite “contemplation” with “apostolic love.” Yet each unites the two in distinct ways that together form a “wonderful variety,” equipping the church “for every good work” and diversely reflecting the “manifold Wisdom of God to be revealed through her.”

Along these same lines, one may recall the central Pauline analogy of the church as a body in which each of the parts is intricately interrelated and interdependent. In some cases, of course, the relation among parts proves even more integral than in others. The hands and feet of a body, whether physiological or ecclesial, are nothing without its lungs and heart, and this primordial mutuality is a matter not only of function but also of identity. When Paul explained this analogy in 1 Corinthians 12, he began by speaking of what each part of the body is, as a hand or foot, an ear or eye (vv. 15–16), before explaining the mutual necessity of their operations (vv. 17–21). Who and what we are and do, in other words, is inseparable from what we are and do together. Just as every individual human life is inextricably woven into a vast fabric of mutuality, so does every member of the church realize themselves only in relation to each other and within the whole Body of Christ. While such dynamics most fundamentally pertain at the level of persons themselves, they also suffuse all human forms of organization. Particularly in the life of the church, whenever the vocation and mission of a person are received in a broader charism, the uniquely individual aspects of their identity and action are drawn into a new correspondence with the charism at large. The “exquisite mutuality” of the Body of Christ, to borrow an expression from Greg Boyle, is


26 PC, §5.


28 So may be transposed and writ large the insight of Gerard Manley Hopkins: “What I do is me: for that I came.” “As Kingfishers Catch Fire,” in The Major Works (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 129.
thereby based in the uniqueness of each person yet also coalesces around certain forms. In fact, the only explicit reflection that Paul provided in First Corinthians on the complementarity of parts in the church is made according to general vocational types. “Now you are Christ’s body, and individually parts of it,” explains Paul, such that “God has designated” some as “apostles,” “prophets,” “teachers,” “administrators,” and so forth (vv. 27–30). If not only every member but also every broader kind of vocation within the pneumatic Body of Christ is constituted in relation to the others, then it is only to be expected that every ecclesial charism should likewise arise by the Spirit in accord with a similarly reciprocal relationality.

Whereas the Carthusian Order has long been regarded as among the most contemplative congregations in the church, the Society of Jesus is commonly placed among its most apostolic. The analysis offered here nonetheless follows a range of profound parallels between their charisms, as manifested in their founders and normative documents, their spiritualities and practices of prayer, and their structures and ways of proceeding. In each case, of course, these commonalities tend to run parallel as on opposite sides of the diametrical line that divides what is contemplative in the consecrated life from what is apostolic, even if the aforementioned Carthusian experiment in urban monasticism temporarily drew the two closer together and so contributed to the emergence of an Ignatian way. But even from the origins of the Charterhouse and the Society unto the present, there remains a kind of inversely shared logic between their ways of proceeding that renders them peculiarly alike. The significance of this correspondence may be broached by a series of questions. Why is it, for instance, that each of these congregations comparatively lacks structured activities in common and has

---

consistently prayed much of the Liturgy of the Hours in private? Why do their founding documents call for a close union of minds and hearts among members while their spiritualities focus on a personal, interior knowledge of Christ acquired in solitude and silence? Why have their charisms been fitted with constitutions that render everything distinctly subject to overarching international authorities to whom replete obedience is due? Why are their structures for common life similarly organized like a scaffolding meant to facilitate and realize the personally tailored work of their members, especially Carthusian cloister monks or Jesuits professed of four vows?

There are many contemplative and apostolic religious congregations in the church, yet there are relatively few between which these same parallels might be drawn. Before proceeding further, nevertheless, it is best to begin with a caveat. The claims to correspondence made here are not meant to be strictly exclusive, as if all these parallels pertained to the Charterhouse and the Society of Jesus alone. At the time of both their foundings, there were in fact a variety of similar experiments in religious life. In the eleventh century, other congregations were founded to pursue solitude, and other orders of clerics regular emerged in the early modern period. Over time, some of these have merged with others or faded into the recesses of history. Yet the Charterhouse and the Society of Jesus have endured, even obtaining a kind of representative place in the history and contemporary expanse of consecrated life. While both their charisms as a totality are unquestionably unique, this query could thus be considered not only a comparative analysis of two congregations but an investigation whose implications may at times extend beyond their particular bounds, as toward types.

III. Comparative Analysis: Inverse Parallels in Spirit, Structure, and Way of Proceeding

The differences between Carthusians and Jesuits are obvious to all. Yet in keeping with the coincidence of the contemplative and apostolic called for by Vatican II, both congregations have long claimed to exhibit the virtues for which the other is known. Nadal described Ignatius as *simul in actione contemplativus*, or a contemplative who is likewise in action, and Jesuits have understood themselves to be
formed according to this same pattern. The term *contemplativus* notably operates as the noun that defines Ignatius and, by implication, the Jesuit, who is first and substantively a contemplative—likewise in action. By the same token, the contemplative life of a Carthusian is often presented as an apostleship of prayer, the solitude of which is sought not so much in spite of the world as for its sake. Solitude is rather, in the words emblazoned on the emblem of the Charterhouse, a participation in the redemptive movement by which “the cross stands while the world turns (*stat crux dum volvitur orbis*).” “Even though we abstain from exterior activity,” explain the Statutes of the Carthusian Order, “(we) exercise nonetheless an apostolate of a very high order, since we strive to follow Christ in this ‘inmost heart of His saving task.’” The heart of the Carthusian “is not narrowed but enlarged by intimacy with God,”

---


31 In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the coat of arms of the Grande Chartreuse came to consist of a globe surmounted by a cross and crowned with a semicircle of stars. However, the Latin phrase, *stat crux dum volvitur orbis*, did not first appear in print until 1638, when Dom Nicolas Molin used it in his *Historia Cartusiana* to explain the significance of the coat of arms. In the nineteenth century, these words became more broadly adopted as a motto of the Carthusian Order. For further details, see Cyprien-Marie Boutrais, *La Grande Chartreuse par Un Chartreux*, 18th ed. (Bresson: Lettre de France, 2007), 208–09.

32 Statutes of the Carthusian Order 34.4, hereafter Statutes. The history of these Statutes is long and complex. Guigo I, the fifth prior of the Grande Chartreuse, composed the first Carthusian customary, or Consuetudines, in the 1120s. At the first General Chapter in 1142, Guigo’s customary was further developed and universally adopted. The general chapter of 1271 integrated ordinances of the Grande Chartreuse into Guigo’s customary, producing the Statuta Antiqua. Additional documents were appended in 1368 to form the Statuta Nova, and still further documents were added in 1509 to comprise the Tertia Compilatio. Following the Council of Trent, all extant Carthusian ordinances were collated into the Nova Collectio Statutorum, which was promulgated in 1582. In response to the call for a renewal of religious life made by the Second Vatican Council, the general chapter of 1971 approved Renewed Statutes. These were made to conform with the 1983 Code of Canon Law and promulgated anew by the general chapter of 1989. To this contemporary text refer all citations of the Statutes in this article. See The Carthusian Monks, Monastery of the Grande Chartreuse, Statutes 1.1–3, https://chartreux.org/moines/en/statutes/#haut; James Hogg, “The Carthusians: History and Heritage,” 31–56.
embracing “in him the hopes and difficulties of the world.” Carthusian prayer is thus presented with a universality that parallels the universal mission of the Society. “Far from becoming shut in” on itself, it opens “to embrace the whole universe and the mystery of Christ that saves it. Apart from all,” the Statutes elaborate, “to all we are united, so that it is in the name of all that we stand before the living God.”

While the Charterhouse is more singularly devoted to contemplation and the Society of Jesus more wholly devoted to active, engaged work with others, both do so as contemplatives and apostles whose mission encompasses the entire world. The structures of the Charterhouse and the Society likewise both open broad spaces of freedom for every member to fulfill a tailored task, whether in the solitude of contemplative prayer or the activity of the apostolate. Of course, such tasks are ultimately fulfilled by one congregation whose members share a commitment to live together in community. Yet the focalizing of religious life on what Jesuits describe as their mission has involved, for both the Charterhouse and the Society, an eschewal of the communal structures of coenobitic monasticism. “Whatever the religious institute of the Society may be, it is not monasticism,” Nadal famously stressed. In like manner, Carthusians are non-coenobitic or semi-eremitical monks whose cell is considered a hermitage.

---

33 Statutes 6.6.

34 Statutes 4.34.1–2. Ignatius famously stipulates in the Constitutions that in the missioning of Jesuits, one should always keep before one’s eyes “the greater service of God and the more universal good,” adding that “the more universal the good is, the more it is divine.” Constitutions 618, 622, hereafter Const.; ed. Padberg, 282, 286.

35 Quo sit nostram religionem, monachismum non esse (whatever our religious institute may be, it is not monasticism). Jerónimo Nadal, Comentarii de Instituto Societatis Iesu, ed. Michael Nicolau (Rome, 1962) [MHSI 90], 413; see also Epistolae P. Hieronymi Nadal Societatis Iesu ab anno 1546 ad 1577, 4 vols. (Madrid, 1898–1905) [MHSI 27], IV: 174. On the historical context of Nadal’s claims, see the editorial preface of Barton T. Geger in Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits 51, no. 2 (Spring 2019): iii–vii.

36 C. H. Lawrence observes that “the Chartreuse was unique in having successfully domesticated the ideal of the desert in the form of a permanent institution. . . . the regime differed from other experiments of this kind by creating a group hermitage in which the individual pursued the solitary life within the context of a supporting community.” Medieval Monasticism (London: Routledge, 2015), 146.
The logic of each of these ways of proceeding, moreover, has been basically the same. “Our principal endeavor and goal,” the Carthusian Statutes delineate, “is to devote ourselves to the silence and solitude of cell,” and each monk is so “placed in solitude from the very beginning of his new form of life and left to his own counsel.” While such solitude does not exclude communal activities and the multifaceted process of Carthusian formation, it renders central the life of personal prayer and contemplation. In a similar and yet inverted fashion, the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus, after discussing probation, formation, and the vows, turn in their pivotal seventh part to the missioning of Jesuits. Here, the “principal endeavor” of a Jesuit, the Constitutions specify, is to be “dispersed throughout Christ’s vineyard to labor in that part of it” that has “been entrusted to them.” Each member is thus to “leave the disposition of himself completely and very freely to the superior,” who “will have authority to send any of the Society’s members to whatsoever place” he considers “more expedient to send them.” In such tailored, personal missions, there is also ever collaboration as well as discerning freedom in obedience. Most fundamentally, however, neither the founding vision of the Society nor of the Charterhouse focuses on a community acting in unison throughout the day. Each vision is ordered rather toward fulfilling together the personal, tailored work of each member, whether this be done in contemplative solitude or on apostolic mission.

Due to this personal tailoring of Jesuit life and mission, Buckley has aptly noted that there is something “profoundly eremitical about the Jesuit.” Specifically, there is a kind of solitude that makes a Jesuit even “self-contained” and “independent,” rendering him more available to move “from place to place, from work to work, from house to

---

37 Statutes 4.1; see also 2.12.1. Guigo famously wrote that the Carthusian should consider “the cell as necessary for his salvation and life, as water for fish and the sheepfold for sheep” (1.4.2). The cell of a Carthusian typically consists of multiple rooms, a private bath, and a garden. The Statutes caution that a “dweller in cell should be diligently and carefully on his guard against contriving or accepting occasions for going out, other than those normally prescribed” (1.4.2).

38 Statutes 4.33.2. Similar prescriptions, mutatis mutandis, are given for lay monks at 2.12.1–2, 2.13.1–8.

39 Const. 603; ed. Padberg, 276.

40 Const. 618; ed. Padberg, 282.
house.” Carthusians, in turn, describe themselves as “communities of solitaries,” or as “solitaries” called to “form a communion of love.” In a recent study, Tim Peeters thus identifies them as “solitary monks with a minimum of community life.” This minimum nonetheless involves significantly more communal prayer than the Jesuit norm. Evening prayer, a night office, and a conventual Mass are each celebrated daily in common. As in the days of Vauvert, Carthusians habitually gather on Sundays and feasts for common meals, chapter reunions, and recreation. While the common celebration of the Eucharist naturally comprises the “consummation” of Carthusian unity, all their communal practices yield again to solitude, which characterizes most of their time. On a regular day, a cloister monk spends some eighteen hours in his cell, roughly eight of which may be given to sleep. The remaining hours are meant to be devoted principally to prayer and contemplation, or what a Jesuit might call his primary mission. Jean Beyer speculated that the Jesuit practices of praying in silence and praying in one’s room were Carthusian in origin. In this sense, when the first Jesuits made a silent retreat together before their vows at Montmartre, they were doing precisely what they would have seen Carthusians do at Vauvert. Buckley fittingly suggested that to be a “Jesuit was to become the Carthusian apostolic.” Might it not equally be said that to be a Carthusian monk is to evoke the Jesuit contemplative?

41 Buckley, “Mission in Companionship,” 15.
42 [A Carthusian], From Advent to Pentecost: Carthusian Novice Conferences (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1999), 24.
45 Carthusians celebrate privately in their cells the Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary as well as all of the other hours of the Divine Office. Statutes 3.21.6, 12.
46 “When we assemble for the Eucharist, the unity of the Carthusian family is consummated in Christ, who is himself present, and at prayer.” Statutes 3.21.4.
Although the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus prohibit a Jesuit’s transfer to another religious institute without the permission of Father General,⁵⁰ the papal bulls Licet debitum (1549) and Aequum reputamus (1566) made an exception: Jesuits who sought to leave the Society could be “admitted, received, and retained in no other apart from the Order of Carthusians.”⁵¹ While the reasons for this exception are not specified, the resemblances between the structures of the Society and those of the Charterhouse could facilitate such a transition. Specifically, the overarching form of the Carthusians is much more centralized than in coenobitic monasteries, which tend to enjoy relative independence. Every two years, general chapters are held in the Grande Chartreuse, and two monastic visitors are appointed to tour every monastery to ensure a proper observance of the rule and way of life. In the years between the General Chapters, the prior of the Grande Chartreuse then serves as “Father General of the entire Order” and is regarded as primus inter pares.⁵² Aided by a general council comprised of “solemnly professed monks elected” at the General Chapter,⁵³ the prior general possesses a broad and universal authority over the congregation. He is vested with

⁵⁰ Const. 99; ed. Padberg, 45.
⁵¹ Paul III, Licet debitum 6, in “Papal Documents from the Early Years of the Society of Jesus in English Translation,” trans. Philip R. Amidon, Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits (Summer 2020): 29; “Bulla Quarta Pauli III,” 6, in Sancti Ignatii de Loyola: Constitutiones Societatis Iesu, vol. 1 [MHSI 63], 361. De Guibert notes that the transfer of Jesuits to the Carthusians became a concern in the latter part of the sixteenth century, especially in Spain. Some Jesuits who had departed for the Charterhouse eventually sought to return, and this became enough of an issue for the fledgling Society that both the third and fourth general congregations noted that “if any of Ours transfer to the Carthusian Order and later wish to return to the Society, the Society is not by reason of its institute bound to receive them.” On this point, see Joseph de Guibert, The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice (St. Louis, MO: IJS, 1986), 79 n. 18, 222; GC 3, d. 45; GC 4, d. 66; For Matters of Greater Moment, ed. Padberg, 149, 183.
⁵² Statutes 4.31.6; Peeters, When Silence Speaks, 71–72. While the prior general, as prior of the Grande Chartreuse, is elected by the monks of that community, his election “does not have force of law until it is accepted by the assembly of Prior, Priorresses, and Rectors” (Statutes 4.31.6).
⁵³ “These monks, who constitute the General Council, reside in their own Houses and are to be consulted” by the prior general “in the way he deems best. Should the matter so require, and each time the consent of the Council is required by law, the members are summoned to the Grande Chartreuse.” Statutes 4.31.13.
the power to arrange for the visitation of monasteries and even to directly name and confirm priors.\textsuperscript{54}

In similar respects, the superior general of the Society of Jesus, aided by elected assistants, is entrusted with “complete authority over” the Society, in respect of not only its provinces and superiors, but also all its works and members.\textsuperscript{55} Notwithstanding the corresponding levels of centralization in the governance of the two orders, however, differences may also be noted. The general of the Society of Jesus is elected for life or until he requests to resign, and general congregations are held on a more intermittent basis.\textsuperscript{56} By contrast, every Carthusian prior, including the prior general, submits his resignation every two years at the general chapter. A “definitory,” which is newly established at each general chapter and consists of the same prior general and eight elected monks, thereafter deliberates “upon the removal or confirmation” of each prior.\textsuperscript{57}

Regarding the relation between these structures of authority and individual members, both congregations naturally afford a central place to obedience. St. Bruno, when nearing the end of his long practice of the contemplative life, wrote a letter addressed to monks of the Grande Chartreuse whose counsel is now enshrined in its Statutes. He exhorted them to “the sweetest and most life-giving fruit of Sacred Scripture, true obedience.” Bruno explains that this obedience, “never found without deep humility and outstanding patience” and “always accompanied by pure love for God and true charity,” is not only the “carrying out of God’s commands,” but also the “key to the

\textsuperscript{54} The Carthusian Statutes provide the qualification that the prior general can “act with the authority of the General Chapter as often as the good of the Order requires such action, and assuming that the matter cannot await the next General Chapter.” Statutes 4.31.13.


\textsuperscript{56} Const. 677–81, 719; ed. Padberg, 330–32, 356.

\textsuperscript{57} Statutes 4.31.4.
whole spiritual life, and the guarantee of its authenticity.” While some of his counsel may not seem especially distinctive, events in Bruno’s own life are more markedly distinguishing. In a moment of profound sacrifice, he obeyed the summons of Pope Urban II to leave the fledgling Chartreuse only six years after its founding in order to serve the needs of the papacy in Rome. Earlier, Bruno also declined an offer to become archbishop of Rheims, which at the time was the primary see of France. In the contemporary Statutes of the Carthusian Order, Jesus Christ is identified as the prime exemplar of Carthusian life, being above all, the suffering servant who humbly does “the will of his Father.” As by imitation, such pivotal moments in the life of Bruno also present him as a model of an obedient and suffering love and, more specifically, one that is bound to both papal service and the denial of episcopal ambition. In traditional iconography—as, for instance, at the Basilica of Saint Peter in Rome—Bruno is accordingly represented as eschewing an episcopal miter and crozier at his feet.

While there have been many Carthusian bishops through the centuries, especially in cities close to established charterhouses, the lives of Carthusian bishop saints commonly recount their following Bruno in initially refusing or even fleeing from the episcopacy. In keeping with their entirely contemplative character, a document of the Charterhouse of the Transfiguration in Vermont attests that “nowadays it would be inconceivable for a Carthusian monk to become Bishop.”

58 Statutes 2.11.9. The Statutes similarly counsel that, “Though many and diverse are the things we observe, we cannot hope that any of them will profit us without the blessing of obedience” (7.6).

59 Statutes 1.10.13.

60 In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, for instance, Stephen Molvarec chronicles a total of twenty-three Carthusian monks ordained bishops. In the thirteenth century, however, the trend “declined” such that it may be said there was “a brief, twelfth century moment.” See Molvarec, “Vox clamantis in deserto,” 13–49, at 28.


62 [A Carthusian Monk], “Introduction,” in Carthusian Saints. The same author cites the present Statutes, which explain that “since our Order is totally dedicated to contemplation, it is our duty to maintain strictly our separation from the world; hence, we are excepted from all pastoral ministry—no matter how urgent the need for active apos-
Mention may also be made in this regard of the longstanding Carthusian refusal of raising charterhouses “to the rank of abbeys,” so that, in contrast to Benedictine and Cistercian custom, Carthusian priors would never be invested with episcopal privileges. Following Bruno, Carthusians have also exhibited marked devotion to the papacy, even to the point of martyrdom.

It need hardly be said that such elements correspond with the Jesuit way of proceeding, from the role of obedience to the service of the papacy, even if the emphasis that Ignatius placed on obedience is more pointedly interior and comprehensive in scope. Every Jesuit is to “strongly dispose themselves to observe obedience and to distinguish themselves in it,” explain the Constitutions, “not only in the matters of obligation but also in the others, even though nothing else be perceived except an indication of the superior’s will without an expressed command.” The obedience to which Jesuits are to apply “all [their] energies with very special care” is to be shown first “to the sovereign pontiff and then to the superiors of the Society, who hold the place of Christ.” While this virtue begins in the heart by a “great” and “especially interior reverence,” it issues in a complete availability for mission that prioritizes commissions from the Bishop of Rome, which are treated as “most important” in accord with the “vow which the Society made to tolate is—so that we may fulfill our special role in the Mystical Body of Christ” (1.3.9).

Notably, the second prior of the Chartreuse, Blessed Landuin, one of Bruno’s original companions, was returning from his visit to Bruno in Calabria bearing a letter of Bruno for the Chartreuse when he was captured by supporters of the antipope Guibert. Refusing to repudiate his loyalty to Pope Urban II, Landuin was imprisoned for several months until released in ill health, only to die shortly thereafter. A few centuries later, among the two principal congregations whose members were martyred during the recusant period in England were the Carthusians and the Jesuits. See Peeters, When Silence Speaks, 39–44, 50; André Ravier, Saint Bruno the Carthusian (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1995), 151–53; L. E. Whatmore, The Carthusians Under Henry the Eighth, Analecta Cartusiana 109 (Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, 1983); E. Margaret Thompson, The Carthusian Order in England (New York: Macmillan, 1930).

Const. 547; ed. Padberg, 220.

Const. 547, 551; ed. Padberg, 220, 222.
obey him as the supreme vicar of Christ.” In explaining “the fourth vow” that renders this corporate commitment personal for those who profess it, the Constitutions observe that its “intention” is not meant “for a particular place but for having the members dispersed throughout the various parts of the world,” as sent from within a *communitas ad dispersionem.* Ignatius’s strong desire that the Society adjure all ecclesiastical ambition became reflected, in turn, in the promise of fully professed members “not to seek any prelacy or dignity outside the Society.”

Even more recent spiritual nomenclatures in both congregations have proven similar. Dom Marcellin Theeuwes, who served as prior general of the Carthusians from 1997 to 2012, was accustomed to emphasize the total “availability” of each Carthusian to God. “Solitude,” he explained, enabled Bruno “to make sense of his life: to be totally available for the divine love.” Pope John Paul II, in addressing the Carthusian Order on the ninth centenary of the death of Bruno, observed that the whole church is in need of “the Carthusian witness of total availability to the Spirit.” Pedro Arrupe, as superior general of the Society of Jesus, employed the same term to denote what he called “the heart of our identity” as Jesuits: “to be available.” Arrupe indicated that “availability” speaks not only to the identity of Jesuits as “contemplatives in action” but also to the centrality of “mission and obedience and their priority over everything else.”

---

67 *Const.* 603; ed. Padberg, 276.
68 *Const.* 605; ed. Padberg, 276.
69 CN 315; ed. Padberg, 319.
70 *Const.* 817; ed. Padberg, 402–03.
74 Arrupe, “Apostolic Availability,” 236.
course, is a general Christian virtue, and yet it would seem to correspond specifically to those whose vocation pertains to a personal commissioning and work. A deeper reciprocity between the two congregations may likewise be found here: while Jesuit availability locates its origins in prayer and the Exercises, Carthusian availability is often not confined to a particular place until death but has also enabled greater possibility for movement among monasteries according to need. Despite professing the customary monastic vow of stability, Carthusians are not infrequently transferred and missioned anew by the prior general to monasteries in other parts of the world.

In both cases, however, obedience is only fully understood within the broader charism and its tradition. Not only have Carthusians and Jesuits clarified and developed the practice of obedience in recent decades in accord with the “renewal and adaptation” called for by Vatican II, but the centrality of obedience in their respective traditions is contextualized by a likewise characteristic emphasis on personal discernment and freedom.\textsuperscript{75} Such are also virtues native to the life and work of contemplative apostles: “liberty of spirit,” observe the Carthusian Statutes, “is a mark of the solitary life.”\textsuperscript{76} The “continuing quality of our life,” the Statutes elaborate, “will depend more on the fidelity of each individual than on the multiplication of laws, or the updating of customs, or even the zeal of Priors.” So must each member be “led by the Spirit” to “find out what would please God and do it of his own free will, enjoying with sober wisdom that liberty of God’s children” of “which he will have to render an account.”\textsuperscript{77} In the same vein, the term \textit{discretio} has been a guiding principle of Carthusian life ever since it was given a central place in the first Carthusian customary drafted by Guigo I in the twelfth century—the same customary that evolved into what Ignatius requested when convalescing at Loyola. “Let no one be wise in his own eyes,”

\textbf{The expression spiritual exercises, like the formal practice of a midnight meditation, in fact began in the Charterhouse.}

\textsuperscript{75} See \textit{PC}, §2–9.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Statutes} 3.21.7.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Statutes} 4.33.2.
the contemporary Statutes counsel, so as to neglect “to open his heart to an enlightened guide” and “lose the quality of discretion.”78

A similar “discerning attitude” is to be learned by a Jesuit through the Exercises, spiritual direction, and formation so as to become implicit in every decision and mission.79 Perhaps its most celebrated articulation is found in the Constitutions in the section entitled “the occupations which those in the Society should undertake and those which they should avoid.” Given the length and depth of their formation, it is “presupposed” that fully professed Jesuits will be:

spiritual and sufficiently advanced that they will run in the path of Christ our Lord to the extent that their bodily strength and the exterior occupations undertaken through charity and obedience allow. Therefore, in what pertains to prayer, meditation, and study, and also in regard to the bodily practices of fasts, vigils, and other austerities or penances, it does not seem proper to give them any other rule than that which discreet charity [caritas discreta] dictates to them.80

On a day-to-day basis, discerning love in freedom provides the operative principle. But here, the Carthusian tradition also proffers a point of caution to which all could perhaps be more attentive. Given how solitude and freedom before God shape the modus operandi of Carthusian life, its spiritual literature has underscored, in accord with the desert fathers, the importance of resisting acedia, or the neglect of the spiritual life. Referencing a collation of patristic texts, Denys the Carthusian noted that, because “the solitary is not excited, rebuked, or observed by others,” a “fierce” temptation to acedia emerges from the “much greater freedom” that he enjoys relative “to monks living in community.”81 A Carthusian master of novices adds

79 CN 223; ed. Padberg, 255.
80 Const. 582; ed. Padberg, 254.
81 Unde ut in Collationibus Patrum habetur: Acedia acrius solitarios tentat, quoniam non excitantur nec increpantur, neque notari verentur ab homine, et majoris sunt libertatis quam in
that the “heaviest” form of this temptation is that acedia in which the religious begins to doubt the very “meaning in his way of life” and the vitality of what a Jesuit would call his mission.\(^82\)

One whose religious life is more solitary, whether within a cell or an apostolate, will require a personal spirituality with a strong internal impetus. The expression *spiritual exercises*, like the formal practice of a midnight meditation, in fact began in the Charterhouse.\(^83\) While these historical connections have long been known, deeper consideration of the correspondence between the two charisms may elucidate why such influences have taken shape and perdured. A more solitary mission must be impelled by a more personal love. Not only do Carthusian and Jesuit ways of proceeding thereby give a central place to personal contemplation and spiritual exercise, but their members have likewise historically gravitated toward a personal, affective experience of divine love as expressed, for instance, in devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. In fact, the “oldest known carving of the Sacred Heart of Jesus,” is claimed to be in a keystone arch of the Grande Chartreuse dated to 1474.\(^84\) Consistent with this artifact, the Carthusian understanding of prayer as “an affair of the heart”\(^85\) appears distinctly in a recently republished collection of Carthusian writings on the Sacred Heart from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. None other than Ludolph of Saxony, in a reflection on “Three Lessons from the Heart of Jesus,” asks why “the Heart of Christ was wounded for us with this wound of love,” concluding it was “so that we, returning love for love, could enter through the door of his side into his heart” and “unite all our love to his divine love.”\(^86\) Needless

---


\(^83\) Beyer traces the origins of the expression *spiritual exercises* from Garcia de Cisneros, whose *Ejercitatorio* introduced Ignatius to contemporary spiritual practices at Montserrat, back through several Carthusian sources to Guigo I. “Saint Ignace de Loyola chartreux…” 942–43.

\(^84\) [A Carthusian], “Preface,” in *Ancient Devotions to the Sacred Heart of Jesus* (Leominster, UK: Gracewing, 2018), 23.

\(^85\) [A Carthusian], “Preface,” in *Ancient Devotions to the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, 31–32.

\(^86\) Ludolph of Saxony, “Three Lessons from the Heart of Jesus,” in *Ancient Devo-
to say, such longings correspond profoundly to the spirituality of the Society of Jesus, in which affective and interpersonal dynamics course through the Exercises, from their application of the senses and focus on the *sentir* of the experience of God to the intimacy of the colloquies and love of the *Contemplatio*. There is also the long and rich history of a corresponding Jesuit devotion to the Sacred Heart that extends from the early Society unto the present day.

Of course, the internal spiritual impetus that such spiritualities facilitate is never experienced in sheer isolation, however. The personal and affective closeness of the incarnate love of God is rather received through and builds up that spiritual communion of which both Carthusian and Jesuit traditions speak. Both the Carthusians and the Jesuits were founded by a group of companions bound by a “holy friendship” or “friendship in the Lord.” This friendship, as begun in the founders, binds together every member into a unity that, while not expressed in a coenobitic fashion, is profound. However much Carthusians may pray and work alone, they are “bound together by love for the Lord, by prayer and by zeal for solitude.” Living in “harmony” and “mutual love,” they are to be “of one heart and soul.” Carthusians, explain their Statutes, so pray both alone and together that they may “with one voice glorify

---


88 *SpEx* 54; *Exercitia*, I: 192.


90 Ravier, *Saint Bruno the Carthusian*, 90.


92 Statutes 1.3.4; 2.11.4. “The grace of the Holy Spirit gathers solitaries together to form a communion in love, in the likeness of the Church; which remains one, though spread throughout the world (3.21.1).
God." While Jesuits, in turn, may be “spread out in diverse parts of the world,” the Society of Jesus can neither “be preserved or governed,” nor “attain the aim it seeks for the greater glory of God,” explain the Constitutions, “unless its members are united among themselves and with their head.” Although this “union” is to be expressed by “persons in congregations or chapters,” it is first and foremost “a union of hearts.”

Several other historical and structural parallels between the Charterhouse and Society further underscore the correspondence between the congregations. The Statutes of the Carthusian Order explain that lay monks, who “observe their own particular form of solitary life” . . . provide for the material needs of the House” in order to enable “the cloister monks to devote their time more freely to the silence of the cell.” These two distinct Carthusian “forms of life” coexist in a “complementary” relationship, the Statutes elaborate, in which a “communication of spiritual benefits” engenders a mutual and diverse “harmony” by which “the charism entrusted by the Spirit to our Father St. Bruno reaches its full expression.” Over the centuries, and especially in recent years following the Second Vatican Council and its distinctly universal vision, the lives of cloister and lay monks have become more integrated. Since the early 1970s, cloister and lay monks now pray the office together without a partition between them, share a common refectory, and may engage in common walks and recreation. Nevertheless, their respective schedules remain distinct, with fewer times of solitude for lay monks and more manual labor. Notably, the same distinctions pertain among Carthusian women, suggesting that they are not so much a matter of priesthood but of charism: Carthusian cloister nuns are also more singularly devoted to contemplative prayer in their cell in comparison with

---

93 Statutes 2.11.4.
94 Const. 655; ed. Padberg, 316.
95 Statutes 2.11.5. Unlike in the Society, the distinction between priest monks and lay brothers extends in Carthusian history even to their origins in the band of four priest monks and two lay brothers who founded what became the Grande Chartreuse.
96 See Statutes, 3.22.8–14, 6.49.10. I am also indebted for this and other information in this article to the Carthusian monks of the Charterhouse of the Transfiguration in Vermont.
converse and donate sisters, whose days are pervaded by practical tasks in the monastery. Yet among Carthusian men, every cloister monk is ordained a priest—a historical departure that distinguished Carthusian practice from Benedictine coenobitic monasticism. In addition to attending a daily conventual Mass, each cloister monk celebrates a “daily Eucharist in solitude, united to the entire Church.” Even on feast days, Carthusian liturgy is simple and spare: superfluous music, musical instruments, the transfer of feasts, processions, and solemn vestments are all proscribed. Prayer and contemplation are ever the priority. And although the liturgy is chanted, a Gregorian tone is used because its “melodies favor interiority and spiritual sobriety.” The Eucharist is the “center and high point of (Carthusian) life,” and yet it is adorned principally by the united interior prayer of the monks.

The inverse parallels of these characteristics in the history and form of the Society of Jesus again prove striking. In the Society as in the Charterhouse, the entire structure of the institute, while distinctly apostolic, is arranged for the fulfillment of the mission. The General Examen and Constitutions distinguish the temporal and spiritual coadjuitors from the professed members in light of a primary principle of mission fulfillment, whereby the former are to “help” in all the “necessary exterior” and “spiritual matters,” respectively, that “other members could not fulfill without detriment to the greater service of God.”

---

98 “It is an old custom of ours—in which we recognize a wonderful gift of God’s loving kindness—that every cloister monk is called to the sacred ministry of the altar” (Statutes 1.3.8).

99 Statutes 3.21.4. Jean Leclercq observes that “the priesthood of the Carthusian then was not ‘ministerial,’ nor was it ‘liturgical,’ to the same extent as with other monks.” The Spirituality of the Middle Ages (New York: Seabury Press, 1968), 158–59. The contemporary Statutes specify in respect of the conventual Mass that “on days when the community aspect of our life is more in evidence, the monks may concelebrate, united in one priesthood” (3.21.4).

100 On the origins and development of Carthusian liturgy, see Peeters, When Silence Speaks, 170–87.

101 Statutes 3.21.10.

102 Statutes 1.3.7.

103 Const. 112–14; ed. Padberg, 49; see also Const. 205–306, 365; ed. Padberg, 128, 154.
That said, among both Jesuits and Carthusians, there has always been one mission shared by all members. In this vein, the Carthusian Statutes also employ Paul’s analogy of the “body whose members have different functions,” such that the Carthusian Order, “composed of fathers and brothers,” consists of monks who “thus share in the same vocation, although in different ways.” Yet the finality of one has at least ostensibly been placed at the service of the other, and in the mutuality of these different ways, the contemplative and apostolic activity of the Carthusian cloister monk or Jesuit professed of four vows has been given a certain intrinsic priority, even as recent reforms made in light of the Second Vatican Council have established in both communities a more equal basis among all members. As among cloister monks, every Jesuit who is professed of four vows is a priest. The Society likewise shares the external liturgical “sobriety” of the Charterhouse, eschewing what might be considered liturgically superfluous in favor of a focus on formation for and devotion to mission.

A comparably instrumental dynamic appears in both the Carthusian and Jesuit perspectives on poverty. Guigo I wrote in his customary that Carthusian life was “in its littleness, thanks be to God,” to be “rarely affected either by penury or abundance.”

104 Statutes 2.11.1.
106 See CN 6, 1; 43, 1; 81, 3; 314, 1–2; ed. Padberg, 62; 109–11; 151; 317.
107 Statutes 3.21.10. Beyer suggests that Ignatius derived his liturgical sensibilities from his observance of the Carthusian rites, noting that the inaugural vow masses at Montmartre in 1534 and at Saint Paul Outside the Walls in 1541 were both Carthusian “in style,” being spare, “silent and solitary.” “Saint Ignace de Loyola chartreux…” 943–44.
108 With a marked narrowness and reserve, the Jesuit Constitutions prescribe: “Because the occupations which are undertaken for the aid of souls are of great importance, proper to our Institute, and very frequent; and because, on the other hand, our residence in one place or another is uncertain,” Jesuits “will not regularly hold choir for the canonical hours or sing Masses and offices.” If it seems apt to recite Vespers to draw people to “confessions, sermons, or lectures,” this may be done “without measured music or plain chant,” “on a devout, smooth, and simple tone,” but only “to the extent that it is judged useful” for drawing people to events that more directly correspond to our charism, “and in no other manner.” Const. 586–87; ed. Padberg, 256.
in the Charterhouse may often be lived in a more austere fashion than in the Society, Carthusian poverty is “not sought for itself,” explains a Carthusian novice master, but is rather “subordinated to the contemplative life, which ought to shun all that could distract from adhering to God.”¹¹₀ In a similar yet inverse fashion, Jesuit poverty is commonly described as “apostolic.”¹¹¹ Although poverty is to conform Jesuits to the “radical following of the humble and poor Christ” and is presented as a “condition of apostolic credibility,” it is “measured by our apostolic purpose.”¹¹² For this reason, everything requisite for study and apostolic work is to be readily available, and in “what pertains to food, sleep, and the use of the other things necessary or proper for our life,” the manner is “ordinary.”¹¹³

IV. Concluding Reflections: Loving God and Neighbor, Together

More than the simple complementarity between the contemplative and apostolic, as might appear between other religious congregations, the parallels between the Charterhouse and the Society suggest another level of shared logic. To return to the familiar Pauline analogy, just as the parts of a human body cannot be fully understood apart from the others, so the charisms of the body of Christ should likewise be fully understood only together, as forms of life that, like organs, prove mutually illuminative in their complementary interconnectedness. Several striking manifestations of this complementary yet inverse parallelism may be found in the common tensions that may recur in both Carthusian and Jesuit life. There is, for instance, the question of how to balance each member’s commitment to a personally tailored mission, whether in the solitude of a cell or in the activity of the world, with the shared commitment

¹¹₀ This “principle,” he continues, “is applied in every area: liturgy, the individual life of the monk and the economic organization of the monastery.” [A Carthusian], Poor, Therefore Rich, 144.

¹¹¹ CN 159; ed. Padberg, 227.


¹¹³ Const. 580; ed. Padberg, 238.
of living together as a community of contemplative apostles. Perhaps for both Carthusians and Jesuits, the comparisons made here may serve to remind us of the non-coenobitic priorities of our charisms, as in contemplation and in the apostolate. When viewed together, the Carthusian and Jesuit ways of life thereby also illumine the vitality of an interior formation of the heart that fosters a personal appropriation of the mysteries of faith and its accompanying spiritual dispositions, such as obedience, availability, discerning love, and freedom.

In both of these charisms, questions could nonetheless be raised over the extent to which the relative subordination and even instrumentalization of other elements of religious life for the sake of mission may compromise their intrinsic value, such as with the liturgy or the observance of poverty. In the same vein, since the Second Vatican Council, questions have arisen in both congregations as to how to integrate more fully into one community their diverse levels of membership. While Carthusians have maintained more practical distinctions in distributing tasks between cloister monks and brothers, Jesuits often have obviated the difficulties that would otherwise arise from the need for a certain institutional infrastructure for mission by hiring lay employees. In the celebration of the Eucharist, the “font and apex of the Christian life,” questions persist on how to balance the personal and ecclesial obligations of a contemplative apostolic priest with the communal dynamics of the liturgy. Intriguingly, Carthusian cloister monks have navigated this tension by typically assisting at two masses each day, one as the sole celebrant and the other in a communal congregation. A Jesuit apostolic schedule would not seem to allow for such a luxury. When a Jesuit is not otherwise engaged in pastoral ministry, might not concelebration best hold the two priorities in tandem?

There are also, of course, many differences between the two congregations, even beyond their obvious polarities. As with every order founded before the Society, Carthusian ordination to the priesthood

---

follows multiple rounds of temporary and then solemn profession. There are likewise Carthusian branches for both men and women. However, just as Carthusian cloister sisters live by a very similar pattern to cloister monks, so do many modern women’s apostolic congregations, from Mary Ward’s Congregation of Jesus (1609) onward, intentionally live according to the spirit and structures of the Society of Jesus.\(^\text{115}\) Another practical difference between the two congregations appears in their approach to worldly recognition. The rigor, seclusion, and spiritual depth of Carthusian life has aptly won them a certain succès d’estime. Yet they deliberately shun all honor and distinction from without to the point of publishing only under anonymity, preferring “to be a saint rather than to be called one.” Knowing, perhaps, that the directness of Jesuit exposure to the world would render Jesuits more prone to the untrustworthy lure of its esteem, Ignatius time and again referred the “least Society of Jesus” to “the greater glory of God.” Yet as with the Carthusian counsels concerning acedia, Jesuits may undoubtedly still learn much in this respect from the ingrained degrees of Carthusian humility.

All our differences notwithstanding, there are too many parallels between Carthusians and Jesuits to dismiss the special \textit{societas fraternitatis} established by the Charterhouse and the Society as merely coincidental. As in a fugue, their distinct, contrapuntal voices harmonize into a whole that is irreducible to any of its parts. Or, in keeping with the more organic, corporal, and simultaneously integrated biblical analogy, as each connecting organ and limb of a body is fully understood only in relation to the others, so does the juxtaposition of these different yet complementary ways of life enable a deeper understanding not only of their distinctiveness but also of the profound harmonies that

persist in the diversely integral body of the church. Perhaps most significantly for Jesuits, the parallels between the Society and the Charterhouse may serve to recall the ever-foundational role of contemplative prayer in Jesuit life. “The more our soul finds itself alone and solitary,” Ignatius counseled, “so much more does it become apt for approaching and drawing near to our Creator and Lord.” At the same time, for Carthusians, the juxtaposition of our charisms may recall how the solitude of a cell is not only for the sake of the Carthusian but also for the whole world. By contemplative prayer, elucidates an anonymous Carthusian, “I lend my voice to those without a voice who are often the poor, my faith to the unbelieving, my trust to the despairing, my words of forgiveness to those who hate. And this is not a pious fiction,” he recalls, for “in Christ, we are a single being.”

Jesus presents the love of God from the heart as the “first and greatest commandment.” For “God wants first of all our love for himself,” a love itself made pure and complete only by grace. In response to the God who has loved us “to the end” (Jn 13:1), we seek to make an “evening sacrifice” of our lives that rises with a “fragrance of sweetness” to God, that the Lord deign to “receive this holocaust” of ourselves “through the blood of Jesus Christ.” Solitude reminds both Carthusians and Jesuits that the heart of our return of the love of God is “giving unreserved priority to an attention, a receptivity without any other end in itself, apparently absurd from the earthly point of view, in the service of divine Love among all our occupations, however urgent

---

116 Quanto más nuestra ánima se halla sola y apartada, se hace más apta para se acercar y llegar a su Criador y Señor (SpEx 20; Exercitia, I: 162). The Carthusian Statutes likewise recall that “for tasting the spiritual savor of psalmody; for penetrating the message of the written page; for kindling the fire of fervent prayer; for engaging in profound meditation; for losing oneself in mystic contemplation; for obtaining the heavenly dew of purifying tears—nothing is more helpful than solitude” (2.11).

117 [A Carthusian], Poor, Therefore Rich, 68.

118 [A Carthusian], From Advent to Pentecost 105.


120 “Therefore I suppliantly beg your immense Goodness and Clemency, through the blood of Jesus Christ, to deign to receive this holocaust in an odor of sweetness” (Const. 540; ed. Padberg, 210).
and reasonable they may be.”\footnote{[A Carthusian], From Advent to Pentecost, 105.} For what divine love ultimately wants is our love in turn, and the vocation of a Carthusian uniquely illumines and fulfills the primacy of this call. At the same time, the latter part of the double commandment of love issues in an evangelical and charitable mission that must be put into practice on behalf of the Christ who awaits us in the neighbor, and this corresponds directly with the Jesuit emphasis on love-in-action. Both Carthusians and Jesuits may be at once contemplatives and apostles, and yet by a paradoxical harmony, we best fulfill what the Lord has asked of us only together. So is the indispensability of the love of both God and neighbor in the life of each Jesuit, Carthusian, and Christian also realized and reflected in a broader diversity of charisms, a beautiful mutuality in which each part remains incomplete. For neither any individual nor any charism is an island but part of a reciprocal communion whose many variations of love together comprise the life of “one body, one spirit in Christ.”\footnote{Eucharistic Prayer III, §113, The Roman Missal (New Jersey: Catholic Book Publishing Corp., 2011), 505.}
Editor:

I read this issue of Studies (Winter 2022) with great interest, gratitude, tears, and hope. Thanks to all of you for bringing all this to our eyes now.

Fr. Chisholm, your history of slaveholding in the long history of our Society is powerful. As a member of the former Missouri Province, I knew that the great trip by river in 1824 from Whitemarsh, Maryland, to Florissant, Missouri, included three slave couples. I also knew that Saint Louis University was built with slave labor. Fr. Peter DeSmet strongly opposed our holding slaves. If I remember correctly, the six slaves at St. Stanislaus Seminary in Florissant were freed about 1848. Of course, they had no place to go, so they stayed there, working for the Jesuits as hired laborers.

Mr. Critchley-Menor, I appreciate your work on the racism that prevented us from accepting Blacks into the US provinces. I am fortunate to have entered the Missouri Province in 1958, when we had about eight Black novices. Most were from Belize, but one was an African American from Denver, two years behind me.

While I was not privy to the provincials’ decision-making policies, I took it for granted that some of my classmates and companions in ministry would be Black.

Fr. Kesicki, your work on slavery, memory, and reconciliation gives me great hope that we as US Jesuits are on our way to the necessary humility and contribution. I certainly desire to be a part of this. I am so grateful to you, to the provincials, and to Georgetown University for so much hard work in this long overdue process. Do not grow weary. Keep up the good work.

You mentioned Maringouin, Louisiana. It reminded me of an episode of Finding your Roots. Henry Louis Gates, Jr., was interviewing C. Epatha Merkerson, an actor known for, among other things, her work on the television program Law and Order. She mentioned that some of her relatives live in Maringouin, where she continues to visit them. Gates told her of the sale of the 272 slaves by Georgetown, some of whom ended up in Maringouin. Merkeson was surprised and upset that priests owned and sold slaves. Then Gates told her of the project at Georgetown and that
one building had been renamed after the slave Isaac Hawkins. It was a powerful moment in the program.

Many, many thanks. I will re-read this issue in the coming week to help me be humble and to lift my spirit of hope.

Louis J. McCabe (ucs)
Our Lady of the Oaks Retreat House
Grand Coteau, Louisiana, USA
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