



BOSTON COLLEGE

FEB 18 1903

PROPERTY OF BAPST LIBRARY

✓

STUDIES

in the Spirituality of Jesuits



The General Congregations of the Society of Jesus
A Brief Survey of Their History

John W. Padberg, S. J.

Published by the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality,
especially for American Jesuits working out their *aggiornamento*
in the spirit of Vatican Council II

Vol. VI

January and March, 1974
75 cents

Nos. 1 and 2

THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

consists of a group of Jesuits from various provinces who are listed below. The members were appointed by the Fathers Provincial of the United States. The purpose of the Seminar is to study topics pertaining to the spiritual doctrine and practice of Jesuits, especially American Jesuits, and to communicate the results to the members of the Assistancy. The hope is that this will lead to further discussion among all American Jesuits -- in private, or in small groups, or in community meetings. All this is done in the spirit of Vatican Council II's recommendation to religious institutes to recapture the original charismatic inspiration of their founders and to adapt it to the changed circumstances of modern times. The members of the Seminar welcome reactions or comments in regard to the topics they publish.

To achieve these purposes, especially amid today's pluralistic cultures, the Seminar must focus its direct attention sharply, frankly, and specifically on the problems, interests, and opportunities of the Jesuits of the United States. However, many of these interests are common also to Jesuits of other regions, or to other priests, religious men or women, or lay men or women. Hence the studies of the Seminar, while meant especially for American Jesuits, are not exclusively for them. Others who may find them helpful, are cordially welcome to read them.

THE MEMBERS OF THE SEMINAR ARE:

- Thomas E. Clarke, S.J., Gonzaga Renewal Center, Box 150, R.D. 2, Monroe, New York 10950
- William J. Connolly, S.J., Center for Religious Development, 42 Kirkland Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- David L. Fleming, S.J., School of Divinity, St. Louis University, 3634 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63108
- William J. Fulco, S.J., Jesuit School of Theology, 1735 Le Roy Street, Berkeley, California 94709
- George E. Ganss, S.J., School of Divinity, St. Louis University. (Chairman of the Assistancy Seminar and Editor of its *Studies*) His address is: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, Fusz Memorial 3700 West Pine Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63108.
- James J. Gill, S.J., 1575 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
- James E. O'Hearn, S.J., Secretary of the American Assistancy Seminar, Fusz Memorial, 3700 West Pine Blvd, St. Louis, Missouri 63108
- Charles E. O'Neill, S.J., Loyola University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
- Ladislav Orsy, S.J., Department of Theology, Fordham University, Bronx, New York 10458
- John H. Wright, S.J., Jesuit School of Theology, 1735 Le Roy Street, Berkeley, California 94709

STUDIES

in the Spirituality of Jesuits



The General Congregations of the Society of Jesus
A Brief Survey of Their History

John W. Padberg, S. J.

Published by the American Assistancy Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality,
especially for American Jesuits working out their *aggiornamento*
in the spirit of Vatican Council II

Vol. VI

January and March, 1974
75 cents

Nos. 1 and 2

STUDIES



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/generalcongregat612padb>

CONTENTS

THE GENERAL CONGREGATIONS OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

A Brief Survey of Their History

by

John W. Padberg, S.J.

	Page
Editor's Foreword	iv
A Reference List of the Generals and General Congregations	vi
Introduction	1
PART I. FROM GENERAL CONGREGATION I TO THE SUPPRESSION IN 1773	5
Congregations I (1558) through XIX (1758), Chapters 1 through 19	5
PART II. THE INTERIM CONGREGATIONS, 1773-1814	36
Interim Congregations I (1782) through V (1805), Chapters 20 through 24	37
PART III. FROM THE RESTORATION TO CONGREGATION XXXI, 1814-1966	40
Congregations XX (1820) through XXX (1957), Chapters 25 through 30	42
Congregation XXXI (1965-1966)	
A. Introduction	73
B. The Opening	75
C. The Procedures	78
D. The First Session (May 7-July 15, 1965)	80
E. The Second Session (September 8-November 17, 1966)	82
F. On the Institute in General	83
G. On the Formation of Jesuits	85
H. On Religious Life	87
I. On the Apostolate	92
J. On the Congregations	97
K. On Government	100
L. On the Decrees in the Appendix	102
M. Comment	105
PART IV. TOWARD GENERAL CONGREGATION XXXII	108
Footnotes	112
Abbreviations	126
Editor's Note about an Index	127
Announcement: I. Iparraguirre, S.J., <i>Contemporary Trends in Studies on the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus</i>	128

Editor's Foreword

The lack of a comprehensive history of all the general congregations of the Society was found to be an unfortunate handicap by many members of General Congregation XXXI in 1965 and 1966. The decrees which resulted from past congregations were readily available. But often it was hard or impossible to learn the historical background which issued in some given decree, or the reasons pro and con which had been alleged about it, or whether or not those reasons still hold good for today. Fortunately, awareness of this handicap has led the Historical Institute of the Society in Rome to undertake the production of a thorough history to meet these needs. But much time will be required to complete it; and it is not likely to be in English.

Nearly a year ago Father John W. Padberg observed that even a brief history of the congregations, composed in English, would be very helpful to many American Jesuits, especially to those who are members of provincial congregations or are engaged in writing postulata for General Congregation XXXII, which is scheduled to begin December 31, 1974. He suggested this as a topic for our *Studies*. The members of the Assistancy Seminar agreed with him on its importance and invited him to undertake the project himself as an associate member of the Seminar. He graciously consented; and despite the pressure of many other tasks, he completed the work in time for this issue. We are deeply grateful to him.

A native of St. Louis and a Jesuit since 1944, Father Padberg did doctoral work in history at Harvard University and postgraduate work in theology at the Institute Catholique

in Paris. From 1964 onward he taught history and historical theology at Saint Louis University, where in 1969 he received the \$10,000 Harbison Award, given nationally by the Danforth Foundation, for excellence in teaching. He was Academic Vice-President of Saint Louis University, 1969-1972, and Acting Executive Vice-President, 1972-1973. He is the author of *Colleges in Controversy: The Jesuit Schools in France from Revival to Suppression, 1815-1880* (Harvard University Press, 1968), and of many articles in various periodicals. At present he is Professor of History at Saint Louis University. But he is on academic leave and is serving as one of the research associates at the Jesuit Conference in Washington, D.C. With several Jesuit colleagues he is working on a study of the Jesuit apostolate of education in the United States.

George E. Ganss, S.J.
Chairman and Editor
The American Assistancy Seminar

A REFERENCE LIST
of the
Generals and General Congregations

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Ignatius of Loyola, Apr 19, 1541 – July 31, 1556 | |
| 2. Diego Laynez, July 2, 1558 – Jan 19, 1565 | 1. June 19 – Sept 10, 1558 |
| 3. Saint Francis Borgia, July 2, 1565 – Oct 1, 1572 | 2. June 21 – Sept 3, 1565 |
| 4. Everard Mercurian, Apr 23, 1573 – Aug 1, 1580 | 3. Apr 12 – June 16, 1573 |
| 5. Claudio Aquaviva, Feb 19, 1581 – Jan 31, 1615 | 4. Feb 7 – Apr 22, 1581 |
| | 5. Nov 3, 1593 – Jan 18, 1594 |
| | 6. Feb 21 – Mar 29, 1608 |
| 6. Muzio Vitelleschi, Nov 15, 1615 – Feb 9, 1645 | 7. Nov 5, 1615 – Jan 26, 1616 |
| 7. Vincenzo Carafa, Jan 7, 1646 – June 8, 1649 | 8. Nov 21, 1645 – Apr 14, 1646 |
| 8. Francesco Piccolomini, Dec 21, 1649 – June 17, 1651 | 9. Dec 13, 1649 – Feb 23, 1650 |
| 9. Luigi Gottifredi, Jan 21, 1652 – March 12, 1652 | 10. Jan 7 – Mar 20, 1652 |
| 10. Goswin Nickel, Mar 17, 1652 – July 31, 1664 | |
| 11. Giovanni Paolo Oliva, Vicar June 7, 1661 | 11. May 9 – July 27, 1661 |
| General, July 31, 1664 – Nov 26, 1681 | |
| 12. Charles de Noyelle, July 5, 1682 – Dec 12, 1686 | 12. June 22 – Sept 6, 1682 |
| 13. Tirso González, July 6, 1687 – Oct 27, 1705 | 13. June 22 – Sept 7, 1687 |
| | 14. Nov 19, 1696 – Jan 16, 1697 |
| 14. Michelangelo Tamburini, Jan 31, 1706 – Feb 28, 1730 | 15. Jan 20 – Apr 3, 1706 |
| 15. Frantisek Retz, Nov 30, 1730 – Nov 19, 1750 | 16. Nov 19, 1730 – Feb 13, 1731 |
| 16. Ignazio Visconti, July 4, 1751 – May 4, 1755 | 17. June 22 – Sept 5, 1751 |
| 17. Luigi Centurione, Nov 30, 1755 – Oct 2, 1757 | 18. Nov 18, 1755 – Jan 28, 1756 |
| 18. Lorenzo Ricci, May 21, 1758 – Aug 16, 1773 | 19. May 9 – June 18, 1758 |
| 19. Tadeusz Brzozowski, Aug 7, 1814 – Feb 5, 1820 | |
| 20. Luigi Fortis, Oct 18, 1820 – Jan 27, 1829 | 20. Oct 9 – Dec 10, 1820 |
| 21. Jan Roothaan, July 9, 1829 – May 8, 1853 | 21. June 30 – Aug 17, 1829 |
| 22. Pieter Beckx, July 2, 1853 – Mar 4, 1887 | 22. June 22 – Aug 31, 1853 |
| 23. Anton Anderledy, Vicar Sept 24, 1883 | 23. Sept 16 – Oct 23, 1883 |
| General Mar 4, 1887 – Jan 18, 1892 | |
| 24. Luis Martín, Oct 2, 1892 – Apr 18, 1906 | 24. Sept 24 – Dec 5, 1892 |
| 25. Franz Wernz, Sept 8, 1906 – Aug 19, 1914 | 25. Sept 1 – Oct 18, 1906 |
| 26. Wlodmir Ledochowski, Feb 11, 1915 – Dec 13, 1942 | 26. Feb 2 – Mar 18, 1915 |
| | 27. Sept 8 – Dec 21, 1923 |
| | 28. Mar 12 – May 9, 1938 |
| 27. John Baptist Janssens, Sept 15, 1946 – Oct 5, 1964 | 29. Sept 6 – Oct 23, 1946 |
| | 30. Sept 6 – Nov 11, 1957 |
| 28. Pedro Arrupe, May 22, 1965 | 31. May 7 – July 15, 1965 |
| | Sept 8 – Nov 17, 1966 |

Reproduced, with permission, from William V. Bangert, S.J., *A History of the Society of Jesus* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1972), page 515.

THE GENERAL CONGREGATIONS OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

A Brief Survey of Their History

by

John W. Padberg, S.J.
Research Associate
Jesuit Conference
1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Introduction

In the Society of Jesus, the general congregation is the supreme governing body. This we know from the *Constitutions* of the Society; yet, at the same time, a strange anomaly exists in that up to the present a full history of the general congregations of the Society has not yet been written. This present work does not attempt to fill that lacuna. Such a full history would be far lengthier than what can be put between the covers of this booklet; and, more importantly, it would need time and resources, especially archival resources, which are simply unavailable at the present time to this present author. Fortunately, a thoroughgoing history of the general congregations is now being prepared by the Historical Institute of the Society in Rome. But it cannot be available, at least to us Americans, before General Congregation XXXII begins. The present writer hopes that the new history from Rome will appear soon and supersede what is presented here. This present work, by contrast, is simply a brief sketch done in the conviction that, as we prepare for General Congregation XXXII and our provincial congregations, it will be helpful to Jesuits to know, at least in summary form, something of the history of past general congregations.

Why helpful? Although we may theorize on the structure and actions of past congregations, and also pray for the work of future congregations, both theory and prayer are ordered eventually to deeds. It will be helpful,

and indeed perhaps necessary, to see what past congregations have done, in order that we may come to know what future congregations can do; in other words, that we may approach the forthcoming congregation with realistic aspirations, with awareness of our human limitations, both individually and societally, and with great trust in the providence of God.

Generosity in conceiving great plans and carrying them out is a trait which Jesuits have long wanted to be characteristic of the Society. But we can conceive impossible plans or become discouraged when more modest plans do not mature unless we see the real life conditions in which they are inevitably inserted; and hence will come our realistic aspirations.

Every general congregation, from the first in 1558 to the most recent in 1966, has brought together a great variety of men, with an equally great variety of talents and limitations. Each congregation tried to make ample use of those talents. Each surmounted such limitations with a greater or lesser degree of success, as future congregations will also do and for which they may be helped if they know what has happened in the past; and hence will come our awareness of human limitations. The Society has pursued its vocation through the stormiest of circumstances, both internal and external to the Society; and general congregations often reflect and epitomize those circumstances. But through them all it was as sure as was Ignatius of God's protection; hence can come a great trust in the providence of God.

But perhaps the best way to sum up how a knowledge of past congregations can be of help to the individual Jesuit and to the Society as they face the future is to recall the words of the bronze plaque at the front of the National Archives in Washington: "The past is prologue." The better we know that past, the more complete a prologue we have to the drama of the future. With that prologue knowledge, we are better able to shape that future. Continuity with the history of the Society can help us in making surer decisions in contemporary life.

In addition, and even more importantly, if we take seriously St. Ignatius' desire that we seek to find God in all things, we shall surely find him, and the opportunity to go to him in prayer, in the general

congregations of the Society. God, our Father, may have promised to be propitious to Ignatius and to the Society, but he never promised it to the neglect of either prayer or of human means through which to carry out his designs. One of those means important to our life as members of the Society is the general congregation. Indeed, much of what it does can seem to be and can really be legal, juridical, formal, structural. Yet our spirituality, both corporate and individual, cannot fail to be influenced by those structures.

To use a distinction not quite adequate, but still useful for clarification if not for living out our lives as Christians, the congregations serve, both naturally and supernaturally, as means to God. The congregations and what they do can be the means on the individual level by which we advance in holiness; Ignatius valued such means highly. A congregation, too, can be the means on the level of the supernatural by which the Spirit speaks to and within the whole Society. But we shall understand his voice only poorly as he speaks through the congregation unless we know something about the congregation itself. Then, on the most immediate level of the present day, we have repeatedly been asked to pray for the success of the coming Thirty-second General Congregation. Our prayers can surely be more direct, more heartfelt, perhaps more realistic, if we know something about what a congregation is, how it has functioned, what we might expect from the future as we look at its past.

So brief a paper as this must obviously dictate practical choices among the vast material theoretically available on past congregations. The choice of events has to be narrowed down lest the paper become a mere listing of facts. Although all of the past congregations are dealt with at least briefly, a more detailed treatment is usually given to those congregations and those events which seem to have a more decisive influence on the life of the Society. The archival material on the sum total of the thirty-one congregations is surely enormous and would be absolutely necessary as primary sources for anyone writing a comprehensive history of them. For this present brief treatment, the main primary source material is to be found in the decrees of all the congregations as printed

in the Florentine edition of the *Institute*, the decrees as published in the *Acta Romana*, the decrees of Congregations XXVII through XXX in the *Collectio Decretorum*, and the decrees of General Congregation XXXI in the Latin version of the *Acta Romana* (XIV, fascicle VI), and the English version, *Documents of the Thirty-first General Congregation*, published by the Woodstock College Press.¹

Again for reasons of brevity, certain conventions have been adopted. Every congregation set up various committees, such as the *deputatio ad secernenda postulata*, approximating a steering committee today, charged with arranging the postulata and hence, in many ways, the business of the congregation; or such as the *deputatio ad detrimenta*, charged with looking to what might be injuring the welfare of the Society. Every congregation had its postulata, its speakers, its influential members. Every congregation approached its work out of the background of its own time and the explicit awareness of the opportunities and problems bearing upon the Society. Every congregation also began its work with a set of operational ideologies, more or less strong but almost always implicit. Any full history of the general congregations would, of course, examine in detail every one of these factors. They are all important, but none of them has been directly treated here; they cannot be in so brief an essay. Another convention adopted here is the use of illustrative anecdotes. Often they can sum up in a vivid way an attitude, a mood, a reaction, which would be less well described in a multiplicity of abstract words.

One last preliminary remark. The reader will notice very little explicit treatment given to material directly dealing with the spiritual life of Jesuits or of the Society as a whole. The omission is regrettable, but deliberate; and that for two reasons. The first is brevity. The second is immeasurably more important and makes the omission and the brevity possible. *It is simply that every single congregation thought this concern for the spiritual life to be the most important of its responsibilities, that every single congregation discussed and passed decrees on it, and that every single congregation treated in its own way the same essential spiritual concerns which are the topics of our most recent con-*

gregation, *General Congregation XXXI*. Such being the case, it was possible in these brief pages to omit a particular treatment of the spiritual life in each congregation, since this topic was both an ever-recurring one and one already known in its essentials to present-day Jesuits. If a Jesuit today wishes to know what spiritual concerns were in the minds and hearts of his forefathers at past congregations, he can do no better than consult the list of such spiritual concerns in the contents of *Documents of the Thirty-first General Congregation*, and perhaps also look them up in the extensive index at the end of Volume III of the *Florentine Institutum* (1893). For each of us, this can well be a source of happiness and peace. For the author of this present essay, nothing shines through more clearly and nothing indicates more strongly than this fact that the Society of today in its concern for preaching the Gospel is truly the original Society of Jesus, in historical continuity with its past while it engages in contemporary discernment of its present and its future.

PART I. FROM GENERAL CONGREGATION I TO THE SUPPRESSION IN 1773

1. General Congregation I, June 19--September 10, 1558. 20 Members

When St. Ignatius died on July 31, 1556, the Society of Jesus was composed of twelve Provinces: Portugal, Italy, Sicily, Upper Germany, Lower Germany, France, Aragón, Castile, Andalusia, the Indies, Ethiopia, and Brazil. Diego Laynez, although at this time ill, was chosen as vicar-general during the interval between the death of Ignatius and the general congregation, which was called for November, 1556. Actually, it was almost two years from the death of Ignatius to the opening of the First General Congregation.

Five of the very early companions of Ignatius were still alive, Laynez, Salmerón, Bobadilla, Rodrigues, and Broët. Besides these men, all of them professed, there were no more than thirty-five other professed fathers at the time, despite the fact that already there were more than 1,000 Jesuits spread all over the world. At this time, too, the war between Pope Paul IV and King Philip II of Spain was ready to

break out. It made impossible the presence of the Spanish fathers at the congregation, and so Laynez adjourned the opening date until April, 1557. Philip had forbidden his Jesuit subjects, even Francis Borgia, to go to Rome. The need to elect a general seems to have moved some of the fathers in Rome to think about going to Spain for a congregation because the king persisted in his refusal; but the pope and the pontifical court, very suspicious of the Spaniards, would never have consented to such an idea. In fact, Paul IV forbade the professed to leave Rome without his authorization.

The already tense situation was not helped by the fact that two complicating circumstances made the interregnum difficult. The first was that while Laynez had been elected vicar-general, two years earlier Ignatius, when sick, had named Nadal to that post. Ignatius, when well, took back to himself from the vicar the work of the general. Some thought that Nadal, then far away in Spain, had been unjustly treated at the time of the election of the vicar-general. Fortunately, Nadal supported the choice of Laynez. The second was that the ever-unpredictable Bobadilla, one of Ignatius' early companions, got the idea that until the *Constitutions* written by Ignatius had been formally adopted or ratified by the Society in a congregation, those early "founding fathers" should govern the Society as a group. Bobadilla got to Paul IV with a vigorous critique of Ignatius and of the *Constitutions*. Fortunately here, too, Nadal countered Bobadilla's theories; and the delegate of the pope finally persuaded Bobadilla to drop his plan. Even so, Paul IV still ordered the *Constitutions* of the Society to be submitted to a new examination by the papal curia, even after all they had previously been through before the approval which they had received.

Finally, peace was concluded between the Holy See and Spain. On June 19, 1558, the First General Congregation opened in Rome; it was composed of no more than twenty members. The provincials were to attend, along with two professed fathers elected by provincial congregations. But in France, in Sicily, and in several other places, there were not yet two professed fathers. In addition to the five early disciples,

there were also such people as Canisius, Nadal, and Mercurian as members of this First Congregation.

On July 2, 1558, the day on which the election of the new general was to take place, Cardinal Pacheco, in the name of the Holy Father, presented himself in the meeting and announced to them that, while Paul IV did not at all intend to influence the choice which ought to be made solely in accord with the Institute, and while the pope desired to be considered as the protector of the order in a very special way, nonetheless, he, the cardinal, was deputed by Paul IV to take on the functions of secretary of the congregation and to be the counter of votes. This was not as unusual as it may strike us at the present time. In such troubled times, there were disputes in many of the religious orders precisely at the point at which a new head was to be chosen. Nonetheless, given Paul IV's autocratic temperament, it did not bode well for the Society.

Layneze was elected by a majority of thirteen out of the twenty votes; Nadal received four; Borgia, Lannoy, and Broët each received one.

When the *Constitutions* had been experimentally promulgated, St. Ignatius wished to leave to his successor and to the general congregation the right to modify those parts which did not work out in practice. He therefore expected that the *Constitutions* would be examined anew by the first general congregation, and in order for them to acquire the force of law, that they would be approved by this same congregation. This it did just as Ignatius had written them. Paul IV, however, was in a reforming mood, and he had other ideas as to what those *Constitutions* ought to say. First he demanded that the Society adopt the practice of choir as other orders were obliged to do; and, second, that the general be elected for a determined length of three years. The congregation protested respectfully and said that they would send to the pope "the unanimous opinion of the congregation in favor of the perpetuity of office for the general."² Layneze and Salmerón took to Paul IV a letter which, with the exception of the new general, had been signed by all of the professed fathers. The pope received them rather coldly; and when Layneze and Salmerón attempted to explain the reason for their persistence in

their views, Paul accused them of being insubmissive and said he feared that he would see all kinds of disorders arise in the Society.

The position of Laynez was embarrassing. He told Paul IV that he had not sought for nor desired the office of general. As far as it touched him personally, he was perfectly willing to give up his office at the end of three years; in fact, he would regard it as a favor if the pope delivered him of the burden right then and there. Nonetheless, he told the pope that he knew that the fathers of the congregation, in electing him, had the intention to elect a general for perpetuity, following the spirit of the *Constitutions*. Laynez said that they came to have the lifetime election confirmed; but if Paul did not approve and confirm it, they would obey willingly. Obey they did.

Paul insisted, too, on the common office in choir; and on September 29 the Jesuits began this. Fortunately in these several changes ordered by the pope, Paul had never made any mention of the earlier bulls which had formally and canonically established the Society. Several of the curial cardinals were consulted when Paul IV died a year later; and they responded that the modifications were simply the personal wish of the pope, not a formal decision of the Holy See, and that nothing in the Institute of the Society was altered. Because of this, the Society assumed its old usages, only to have some of these questions brought up again at a later time.

The congregation passed more than one hundred and thirty decrees, many of the first ones on the juridical formalities of the process of election for the general. They even went into such details as when the votes were to be burned. Much more important was the reaction to the suggestion that the congregation should set down more time to be spent in prayer than the *Constitutions* originally established. The congregation voted down the suggestion.³ This question was to recur more than once in the history of the congregations. Also to recur was the question of whether the "substantials" of the Institute were to be changed, and the answer was "No."⁴

To conclude on a minor, but perhaps contemporary note, this first

congregation even had to consider whether beards should be cultivated in the Society. Despite the example of their holy founder, the congregation members decided against it.⁵ The congregation ended on September 10, 1558.

2. General Congregation II, June 21--September 3, 1563. 39 Members

At the death of Laynez in 1565, the professed fathers living in Rome chose as vicar Francis Borgia, one of Laynez' former assistants. Borgia convoked the Second General Congregation for June 21 of the same year. Among the thirty-nine fathers present were again some of the first companions of Ignatius, such as Salmerón and Bobadilla. Also prominent were Polanco, Mercurian, Ribadeneyra, Canisius, and Nadal. Borgia, as vicar general and one of the most prominent Jesuits among those present, was an obvious candidate for the generalate. He even wrote to Salmerón and Ribadeneyra asking what they thought about the possibility of his explicitly asking the members of the congregation not to think about him as a choice. The two of them counseled him against this, saying there was more virtue in leaving the matter to God Himself. On July 2, 1565, Borgia was elected general on the first ballot with thirty-one of the thirty-nine votes. The other eight included his own and seven of those who knew Borgia very intimately and did not wish him to leave the kind of solitude, penance, and prayer which he so ardently desired.

The congregation had begun on June 21. In the context of the rapid growth of the Society in the twenty-five years of its existence and the expansion of its works, the congregation passed more than one hundred and twenty decrees, some of them momentous for the later life of the Society. With requests pouring in from all over Europe, the congregation recommended moderation and reserve in the acceptance of new colleges.⁶ At the same time, a house of training and a novitiate for young Jesuits are ordered to be established, as far as possible, in each province of the Society. This was a change from the way earlier Jesuits had been trained in regular houses of the Society.⁷ Again, the "substantials" of the Institute were not to be changed.⁸ Questions arose of whether the *Constitutions* were congruent with the newly-concluded Council of Trent,

and it was decided that they were.⁹ Assistants from four "nations" were chosen.¹⁰

Perhaps the most important decree followed on a serious discussion of several days whether the general could increase the length of time prescribed for prayer. This congregation decided that he could, and he did for some provinces.¹¹ This is to be seen in the light of what the First Congregation did in refusing to change the prescriptions of Ignatius. In general, at Congregation II the German and French delegates insisted on fidelity to the decisions of Ignatius. The Italians, the Spanish, and the Portuguese (approximately three assistancies versus one) thought that the preservation of the spirit and the reality of prayer in the Society, something which both sides agreed in wanting, demanded fixed and lengthened times of prayer. The ramifications of this decision, what it meant for the future, what it implied of one's view of the apostolic life, have been discussed for centuries.¹² At the risk of simplifying, it might be said that the Thirty-first Congregation, without in any way discounting prayer, opted for a return to and confirmation of Ignatius' basic insights on prayer, which surely rested on "finding God in all things."¹³

Just at this time, before the Congregation ended, Rome heard that Suleiman the Magnificent, at the head of the Moslem forces, was laying siege to Malta. The congregation offered six Jesuits to the pope as part of the Crusade being preached by Philip II of Spain and Pope Pius IV. The next year, in 1566, as the Turks became even more menacing, "Litanies" were introduced by Borgia. When the peril receded, they were maintained permanently, another change from the way Ignatius conceived of prayer in the Society. This congregation left open to the newly-elected general, a very holy man of the very best intentions, a rather free field for the results that would flow from his own personal predilection for solitude, penance, and prayer.

3. General Congregation III, April 12--June 16, 1573. 47 Members

General Congregation III was summoned to meet on April 12, 1573, by Polanco, who had been named vicar-general. The forty-seven professed fathers of the congregation still included two of the first companions

of Ignatius, Salmerón and Bobadilla.

The members of the congregation went, according to custom, to ask the Holy Father for his Apostolic Benediction. Gregory XIII gave it and then inquired about details of the congregation, about how many Spaniards there were among the voters and how many generals up to the present had been Spanish. All three generals had been Spaniards. The pope replied that it seemed to him good that somebody be chosen from another nation. This intervention by the pope brought out into the open a problem which had been growing for some time. This was the resentment in some Jesuit areas of Spanish predominance in the Society, not only in regard to the generals, but also to a number of other officials and that not only in Spain. Along with this was resentment against the New Christians, converts from Judaism living in Spain and Portugal, a resentment very strong in the Portuguese monarchy.

Polanco, secretary of the Society under Ignatius, Laynez, and Borgia, was an obvious possibility for election as general. He was Spanish. Some tried to say, too, that he was of New Christian family, or at least looked upon them sympathetically. Polanco had asked that his own name not be considered, but that the Jesuits of a whole nation not be denied the possibility of electing a general from their nation.

Gregory XIII knew exactly what he was doing, but the general congregation asked that it be allowed to act independently of all influence. The pope, in turn, asked whether there were not any subjects other than Spaniards capable of governing the Society and suggested that Father Mercurian appeared to him a man worthy of such a choice. Without leaving the Jesuits time to protest against this specific intimation, he told them to go on to their work and do that which they thought best.

The congregation gathered; Possevino (later a cardinal) had just begun the opening discourse, when the Cardinal of Como arrived, announced that he had come in the name of the pope and in the interests of the universal Church to ask the professed to elect, at least this time, a non-Spanish general. Immediately a deputation from the congregation went to see Gregory XIII about this removal of their freedom. The pope heard them out and, finally convinced by them, gave them all the freedom they asked

for, the only restriction being that, if a Spaniard were named, the congregation should let him know the choice before it was publicly announced. The next day, on April 23, 1573, Everard Mercurian, a Belgian, was elected on the first ballot by a majority of twenty-seven votes. Mercurian, as a Belgian from the Spanish Netherlands, was a subject of the king of Spain but, not being Spanish himself, was agreeable to the Holy See. He was at this time sixty-eight years old, and he thought that his main job was to consolidate the Society which had grown so rapidly under the previous three generals.

Perhaps the most important question treated by the congregation, and an indication of some misunderstanding of obedience in the very need to ask the question, was whether those who had professed four vows owed obedience to the professed of three vows and to the other priests who were not professed whenever these filled the position of rector or minister. About this there had been disagreement on the part of certain of the professed fathers, and in the congregation itself, the proposition was "vigorously discussed for two days." It was finally made quite clear that power did not flow from the personal qualities of the individual, nor was it conferred by profession of the four vows; rather, it resided in the general, who delegated it to the various superiors of the Society, and such obedience was indeed thus owed.¹⁴

4. General Congregation IV, February 7--April 22, 1581. 57 Members

On August 1, 1580, Everard Mercurian died. During his generalate, the *Summary of the Constitutions* had been published and the rules for the various offices had been drawn up. Mercurian, somewhat advanced in years when he was elected general, had accorded absolute confidence in working with him to Father Benedict Palmio. Worrying that this might seem to be an indication of partiality, he had then also asked Father Olivier Mannaerts (sometimes more familiarly known under the Latinized form Manaraeus) to share in that confidence. Palmio was the assistant of Italy. Mannaerts was assistant of the provinces of Northern Europe. Palmio was not happy with this affair and was less happy that Mannaerts was chosen vicar-general the day after the death of Mercurian.

Mannaerts called the Fourth Congregation for February 7, 1581. Immediately a problem arose. Rumors began to go around among the Jesuits that he aspired to be general. Some thought that Mannaerts should confront and put to rest this calumny; others thought that, even if this were not so, nonetheless, he could voluntarily provide an example of abnegation by removing himself from the possibility of being elected general. Among the partisans of Mannaerts was Claudio Aquaviva, at that time provincial of Rome; he urged him to pursue the case against the authors of the imputation of ambition on his part. But Mannaerts, as vicar-general, was the head of the Society and could hardly pursue such a case himself, so he gave the task to two other Jesuits, Fatio, Secretary of the Society, and De Fabiis.

It was in the midst of this problem that the congregation assembled. There were fifty-seven delegates, from among a Society of now more than 5,000 members. Again present were the last two remaining companions of Ignatius, Salmerón and Bobadilla. This was also the congregation in which Bellarmine and Aquaviva participated for the first time. At the point at which the election was to take place, the accusation against Mannaerts was renewed. In accord with the *Constitutions*, it was to be taken up by the four oldest professed at the congregation. Bobadilla was one of them. The accusers of Mannaerts asked that he not serve on this commission because, they said, he had already made known in advance his opinion favorable to Mannaerts. Bobadilla decided not to become a members of the commission, so the judges of this rather unusual process were Salmerón, Domenech, Lannoy, and Cordeses. By a vote of three to one, they agreed that Mannaerts did not, to them, appear to be totally exempt from reproach. Lannoy disagreed with this view and thought Mannaerts totally innocent. Almost all of the fathers of the congregation disapproved of the majority judgment, too. Bobadilla, always impetuous, protested that he had been fraudulently removed from the picture. Mannaerts at this point told the members of the congregation that, as far as he could in conscience judge, he was completely innocent of the charge. Nonetheless, he said, because he was such a great sinner, he would not refuse the judgment which had been

pronounced. Above all, he thought it necessary that the dignity and the peace of the Society be saved. The members should, then, choose a general; he thought himself unworthy according to the norms set down in the *Constitutions*; and so that everything might take place in order and in peace, he freely renounced any right which his situation as a professed father would confer on him. The members of the congregation, in turn, wanted to prove to Mannaerts that the imputation which was directed against him did not change any of their sentiments in his regard; and so they retained him in the position of vicar-general in this first part of the congregation. The ins and outs of this strange situation have never been completely resolved.

Eventually, on February 19, 1581, Claudio Aquaviva was elected general of the Society almost by unanimity. When Gregory XIII heard that Aquaviva, only fourteen years in the Society, for the first time a delegate to a congregation, and only thirty-seven years old, had been elected, he could hardly believe it, and in astonishment told the members of the congregation, "Good heavens, you have chosen for your ruler a young man who isn't even forty years old!" Aquaviva was indeed an extraordinarily young choice, made by a congregation that in this instance acted as no other congregation would ever do. He served in an extraordinary period of thirty-four years when the Society grew from 5,000 to 13,000 members, when schools went from almost 150 to 370, residences from about 30 to about 120, and provinces from 21 to 32.

The congregation went on to pass fifty-nine decrees. The fifth of these decrees, when dealing with the length of determined time of prayer, confirmed "the pious and salutary custom as it was introduced by Reverend Father Borgia. . . ." ¹⁵ In the history of the Society this meant effectively then that, until the most recent Congregation XXXI, besides the two examinations of conscience at noon and night, there would also be another hour devoted to prayer every day. Eventually, by a series of customs, this became the rigidly set time of the morning meditation. An especially important decree declared that the general had a right to explain the meaning of the *Constitutions*. ¹⁶ This was to be done in such a way, however, that these declarations would be explications and would not

have the force of universal law but would serve as practical directions in the government of the Society. Some of those less friendly to the Society have seen in this particular decree a way in which the power of the general was increased far beyond the measure originally thought wise. Another decree gave the general the power before he died to designate a vicar-general who would hold the power of office until the election of a new general.¹⁷ These two decrees seemed to give more power to the general than he had had before.

On the other hand, other decrees seemed to circumscribe his power.¹⁸ It was decided, for example, that, outside the time of the congregation, the general could not dissolve houses or colleges of the Society without a majority of votes among the assistants, the provincials, the procurator general, and the secretary general of the Society; besides, the oldest fathers of each province had to be consulted on this. It is obvious that that particular group of Jesuits, therefore, and not the general alone, were charged with resolving, according to a majority vote, the questions of life and death for the houses and for the colleges.

Finally, if a congregation was supposed to deal with "long-lasting and important matters . . . or with other very difficult matters pertaining to the whole body of the Society or its manner of proceeding. . . ,"¹⁹ one may perhaps legitimately doubt if some of the decrees of this congregation as well as of others lived up to these criteria. For example, it is hard to see the criteria operative in a debate on and a decree about wearing a surplice when reading Scripture.²⁰

5. General Congregation V, Nov. 3, 1593--Jan. 18, 1594. 63 Members

The Fifth General Congregation was the first one to be called during the lifetime of a general. It met under the shadow of the serious possibility that fundamental changes might be introduced into the Institute of the Society, due to the powerful influence of a few malcontents who had enlisted on their side all the power held by Philip II of Spain and the Spanish Inquisition.²¹

Some years before the congregation, some Spanish members made an attempt to alter the Society's *Constitutions*, relying upon the help which

they would receive from the king and upon his influence with Pope Sixtus V. Most especially, these particular Jesuits wanted the office of the general to be restricted, especially in his power to appoint provincials and rectors, and the inauguration of provincial chapters or congregations which themselves would have the power to make such appointments. Sixtus V was enough disturbed by stories of serious discontent and, persuaded by the diplomatic service of Philip II, ordered a special episcopal visitor for the Society in Spain, with instructions to look into the general's power of appointing and into the dependence of the Spanish provinces upon the government of the Society in Rome.

Aquaviva, on his part, managed to persuade both the king and the pope that these agitators were only a small minority in the Society. He did it by soliciting testimonials and representations against the visitation from the most prominent Jesuits in Spain. Sixtus was finally persuaded to give up the visitation when Aquaviva pointed out to him the rather scandalous life of the bishop whom he had appointed to look into the reform in the Society. The bishop had earlier fathered three bastard children. The only point on which Sixtus was rather adamant was that the Society should change its name, and he directed Aquaviva to present to him a formal petition for such a change of title. Aquaviva did this, but Sixtus died in 1590 before anything could be done about it; and the following pope, Gregory XIV, confirmed the Society's Institute as it stood.

Not to be vanquished by this, during the reign of the next pope, Clement VIII, the agitators started their process again, especially two of them from Spain and two from Portugal. Among them was a Father Acosta, who had originally been appointed one of the visitors to Spain and Portugal in place of the bishop who had earlier been appointed. Acosta had become bitterly disappointed because he had not been named one of the provincials of Spain; and he, with his companions, managed to get together a whole series of complaints against Aquaviva's administration. He even got to Rome to see the pope and said that the cause of the unrest in Spain was the worldliness of superiors and the excessive powers which the general possessed. Clement VIII, a very conscientious man, was disturbed enough

to order Aquaviva to call a general congregation of the Society. By this time, the news had become rather public that the purpose of the congregation was, in the minds of the agitators at least, a fundamental change in some of the prescriptions of the Institute. Unfortunately, Acosta exercised a large amount of influence on the king of Spain and upon the pope himself through a mutual friend, the Jesuit who was later to become Cardinal Toledo. None of the malcontents was elected a member of the congregation, but they sent a memorial to Rome, including with it the request that at least the Spanish Jesuits might be governed by a special commissary.

To get Aquaviva out of the way in the meantime, Clement VIII had been persuaded to send him on a mission of conciliation away from Rome to try to patch up a quarrel between the dukes of Parma and Mantua. Supposedly, Toledo helped to do this. There was also a plan afoot that, once Toledo had been given the red hat of a cardinal, he would be designated as presiding officer of the congregation. Toledo did persuade Clement VIII to ask for the congregation, but Aquaviva managed to retain the chairmanship of it. It was this congregation that began on November 3, 1593.

Without going into all the moves and counter-moves internal to the congregation and all of the maneuvers on the part of the malcontents, we merely mention that Aquaviva was confirmed in his government. Among the first things he asked of the sixty-three Jesuits who were members of the congregation was that they take *informationes* on his government, that a special investigating committee be set up on the matter, and that all of the complaints be heard freely and later told to the pope. After hearing those complaints at some length, the congregation decided that Aquaviva was innocent and that he had governed the Society well, even if at times he was too set in his opinions and sometimes showed some favoritism.

After this, the request of the Spaniards that there be changes in the *Constitutions* was taken up, a request supported by the Spanish ambassador in Rome. These dealt especially with changes in the way in which profession was conferred, changes in the type of grades in the Society, particular problems on reserved cases, and especially the question of a special superior for the Spanish peninsula, and special provincial congregations at which

the Spaniards alone would have the right to assist. They also asked that the general should not be named for life and that the choice of provincials and other superiors should not be one of his prerogatives. The congregation rejected all of these petitions in its desire to preserve the integrity of the Institute.

In the same desire, it unfortunately went farther and imposed on the Society a rule which, all the way up to its abrogation in 1946, caused problems and which could be, in the years after the congregation, a source of scandal. Twenty-seven Spanish Jesuits had signed "memorials" against the *Constitutions* of the Society. Of these twenty-seven, twenty-five were of Jewish or Moorish descent. The congregation not only called these Spaniards "false sons" and ordered that they be dismissed from the Society; it went farther and decided that no one of Jewish or Moorish origins could, without special dispensation, be admitted to the Society for the future.²² How this particular punitive legislation could be squared with the views of St. Ignatius himself, it is hard to see.

In addition to concern with the overriding problem of the internal government, shown again in inquiries about the "substantials" of the Institute,²³ the congregation also turned to external problems by adopting the historic decrees 47 and 48, by which members of the Society were ordered not to involve themselves in secular political conflicts and negotiations.²⁴ In addition, by another decree and "in virtue of holy obedience," it was ordered that of all Jesuits

no one, for whatever reason there may be, is to involve himself in public or secular affairs of princes which touch on the government of the state, no matter who they may be, no matter who might wish to get them to do this and engage them in these affairs, and never to take the liberty of occupying themselves with political interests or affairs. It is urgently recommended to superiors that they permit absolutely no one of ours to engage in these sorts of affairs, and if they should see some who are too much inclined toward them, they ought to let the provincial know, in order that he might send them away from the place where they are at that time, if in that place there would be for them an occasion for such danger.²⁵

There was also need to keep in the good graces of the king of Spain, especially since the congregation had repudiated so many of his desires

expressed through the malcontents. So, at the request of Philip II, the congregation decreed that Jesuits in Spain were not to use any permission which they had to read books on the Index or to absolve heretics. In addition, they were urged to show deference toward the Holy Office of the [Spanish] Inquisition, one of Philip's agencies. On the other hand, Jesuits were forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to obtain or ambition a job with the Inquisition.²⁶

Another decree, far different this time, but of great importance in its consequences, was to set down rules for Jesuit teachers and scholars in choosing opinions in theology and in philosophy. In the first, St. Thomas was to be followed; in the second, Aristotle. This decree and the continued adherence to and reenforcement of it by later congregations would, especially in the case of philosophy, set a very large number of Jesuit teachers and Jesuit schools outside the development of newer philosophical theories (and in some instances, too, theories in the physical sciences) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.²⁷

The congregation accomplished its work in about two and one-half months; and, at the end of it, the position and office of the general remained intact in what it had been before, and the loyalty of the Society personally to Aquaviva was obvious for everyone to see.

The crisis lingered on, however. Clement VIII, still worried about a lifetime term for the general, thought that an immediate answer to the problem would be to appoint Aquaviva as Archbishop of Naples. Toledo was asked to dissuade Clement VIII from this. He refused at first, but then, a man of some vanity, his mind was changed when it was suggested to him that, if Aquaviva became Archbishop of Naples, he would almost certainly eventually become a cardinal too. Toledo was not at all inclined to have another Jesuit cardinal besides himself, and so he proved that he did have this influence with Clement VIII by dissuading him from the appointment.

Finally, one of the Spanish Jesuit malcontents attempted to persuade the new king of Spain, Philip III, to invite Aquaviva to that country. Philip did so; Aquaviva declined such a dubious and perilous invitation. The king then asked the pope to command the general to come to Spain.

Clement did so, but Aquaviva fell so ill with a sickness verified by the pope's own physician that prospect of a visit to Spain was put off and eventually dropped.

6. General Congregation VI, February 21--March 29, 1608. 64 Members

The congregation of procurators had voted in 1606 to hold another general congregation in order finally to put to rest the continuing quarrels about Aquaviva's leadership. The congregation began on February 21, 1608, and lasted just a little more than a month, until March 29 of the same year. The sixty-four members of the congregation confirmed Aquaviva's leadership and their confidence in him.²⁸ This congregation set up a new assistancy, that of France, the first one since the original four assistancies of the "nations" of Italy, Germany, Spain, and Portugal and the Indies, which had been established at the time of General Congregation I. This was due in part as a debt of gratitude to Henry IV, a staunch protector of the Society now that he had become a Catholic at the end of the wars of religion.²⁹

Again, the congregation concerned itself with the "substantials" of the Institute, and even went so far as to say that a provincial congregation could not treat of any matter which even one of the delegates thought pertained to such "substantials."³⁰ However needed this was at the time in the light of the previous troubles, its utility could well be questioned for the generations ahead, and its restrictions may well have influenced the rigidity and formalism later evident in some of the congregations.

There was an attempt to introduce obligatory Advent fast and abstinence in order to avoid scandal³¹ and a postulatium was discussed that the recreation period should be so divided that after one half hour of recreation, a quarter hour should be spent in retailing examples from the lives of the saints, and another quarter hour in saying the rosary or in reading and meditation on a pious book.³² Both were rejected. The latter, however, is thought to be the probable source for the institution in the novitiate of such customs as the *exemplum*.

In the long run, perhaps the most important decree was the one settling the dispute as to whether it was allowable for the Society and

according to its vocation to have colleges exclusively for laymen, one in which Jesuits were not also students. Despite the enormous growth of Jesuit schools since St. Ignatius personally accepted the first one in 1548,³³ this question of a totally lay student population was frowned upon by some Jesuits. The congregation approved it clearly, and the question ceased.³⁴ This decree put the final authoritative seal of approval upon what had become de facto the Jesuits' largest and most successful apostolate.

7. General Congregation VII, Nov. 5, 1615--Jan. 26, 1616. 75 Members

After thirty-four years as general, Aquaviva died on January 31, 1615. If the Society of Jesus owes its birth to Ignatius of Loyola, it undoubtedly owes to Aquaviva much of its development. He had to guide it through the most difficult times it had known since its foundation, and at his death more than 13,000 Jesuits worked in 550 communities spread through 33 provinces. The Seventh General Congregation opened on November 5, 1615, with 75 members present. Again, there was an attempt by some Spanish Jesuits to impede the election of the man who seemed, from the beginning, to be the choice of the delegates, Father Muzio Vitelleschi. When they went to the Holy See, Paul V, a wise man, told them that if Vitelleschi was a person such as they depicted him with a generous variety of faults, it was obvious he would not be elected; and that, therefore, there was no need for the pope to occupy himself with this problem.

As a matter of fact, Vitelleschi was chosen, by thirty-nine of the seventy-five votes, to succeed Claudio Aquaviva. He served as general for thirty years. This was the first congregation in which none of the original companions of St. Ignatius were present, all having died by that time. Vitelleschi was a cautious man who, though ruling in what was in some ways the Golden Age of the Society, was afraid of the dangers of the time.³⁵

A very strong decree passed by the Seventh Congregation forbade Jesuits to occupy themselves with the secular affairs of their relatives or of any other non-Jesuit. They were not to try to get for them either ecclesiastical or secular dignities without the express permission of the general; and the congregation, seeking to bind the hand of the general himself, recommended that he not give his permission except in the most

rare and serious cases.³⁶ The tenor of the decree was to stifle in germ those kinds of cases in which nepotism would be all too easy a temptation, since more than one of the Jesuits was at that time called to direct the conscience of princes, kings, and other important people.

Again, a question about the "substantials" of the Institute came up, and the congregation decided that it was not expedient that they be enumerated.³⁷ This presents some interesting problems about how they were to be known or dealt with. Later congregations were not going to follow this advice. To the credit of the congregation, it turned down a postulatum asking that some of the Jesuit philosophers and theologians should compose a *Summa* of teachings in both fields to be held of obligation and used by Jesuits.³⁸

Perhaps because the Society was now entering an age of favor for half a century, where its members would be the favorites of popes and kings, the confidants of heads of state, the directors in many ways of public opinion, the delegates to the congregation may have felt that there was also time and place for decrees on matters of lesser moment. So at least they may seem to us, and it is hard to square them with the provision that a congregation deal with "long lasting or important matters." However, two such decrees provide for understanding them in the context of their times. So when the congregation congratulated Vitelleschi for voluntarily giving up the private table which the fathers general had hitherto enjoyed, the text must be read in the light of the tradition in which monasticism had long regarded the religious superior, and of the deferential ways in which it had indicated that regard. Also, the very strong secular social distinctions of the time and the symbolism of priesthood and scholarship which lay in the biretta may help account in part for the decree that in the future no one entering the Society as a lay brother could have a biretta, a decree from which the congregation said that not even the general could dispense.³⁹

8. General Congregation VIII, Nov. 21, 1645--April 14, 1646. 92 Members
After having had two generals, Aquaviva and Vitelleschi, who governed for a total of sixty-four years, the Society was in the next seven years to

have three congregations and three generals. Vitelleschi had died on February 9, 1645, and the Eighth Congregation began in November of the same year. Included among the ninety-two members of the congregation were not only Carafa, who was to be elected general at this meeting, but also two future generals, Francisco Piccolomini and Goswin Nickel.

As soon as the congregation convened in November 1645, Pope Innocent X unexpectedly requested the delegates to put aside the usual order of a congregation and discuss among themselves a set of propositions reminiscent of the problems of Aquaviva's time. Among them was the proposal for a congregation every nine years and the proposal of non-immediately renewable terms of three years for all superiors other than the general, and the proposal that local provincial congregations elect the fathers provincial. These and the other proposals the delegates discussed for almost a month. Finally, they frankly told the pope that they could see the proposal for a congregation every nine years, but that with all the other proposals they were not at all happy. Finally, Innocent X, on January 1, 1646, did order the congregation to meet every nine years, and provincials, visitors, rectors, and superiors to serve three-year terms. (Alexander VII annulled this last provision in 1663. In 1746, Benedict XIV abrogated the provision for periodic general congregations.)

Six days later, on January 7, 1646, Vincenzo Carafa, sixty years old, was elected by fifty-two out of eighty votes.

Some hard financial times had begun to come upon the Society in Italy, and the congregation decreed the dissolution of three colleges in the Roman Province and six in the Neapolitan. In addition, it decreed some remedies for the penury of houses and colleges, including the admission as novices of those alone for whom the Society could provide, a limit in the number of lay brothers, the spreading out of extra members of communities to other houses, and surprising if not done before, the giving of a written account of material resources and expenditures by superiors and procurators.⁴⁰

The "clerical hat" for brothers again came up for long discussion, long precisely because needed "before so serious a matter would be decided by secret ballot."⁴¹

One decree recalled problems that the Jesuits and Dominicans had had in arguing about the controversy *de auxiliis* and the question of grace and free will. A recent general chapter of the Dominicans had publicly gone on record with a decree of fraternal affection toward the Society of Jesus. The Society, in turn, responded to these friendly advances and prescribed that all the members of the Society should never speak except with praise of the Dominicans and should render them the duties of charity and mutual hospitality.⁴² In the light of the often bitter quarrels on the question of grace, the opportuneness of the decree is evident.

This was the longest congregation so far, 145 days, and its record was not to be surpassed, even by the precedent-shattering two sessions of the Thirty-first Congregation which lasted a total of "only" 141 days.

9. General Congregation IX, Dec. 13, 1649--Feb. 23, 1650. 89 Members

In three years Carafa, on June 8, 1649, was dead. The Ninth Congregation began in December of the same year. Two candidates who pretty well shared the votes were Piccolomini of the Italian Assistancy and Montmorency of the German Assistancy. On December 21 Francesco Piccolomini was elected, after obtaining fifty-nine of the eighty votes. Piccolomini, in turn, seventy-five when chosen and worn out from serving previously as provincial of three different provinces, served only a year and a half as general.

The congregation treated again of "perturbatores," in this case, those who disturbed the Society by trying to use external help to force the erection of new provinces or to stop the division of old ones.⁴³ The background to this decree were the increasingly strident national and sectional feelings in some of the provinces of the Society. In Sicily, in what is now Belgium, and in Portugal, the mania for each area's own self-determination brought increasing demands for separation of provinces, demands backed up by political pressure to which some of the involved Jesuits appealed.

The question of cutting down on the number of explicit precepts and censures arose, but the congregation rejected the idea and kept intact all those in existence, printed or non-printed, "including the one against brothers wearing the biretta."⁴⁴ Even complaints against a particular Jesuit arose, in this case against a certain professor of philosophy who

"wastes time on useless questions, treats the material in a jumbled-up order, and takes too much freedom to push his own opinions." The congregation decided that the *Ratio Studiorum* had provisions to take care of the case, and it decided the same some days later, when the same complaints were made about a certain professor of theology.⁴⁵

It was this congregation which decided that solemn profession could be granted only after a minimum of ten years in the Society for those who had made all their studies before entrance, and after seventeen years for those who had all their studies in the Society. This continued to be the rule for more than three hundred years, up to the Thirty-first Congregation.⁴⁶

10. General Congregation X, Jan. 7, 1652--March 20, 1652. 86 Members

Six months after the death of Piccolomini on June 17, 1651, the Tenth General Congregation was opened. Two weeks later in January, it elected as general Luigi Gottifredi. The congregation was still in session when, on March 12, Gottifredi died. Five days later Goswin Nickel was elected general with fifty-five out of seventy-seven votes.

Apparently this sequence of events was traumatic, for the delegates passed few decrees, and they were not of great moment for the life of the Society.

11. General Congregation XI, May 9, 1661--July 27, 1661. 78 Members

The Eleventh Congregation was held in accord with the brief of Innocent X, nine years after the previous meeting. It began with the election of a permanent vicar for the general, Goswin Nickel, then eighty years old and so ill that he could not effectively govern the Society. The congregation decided to elect a vicar with the right of succession and asked Alexander VII for permission to do this, giving the vicar the total powers of the general. Alexander VII agreed, and on June 7 Giovanni-Paolo Oliva was elected perpetual vicar-general. He received forty-nine out of the eighty votes. For three years he exercised the functions of a vicar, with Nickel general in name only. Thereafter, Oliva served for another seventeen years. He was descended from the ducal families of Genoa, and his

grandfather and his uncle had been doges of that republic. He was a superb administrator and was involved in all the events of his time. For example, from him went letters on a large variety of subjects to the Holy Roman emperors, the kings of France, Spain, and Poland, the queens and dukes of Savoy, Bavaria, Mantua, Modena, Tuscany, Brunswick, and the landgrave of Hesse. He was much respected by Innocent X, who called him to his death-bed in order to receive his last breath; and he persuaded Alexander VII to repeal the three-year limitation on superiors.

The congregation passed thirty-six decrees. As has been remarked earlier, all the congregations tried to promote the growth of the spiritual life in members of the Society and zeal for the apostolate. This congregation was no exception; but, in all honesty, it must be remarked that while much was said in one of its decrees,⁴⁷ it added nothing new to what had been decreed before. Among the problems dealt with were that of Jesuits publishing books without proper permission, that of imputations of laxity in the moral teachings of Jesuits, and that of the continued tension between Jesuits and Dominicans. For the first, severe penalties were enacted, from deprivation of the right to vote or be voted for to "even corporal punishment." For the second, there was a recalling of the principles to be applied in such teaching and a cautionary note against even seeming cause for such imputations. For the last, another decree of praise for the Order of Preachers was passed, with thanks for a similar decree from their chapter commending the Society of Jesus.⁴⁸ Again, too, the Society tried to get the nine-year rule for congregations abrogated, but even though the delegates wanted it, they did not succeed with the papacy.⁴⁹

12. General Congregation XII, June 22, 1682--Sept. 6, 1682. 85 Members
Oliva died on November 26, 1681. Before dying, he had named the Belgian, Charles de Noyelle as vicar-general. On June 22, 1682, the Twelfth General Congregation met. Even before voting for a new general, Clement XI asked the delegates to deliberate and vote on whether the nine-year rule imposed by the papacy should be kept. After days of discussion, eighty-two of the eighty-five delegates voted to ask for abrogation by the pope. Despite this, the recommendation was not acted on by the papacy.

When it came to the election, Noyelle, on the first ballot, received all of the votes of the congregation for him as general, his own excepted. Other than for Ignatius, this has been the only unanimous choice of a general. The congregation continued to meet until September 6, 1682, and passed fifty-six decrees.

It made very clear, against any possible doubt, that the account of conscience made to a superior was not to be revealed or even hinted at to anyone, not even to the general, without the express consent of the giver.⁵¹ Again, there was worry about and a decree against "novelties and laxity in opinions . . . especially in moral matters."⁵² There were many details set forth in eleven decrees on the way general and provincial congregation and elections for them were to be conducted.⁵³ This was not the first time that these functions were regulated in minute details by a congregation, but these eleven decrees are indicative of both a desire to make the congregations as free of problems as possible and a tendency to increasing formalism in the internal structure of the Society.

The quarrels which had now been going on for a good many years between Jansenist and Jesuit, as well as other heated differences of opinion in which Jesuits were involved are the background for a remarkably strong decree on what was to be done if it should happen that any Jesuit, either vocally or in writing or in any other manner or whatever it might be, should injure some person who was not a member of the Society, and especially other religious or important people, or if he should have given them any reasonable or just motive for taking offense. The superior was, first, to make exact inquiries in the case of the person culpable; and then he was to punish him with the severity demanded by justice, and nothing in this matter was to remain unpunished; secondly, superiors were to take care that those who might be able with some reason to think that they have been damaged would have the most permanent possible satisfaction which was their due. The congregation also decreed that if ever a person should reprint books by a Jesuit containing certain things against which there might be some legitimate complaint, those things were to be cut out entirely. Finally, out of fear that superiors in this regard might be too indulgent

on this point, the consultors, both local and provincial, were to be bound to let immediate superiors know if any one of their subjects had committed a fault of this nature and to also let them know if a penance had been imposed upon them or not and what penance it had been.⁵⁴

Noyelle served as general for four short years, but they were rendered impossibly difficult by the Bourbons in France and the Habsburgs in Spain, who used his position as head of an order existing in both their lands as a focal point of their rivalries and as a test of their influence. Each pressured him to do what the other would have no part of and threatened him and the Society with the most dire consequences if he did or did not accede to their will.⁵⁵ Potentially most serious was the demand by Louis XIV that the Gallo-Belgian Province in the Spanish Netherlands, lately conquered by him, become part of the French rather than the German Assistancy. Spain riposted by demanding that Naples, Sicily, and Milan become part of the Spanish Assistancy rather than the Italian. The letters of Noyelle to Louis XIV are of utmost, almost abject, reverence;⁵⁶ but the problem of dealing with dynastic rivalries could never be far from the mind of the general or delegates to a congregation.

At the same time, certain internal difficulties had been showing themselves for some time. The Society would be 150 years old during the tenure of the next general. Its expansionary burst had gradually been slowing down. From 1600 to 1615 approximately 5,000 new members had joined the Jesuits, more than 330 for every one of those years. In the next ten years, 1615-25, the increase was 2,000; in the next fifty years, it was again 2,000. The slowdown was obvious; and it was due in part to military (The Thirty Years War), economic (the Spanish depression), and religious (the slackening of the Counter-Reformation) causes, and in part to the determination of the Society not to take more candidates than it could support, physically and psychologically. There is no way in which the Jesuits could have increased by almost a thousand every three years and still have kept the kind of unity that the very diversity of its members and its tasks demanded. In 1615, the Seventh Congregation already was worried about the support possible for new Jesuits; we have already seen the decrees of the Eighth Con-

gregation in 1645⁵⁷ on closing certain schools, on means to provide for the poorer establishments, on accepting colleges able to support less Jesuits than usual. In accord with these decrees, Carafa almost closed the doors of the novitiates for a while. The Eleventh Congregation in 1661 spoke in terms quite similar. The Society would continue to prosper, but the growth and the resources would be slower and less abundant in many places.

13. General Congregation XIII, June 22--September 7, 1687. 89 Members

After four years of almost unremitting pressure de Noyelle died on December 12, 1686. The Thirteenth Congregation opened a little more than six months later. On July 6, it elected as general, on the third ballot, by forty-eight votes out of eighty-six, Tirso González de Santalla. González was, from several points of view, a hazardous choice. Most especially was this so because of his tenacity in defending against most of the members of the Society the doctrine of probabiliorism rather than the probabilism taught by the majority of Jesuits. He was a theologian of merit and a strong adversary of the Jansenists, despite this tenacity in holding to probabiliorism. He had written a book on probabiliorism, attacking at the same time probabilism. It had not been able to get by the censors; but, once he became general, he did not wish to see his work in oblivion, so he ordered it to be printed, saying, rather naively oblivious of how the book would be taken, that it was in his capacity as a theologian but not as general of the Society that he had written it. There were many difficulties with his whole position; and, if it had not been for the probabiliorism debate, there is some question as to whether he would have been elected general without that and without Innocent XI pushing his candidacy with the congregation.

Even after electing González, however, the congregation made clear, in an oblique way, that it was still in favor of probabilism by saying in one of its decrees that it did "not prohibit holding the contrary of the opinion that in acting it is allowed to follow the less probable opinion which favors freedom of action. . . ."58

Some of the formalism which had been entering into the thought and action of the Society through several preceding decades and which would

continue to do so for the future is exemplified in a long decree which goes into details of who in a given house first makes the solemn profession of four vows if there are several to do so on the same day. The decree gives the details if they both or several had completed the same number of years in the Society necessary for profession, if they both then had been in the Society for the same amount of time, if they both then had entered on the same day, if then they both were born on the same day. In this last case, "which rarely will occur, the provincial and his consultors cast lots for it."⁵⁹

14. General Congregation XIV, Nov. 19, 1696--Jan. 16, 1697. 86 Members

According to the provisions of the brief of Innocent X, the congregation had to assemble again after nine years; and so it did in 1696, at the convocation of the general, González. The congregation should have met in September; the meeting was postponed until November "because entry into the city in that [September] weather was usually dangerous to the health."⁶⁰

Among the twenty-nine decrees, again the Society tried to get rid of the nine-year rule; and again it was unsuccessful.⁶¹ Again, it repudiated "with abhorrence novelty of opinion and laxity in morals."⁶² Again it took up the rather minor matter of who first makes profession, since even all the elaborateness of the decree of the previous congregation had not settled it to everyone's satisfaction.⁶³ Historians of the Society and researchers in its law are indebted to this congregation and to the Province of Bohemia. That province had proposed to publish, at its expense, a collection of the documents which pertained to the Institute of the Society. It is this collection of the Institute which is known under the name of the Prague Edition, 1705 and 1757, two volumes.

The perils of being a delegate were reflected in this congregation by the desire to finish and get home "because of the dangers of the roads and war."⁶⁴ Dangers by sea were present, too, as the Eleventh Congregation had indicated in deciding to start the meeting without waiting for substitutes for the delegates from Sardinia who had been shipwrecked.⁶⁵

15. General Congregation XV, January 17--April 3, 1706. 92 Members

After eighteen years as general, Tirso González, died on October 27, 1705, eighty-three years old. As late as three years before, he had again sent a petition to Clement XI, asking for a definite approval of probabiliorism and a rejection of probabilism. The congregation had earlier been convoked in accord with the nine-year rule by Michelangelo Tamburini, whom the general had already named as his vicar. But even after that, González requested a papal condemnation of probabilism. On January 30, 1706, Tamburini himself was elected general, receiving sixty-two of the votes on the second ballot out of ninety-two suffrages. He served as general for twenty-four years.

Perhaps the most important work of the congregation was the firm insistence that Jesuit authors must not respond with bitterness or anger to the attacks of adversaries. The delegates made quite clear that a spirit of passionate polemic was completely contrary to the spirit which should animate the Society.⁶⁶ The background from the past to this decree was obvious to any Jesuit who had lived through the passionate attacks on the Society brought on by a revival of the Chinese rites question. The appropriateness of the decree for the future was even more evident from the years of ever worse vilification on the same question which Tamburini and the Society underwent, especially from the Jansenists, from one group of French missionaries, and from certain implacable opponents in the papal curia.

16. General Congregation XVI, Nov. 19, 1730--Feb. 13, 1731. 79 Members
 Since Tamburini had died without designating a vicar, on March 7, 1730, the professed at Rome named Frantisek Retz, the assistant of Germany, to this position; and he set the convocation of the congregation for November of that year. At the congregation, on November 30, Retz himself was elected general, obtaining in this instance all of the votes except two, his own and one other. The congregation passed thirty-nine decrees.

The nine-year rule again came up in one postulatum, asking that the Society forget about its abrogation, and in another, asking that the request again be made. The first was rejected, the second approved.⁶⁷ In the light of the increasing attacks on the Society and the reactions of

certain Jesuits, the congregation reiterated the decision of Congregation XII about recompensing those who had been injured by a written attack by a Jesuit. To keep control over publications, in this same decree it tightened the censorship rules; for the first time author and censor were to be unknown to each other.⁶⁸ Another decree forbade Jesuits to deal with publishers for the publication of their works without the express permission of the provincial.⁶⁹ Previously, the Congregation VII had prohibited any acts which might have even the appearance of *negotiatio*; this congregation confirmed and strengthened the prohibition.⁷⁰ This was timely in view of the incident in later years in France which was to trigger the expulsion of the Society there.

The most important decree of this congregation, one with serious effects for years to come was the one in which, for all the formal deference to the new science, the Society's teachers and schools continued to be tied to Aristotelian physics. The congregation said, first, that Aristotelian philosophy was in accord with contemporary learning, especially with physics. Then it said that since the Society had accepted Aristotelian philosophy as highly useful for theology, and since the *Constitutions* and the *Ratio Studiorum* prescribed it, we should continue to teach it, including its theories on the philosophy of nature, that is, physics. Thirdly, if lovers of novelty were openly abandoning Aristotle or using someone else's theories, they were to be removed from teaching, as Congregation V had ordered. Finally, a list of propositions which were not to be taught should be drawn up, and the provincials were to write to the general on this whole matter every year.⁷¹ The kind words on the congruence of Aristotle and modern science showed some desire to keep abreast of the times. But tying the Society to Aristotle was a serious mistake, even if it can be at least in part understood by knowing that Cartesianism seemed to be the alternative philosophical system. How far Newtonianism, as a physical system and its philosophical implications, was adverted to by the congregation cannot be known from the decree itself. To adduce the *Ratio* and the *Constitutions* as the reasons for embracing Aristotle was even more serious. Almost 150 years had elapsed since the writing of the *Ratio*, more since the *Constitutions*. The *Ratio* was now coming to be regarded as an untouchable mon-

ument; the inherent adaptability of the *Constitutions* was not taken seriously. No matter how well certain individual Jesuits were eminent in the intellectual life of the period, the decree is a sad testimony to the failure of at least these official representatives of the Society to stay aware of and properly appreciate the serious thinking of the times.

Retz lived and ruled the Society in a period of relative internal and external prosperity for it. In some ways, he left the Society more flourishing apparently and more vital than it had ever been; but the bitter attacks of the *philosophes* were mounting and the Society seems to have lost, in a growth of formalism, some of the élan and willingness to try new ventures which had previously characterized it.

17. General Congregation XVII, June 22--September 5, 1751. 90 Members

General Congregation XVII began in June 1751, seven months after the death of Retz in November, 1750. It elected as general Ignazio Visconti, almost seventy years old, the man who had been designated by Retz as vicar-general. His was the first of two short generalates, one of four and one of two years, an unfortunate situation for the Society as it was drawn ever closer to the storm which would engulf it in its suppression.

There is no direct indication in the decrees of this congregation of that danger, only seven years away in its first manifestation in the Portuguese expulsion in 1759. But, in hindsight, one of the decrees is almost ironic. Repeating earlier injunctions, it made it quite clear that to no one was to be given permission to administer temporal goods, except under circumstances of serious necessity.⁷² It was the mismanagement of such goods by the French Jesuit, Lavalette, that gave to the Society's enemies in France the occasion which led to the expulsion from that country in August 1762.

One other decree reiterated what the previous congregation had done in tying the Society's natural science to Aristotle, however much it mistakenly stated that the physics in the system of Aristotle best agreed with the more experimental physics.⁷³

18. General Congregation XVIII, Nov. 17, 1755--Jan. 28, 1756. 86 Members

Visconti died in May, 1755, and General Congregation XVIII opened on

November 17, 1755, with eighty-six members in the assembly. On November 30, again this time the man who had been chosen as vicar-general, Luigi Centurione, again almost seventy years old, was elected general on the second ballot. He ruled for a little less than two years, in ill health almost all of the time, and died on October 2, 1757, just a few weeks after the first overt move of Carvalho in Portugal to remove the Jesuits from the country.

While the older assistancies of the Society in Western Europe were facing increasing hostility, in Eastern Europe a new one was created by this congregation. It was composed of the several provinces in Poland and Lithuania, where the Society had over the years steadily flourished, despite the constant problems brought on by political instability.⁷⁴

The congregation occupied itself heavily in three decrees with a whole series of details in the Formula for a General Congregation, for a Provincial Congregation, and for a Congregation of Procurators. The most important decree dealt, also in great detail, with urging wholehearted living out of those things which would promote spiritual growth. The congregation acknowledged that it was well aware that all these had been proposed before, and therefore needed no new decree; but it wanted, nonetheless, in this present decree to put all the items together in a brief summary and send it to superiors with yet another call to put it into effect. Because most of these details do reiterate past congregations and thus illuminate what they said, and because they demonstrate clearly that, as close to less than twenty years to the suppression, the Society was still faithful to the traditions of the past, they bear explicit notice here.

Zeal for spiritual matters, especially the annual retreat according to the Exercises, comes first in the list of general concerns. Then come care in poverty, flight from idleness and comfort, indifference in the assignment of where one lives and what work one does, the spirit of charity. More specific concerns include the full and careful making of the tertian-ship, the separate and correct formation of younger Jesuits, special concern for the lay brothers, and a way of dealing with our fellow men, which

is utterly religious and which in no way smacks of the wordly or the political. Finally, all of this should actually be carried out under the guidance of superiors and spiritual fathers who ought to be chosen from among the very best Jesuits.⁷⁶

19. General Congregation XIX, May 9--June 18, 1758. 89 Members

The Nineteenth General Congregation was the last one of the old Society. On May 21, 1758, Lorenzo Ricci, formerly secretary of the Society, was elected general on the second ballot. Ricci, fifty-five when he was chosen general, was a fine and holy man; but he did not possess the kind of personal qualities nor experience in administration probably necessary to put up with the kind of combat the Society was going to have to undergo in the next fifteen years. He was a very intelligent man, of a cultivated nature, almost excessively mild, and completely foreign to the kind of passionate hostility of the Bourbons and the fierce hatred of certain elements of the papal curia which were finally to be unleashed against the Jesuits.⁷⁷

The congregation surely by now had some presentiment of the calamities which were soon to happen. It produced one of the briefest sets of *Acta* of all these gatherings. There were only twelve decrees in all, six dealing with the present congregation itself, one designed to assure the existences of professed houses, one on provincial congregations, two dealing with the status of superiors in the Society, and the final two dealing with growth in the life of the spirit. The eleventh decree of the congregation, in recommending the faithful execution of the laws and rules of the Society then in force, exhorted the superiors to enjoin on those who govern the Society the care of spiritual things. They were often to inculcate in the members of the Society that it was upon this fidelity to the duties of piety and of the religious life, rather than upon learning or other natural gifts, that the preservation and the prosperity of the Society depended. "If, God permitting it because of His hidden designs which we could do nothing else but adore, we are to become the butt of adversity, the Lord will not abandon those who remain attached and united to him; and as long as the Society is able to go to him with an open soul and a sincere heart, no other source of strength will be necessary for it."⁷⁸

Surely this congregation was aware of serious danger, but probably not of how great it was nor how closely it was looming over the Society.

For eleven years Ricci, in the middle of the storm of denunciation and demands for the abolition of the Society among the various kingdoms of Europe and of plotting in some of the Roman curial offices, counted on the unflinching support of Clement XIII. Once the pope died in February, 1769, the storm clouds became infinitely more ominous. At the conclave itself which was to elect Clement XIV, the ambassadors of the House of Bourbon did not at all conceal that they were maneuvering for the election of a pope favorably disposed toward the suppression of the Society of Jesus. The ministers of Spain and France threatened quite clearly all around Rome that if the wishes of the Bourbons were not listened to, France, Spain, Portugal, and the two Sicilies might separate themselves from communion with Rome. This threat of schism helped to produce the effect desired. As is known, Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli was elected Pope Clement XIV. He gave no antecedent promise that he would suppress the Society; but he did indicate, as indeed he had every right to indicate, that the good of the whole Church obviously had to be preferred to the good of any one particular group in the Church.

This is not the place to retell the story of the suppression of the Society. In 1769, Clement XIV had foolishly promised the King of Spain in writing that he would do so; for four years he tried to stall off the deed; he suffered for years the humiliating and unremitting pressure from the Bourbon courts. The suppression took place on August 16, 1773.

PART II. THE INTERIM CONGREGATIONS, 1773--1814

This is also not the place to recount the whole story of the years from the universal suppression of the Society to its universal restoration in 1814. For our purposes, some remarks on the vicar-generals who held office during that time and on the congregations which elected them will be in order.

Due to the canonical complexities wherewith the Brief of Suppression

was promulgated, and due to the refusal of Frederick the Great in Prussia and Catherine the Great in Russia to allow its publication in their domains, the Society remained legally and canonically in existence in those two countries for some time. Officially, it remained in existence in Prussia until 1776. In Russia, the Society had a more fortunate and longer, though very precarious, existence. The Brief of Suppression arrived in the Russian domains in Poland in September 1773; Catherine the Great refused to publish it, despite the fact that the Jesuits there tried to make clear to Catherine that they themselves felt conscience-bound to obey it.⁷⁹ Without publication, however, it had no legal effect; and the Society was still in existence in the lands of the great Czarina. The head of the Jesuits in Russia, Stanislaw Czerniewicz, appealed to the new Pope, Pius VI, as to what to do. An enigmatic reply came back in 1776, hoping that "the result of your prayers, as I foresee and you desire, may be a happy one."

Slowly the Jesuits there recognized that it was upon their shoulders to establish a structure for the Society existing now only in Russian territory. First, a novitiate was opened in 1780 with the permission of the Bishop of Mogilev, who had received from Rome powers of visitor for three years. Then in 1782 a congregation was held at the urging of Catherine and with the advice of three former assistants. At the time, there were about 150 Jesuits legally not touched by the suppression.

20. Interim Congregation I, October 10--18, 1782. 30 Members

The congregation, shortest ever held up to this time, but to be rivaled in brevity by the other Polish congregations, spent its first days establishing its legitimacy, the rights of the participants, and the care with which it wished to carry out the prescriptions of the Institute for the running of a congregation. On the next to the last day, on October 17, 1782, it elected on the fifth ballot Stanislaw Czerniewicz as "permanent vicar-general until the Society of Jesus shall be universally restored."⁸⁰ He was a Lithuanian who just before the suppression had been appointed vice-provincial of the Jesuits in White Russia.

The Bourbon courts were furious. This put the Holy See in a difficult position because Spain and France insisted that Pius VI abrogate the election.

Finally under pressure, in January 1783, he sent Briefs to Madrid and Versailles in which he did so and declared still in force the original Brief of Suppression. At the same time, the Pope demanded that the Bourbons keep the briefs secret because the Holy See was worried about irritating Catherine, who had threatened, if such a thing happened, to force the Catholics in her realm into the Orthodox Church. But shortly after, on March 12, 1783, Pius VI gave verbal approval of the Czerniewicz election to the coadjutor bishop of Mogilev. Only about six weeks after the brief to the Bourbon Courts, Catherine sent the bishop to Rome, asking for papal confirmation of the Society and for approval of what the Jesuits had done in Russia. Pius formally and explicitly said that he gave his approval, "Approbo, approbo, approbo,"⁸¹ just ten years after the Brief of Suppression, *Dominus ac Redemptor*, had been issued.

21. Interim Congregation II, October 1--13, 1785. 30 Members

On July 18, 1785, Czerniewicz died, with the Society, a small group of 170 members in Russia, still intact. The Second General Congregation, held with the approval of Czarina Catherine and Potemkin, her minister, was made up of thirty members. It chose the Lithuanian, Father Gabriel Lenkiewicz, as vicar-general,⁸² by a two-thirds vote on the first ballot.

The congregation appointed a committee to work on "a revision of the *Ratio Studiorum*." This was the first time such changes were officially contemplated in the *Ratio* since its publication in 1599. However, the impulse for it came from outside the Society, from Catherine, who wanted the Jesuit schools in Russia to introduce "the form of teaching in use in the schools in St. Petersburg."⁸³

Four assistants were elected, and the congregation officially took notice of and arranged for former Jesuits from outside the Russian lands who were coming there to reenter the Society. Even with this growth, the congregation had to concern itself, too, with how to get enough solemnly professed Jesuits to make up the thirty for a congregation.⁸⁴

Within four years of Lenkiewicz's election, the whole fury of the French Revolution broke upon Europe in 1789. In 1796, Catherine the Great died; but, fortunately, the new Czar, Paul I, was also favorable to the Society.

22. Interim Congregation III, February 7--15, 1799. 30 Members

After thirteen years as vicar-general, Lenkiewicz died on November 10, 1798. The new congregation elected on February 12, 1799, on the first ballot another Lithuanian, Franciszek Kareu. This congregation worried about the gratuity of ministries and ordered that no Mass stipends might be taken, nor any alms "given for the sacred ministries."⁸⁵ As in many of the past congregations, it urged growth in the religious spirit rather than the passing of new laws; it confirmed the decrees of previous congregations; it forbade in the letters of Jesuits any and all treating of the affairs of princes and rulers.⁸⁶

In 1801 Kareu became the first General of the Society to be canonically confirmed in Russia, by the brief of Pius VIII, "Catholicae Fidei." The pope decided that the superior in Russia was no longer to bear the title of vicar-general, but simply general. The Society owes much to the Czar Paul I; it was his own personal letter to Pius VII that urged the formal ratification of the Society in his lands, which came with "Catholicae Fidei." This was suggested to him by the man who was to become the next vicar-general, Gabriel Gruber, following the intimation made by Pius VI before he died that the ruler of Russia ask the Holy See for such approval of the Society.

23. Interim Congregation IV, October 15--25, 1802. 30 Members

In August 1802 Kareu died, and the Fourth Interim Congregation elected on the second ballot Gabriel Gruber, an Austrian. He was a man of extraordinary talent and accomplishment. He knew and practiced architecture, spoke several languages, and was, in addition, a physicist. He was much admired by the Czar, and it was greatly due to him that, under Kareu, the Society had received in the capital of all Russia a church and permission to open a school.

It was a joyful duty for the congregation to offer official thanks for the canonical confirmation of the Society by Pius VII, and this it gladly decreed.⁸⁷ It also made a further step in adapting to the vernacular language when it ordered that the natural sciences be taught in Jesuit schools in the Russian language. But again, the impulse was from outside the Society itself: "so that we might offer our due service of obedience to his sublime

majesty and might make clear our gratitude for all the benefits we have received."⁸⁸

A great loss occurred when Gruber, only three years in office, died on April 7, 1805, in a fire at the general's residence. He had accomplished much, and even more could have been anticipated.

24. Interim Congregation V, September 8--19, 1805. 30 Members

The Fifth and last Interim Congregation opened on September 8, 1805. Nine days later it elected Tadeusz Brzozowski, from Poland, on the third ballot. He was the last superior general of the interim period, up to 1814; and, as of August 7, 1814, first general of the universally restored Society, the nineteenth general in succession since 1540. He had been secretary to the three previous interim superiors general, and he knew well the opportunities and the problems of 1805. He presided now over two provinces, the original Russian of the interim period, and the Italian Province, recently restored in Naples under José Pignatelli, chosen by Gruber to head the restoration there, and urged on and enthusiastically approved by the same king of the Two Sicilies who had thrown the Jesuits out some thirty-seven years before.

The congregation officially expressed its thanks and promised prayers to Pius VII and to the King and Queen of the Two Sicilies for all they had done for the Society.⁸⁹

Various requests had come to the general, and he had made some decisions which he communicated to the congregation and for which he received its approval. No one of them is directly important for this account, but lest we think that actions taken long ago do not even today have their resonances, in a minor key though they be, it is probably the decree of this congregation in Russia that "no one who had not known it before is to learn music without the general's express approval" which is the most recent ultimate source of the regulation against musical instruments which, up to perhaps twenty years ago, many Jesuits experienced when they entered the novitiate.⁹⁰

PART III. FROM THE RESTORATION TO GENERAL CONGREGATION XXXI, 1814--1965/66

Even a lengthy treatment of the history of the Society of Jesus would

be hard put to fit in all the details of how it was gradually re-established almost piecemeal outside Russia even before the official restoration in 1814. It is a complicated and somewhat confusing picture. Here only the barest outline can be given, but given it should be, for many of the men living then in hope of a full restoration became very important in the Society and in the congregations after 1814.

Several attempts were made to set up groups whose members might look toward the eventual restoration. The two most prominent were the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Fathers of the Faith. Both of them, through trials that would put off all but the most determined, gathered men who had decided to join or rejoin a newly restored Society. Their first leaders ranged from near saints to authentic crackpots; Tournely, de Broglie, and Varin for the first group; an erratic show-off, Paccanari, for the second. Nonethelèss, both groups left to the restored Society men who early and regularly show up among the delegates to the Congregations after 1814.

Besides these groups, there was another one of former Spanish Jesuits, kept together through the years by José Pignatelli with incredible intelligence, patience, and sanctity. In 1793, the Duke of Parma asked for Jesuit return; three came from Russia; Pignatelli joined them, renewed his vows as a Jesuit, and in 1795 opened a novitiate in Italy.

Pius VI gradually came to the resolution to recognize the Society formally in the Russian existence. He died in exile in 1799, before he could do so. Pius VII decided once and for all to re-establish the Society in whatever country there were requests to do so. Russia, through Czar Paul I asked; Pius replied by the brief *Catholicae Fidei* in 1801, the formal papal approval.

Catholicae Fidei opened the door to joyous requests from other little groups anxious to affiliate with the Society of Jesus in Russia, now indubitably approved by the pope. Switzerland and England and Holland and Belgium now had their small houses or sometimes provinces, made up of now old ex-Jesuits and young aspirants. Naples was its expected ebullient self in the restoration there in 1804, mentioned earlier. In the United States, John Carroll, former Jesuit and now first American bishop, wrote to Gruber, received a welcoming answer; and on August 18, 1805, five Jesuits of the old

Society pronounced their vows as the first members in the United States of the now partially-restored Society.

During all these events, the master of Europe, Napoleon, would never have countenanced so public and provocative an act as the full restoration of the Jesuits. Indeed in his mind the pope was to serve as little more than his chaplain, directing the Church to the glory of the French Empire. He had forced Pius VII into exile at Fontainebleau in 1812; but before Napoleon, in turn, went into his exile in April 1814, Pius left his and started on his way back to Rome. Toward the end of May, he was back in Rome and had decided to try to have the universal restoration take place only two months later, on July 31, the feast of St. Ignatius. Curial bureaucracy slowed the affair; but on August 7, the octave of the feast, the pope celebrated Mass at his altar at the Gesù; after it, the Bull of Restoration was read, and each of the one hundred and fifty members of the moments-before suppressed Society there present was received by the pope individually as a member of the restored Society.

As the Society grew gradually in Western Europe and America to the great day of 1814, in Russia the shelter and favor that the rulers had so kindly given to the Jesuits gradually grew cold and reserved after 1812. In some ways, the Jesuits were too successful, and old suspicions between Orthodoxy and the Latin Church took over. Little by little, the works of the Society were curtailed, but most serious of all, despite the growing disfavor for the Society, the Russian government would not allow Brzozowski to leave the country and go to Rome, where he would naturally have resided as general of the universal Society of Jesus. This absence from Rome had its serious drawbacks for the Society, even with a vicar in Rome, Mariano Petrucci. The Society, still struggling in rebirth, with members so diverse in background and training, or lack thereof, should have had a strong man in Rome as symbol and reality of the unity it needed. The problems were going to even grow at the first congregation after the restoration, General Congregation XX.

25. General Congregation XX, October 9--December 10, 1820. 24 Members

In 1815 Tadeusz Brzozowski and the other Jesuits in St. Petersburg had been exiled from the city by Czar Alexander I. Five years later, Brzozowski

died at Polotsk on February 5, 1820. In the very next month, all 350 Jesuits in Russia were banished from the country.

The general congregation was called for September 14, 1820, by Petrucci, vicar-general. At that point, trouble erupted. It is a very complicated story; but put very simply, serious internal disagreement broke out even before the congregation met. A Sicilian Jesuit named Rezzi gathered together a group of men, some of them veterans of the old Society, who were apparently jealous of some of the newer, very vigorous and more active Jesuits, some of them in turn formerly members of the Fathers of the Faith and/or enlistees into the Society through the Russian remnant. The Rezzi group was highly suspicious of people such as the Frenchman Rozaven, who fitted the above description of the newer Jesuits. Rezzi's faction wanted to delay the congregation and get enough votes to control it. They questioned the validity of the Russian professions, and they managed to persuade Petrucci, the vicar, to side with them on this question. Besides, Rezzi got the vicar-general of Rome on his side, Cardinal della Genga, the future Pope Leo XII, who had come to distrust the rather odd Paccanari of the Fathers of the Faith and those associated with him, such as Rozaven. The delegates were on the way to Rome when a letter from Della Genga as vicar forbade them to enter the city. He decided to clear up the electoral rights question first. In addition, he gave Petrucci the full powers of a general, increased the number of assistants, and set up a commission for the correction of abuses in the Society, all acts contrary to the old Institute of the Society.

If Rezzi had his Cardinal della Genga, Rozaven and eighteen of the delegates had their Cardinal Consalvi, the great papal diplomat and Secretary of State. Through him, they got to Pius VII with their remonstrances. Pius became convinced of the Rozaven group's correctness and on October 1st, by a rescript, ordered the congregation to assemble in accord with the original arrangements. Petrucci still had scruples about the validity of the Russian professions. To clear that up, the pope personally ratified the canonical validity of all those professions. The congregation wasted no time in dealing with the "perturbatores." Rezzi they expelled; Petrucci they removed from office.

On October 18, 1820, the congregation elected as general on the second

ballot Luigi Fortis, a seventy-two year old Jesuit from Verona, a member of the pre-suppression Society, and vicar for Italy under Brzozowski. Four assistants were elected, a Pole for Poland, an Italian for Italy, and two from any other nations, without regard to regional affiliation.⁹¹ These latter two turned out to be the vice-superior of the Roman professed house, and Rozaven, vice-provincial of France.

It is obvious that despite six years of the restoration, the Society was still just beginning to get on its feet again. The over-riding consideration of the congregation was that it not be a "new," in the sense of a "different," Society, but a continuation of the "old," in the sense of a Society "imbued with the original spirit." Just about the first act after the elections was to decree that all of the *Constitutions*, Decrees, Rules, *Ratio Studiorum*, ordinations of the generals "maintained their ancient force." A new edition of the Institute, too, was to be prepared.⁹² This was obviously with the intention that the legal or juridical character of the Society should remain the same. More important, still, was the maintenance of the spiritual character. To this end, there was a series of postulata on religious discipline, and the congregation urged a full and careful novitiate and tertianship on all Jesuits and faithful observance of common life.⁹³ But realities had to be faced, too; and exceptions had to be made, especially in the light of the disparate backgrounds of the members of the restored Society. For instance, for those who had not ever actually made a novitiate, it was to be supplied by tertianship.⁹⁴ The *Ratio Studiorum* of 1599, though reinstated, was to be adapted to the present times; and, in the meantime, provincials were to draw up interim provisory rules to be approved by the general. So, too, they were to prepare a list "of those opinions which it is not right that Ours should teach or hold, and also of those authors who in our schools should not be used for instruction."⁹⁵

Even the decree on religious discipline had to take account of the concrete situation in which the Society was struggling to rebuild itself. A novitiate of two years was ordered. But at the same time, the decree said that no one but a priest could spend his second year novitiate teaching in a college or prefecting a boarding school. Indeed, it then went on to say that priests were to spend at least a year in the novitiate, and not the

whole of that in the ministry.⁹⁶ One last indication of how small yet and struggling the Society was is the decree in which, worrying whether there would be enough provinces to send a total of twenty members for a general congregation, it was decreed that, if necessary, a fourth or fifth delegate from each province could come (in addition to the provincial and the two elected delegates).⁹⁷ The irony, of course, is that at the same time, the anti-clericals of Europe were having hysterical visions of phalanxes of Jesuits on the march to blot out freedom and impose the tyranny of the Jesuit fanatic.⁹⁸

On January 27, 1829, Fortis died, after setting the Society on the road to reconstruction. That work was to be continued in a special way by his successor, Jan Roothaan.

26. General Congregation XXI, June 30--August 17, 1829. 28 Members

This congregation, unlike the previous one, started and continued smoothly. Jan Roothaan, a Dutchman, was elected on the fourth ballot. As a young man of nineteen, he had left Amsterdam and gone to Russia, he had worked in Switzerland, Germany, the Netherlands, and Italy. At forty-four years of age, he was the youngest general since Aquaviva. For twenty-four years, he greatly helped shape the new Society, as Aquaviva had the old. When he was followed for another thirty-four years by Pieter Beckx, who continued his policies, it can easily be seen that the post-restoration Society from 1829 to 1887 underwent a continuous influence of fifty-eight years, more than one third of the 160 years of its existence from 1814 to 1974. The election of Roothaan was undoubtedly the most significant act of this congregation.

The *Ratio Studiorum* was, by order of the congregation, to be revised and "adapted to the present times, not lightly, and with nothing to be legislated in it which was not previously tested by experience."⁹⁹ Roothaan appointed a commission for this, and it worked so intensely that in three years it finished its task with the *Ratio* of 1832. Roothaan ordered it to be put into effect on a temporary basis. But the old educational uniformity of the Jesuits was to be no more, and this version never became official by action of a general congregation.

While adapting the *Ratio* to the current age, the congregation warned about the "occurrence of the dangers of newness," urged that scholastic theology and philosophy stand firm, wanted teachers of philosophy to know well physics and mathematics, but did not want physics and mathematics to be part of the examination "ad gradum" "lest the theological program be badly served, the program which the other faculties ought finally to serve."¹⁰⁰

Again, in the context of the modern world, now that the printed word was expanding so rapidly in influence, the congregation thought that Jesuits indeed ought to publish useful works. But in the present circumstances, there was not as much need to urge members of the Society to do so as to "rein in on the part of some an itch to write and publish."¹⁰¹

It is a mark of Roothaan's vision and ability to grasp essentials, that although the congregation gave only general directives on education and said really nothing new about the Spiritual Exercises or the missionary apostolate, he did see the centrality of the Exercises, of the apostolate of education and of the apostolate of missionary work in the life of the Society. Whatever might be thought of the inability to be as current in education in the nineteenth century as Ignatius was in the sixteenth, or of the wooden way in which the Exercises were sometimes later presented, or of the European cultural imperialism to which Jesuits were as susceptible as others, these three sources and manifestations of interior and exterior vitality and generosity owe much to Roothaan. After twenty-four years as general, he died on May 8, 1853.

27. General Congregation XXII, June 22--August 31, 1853. 55 Members

Roothaan himself had called for this congregation; but before it could be assembled, he died. The new general, Pieter Beckx, was elected on July 2, 1853, on the first ballot. He was fifty-eight years old, a Belgian, who had previously been rector of the Jesuit college at Louvain and then provincial of the Austrian-Hungarian Province at the time of his election.

The congregation was especially concerned about religious discipline and observance and about education, and very many of the decrees fit into the context of those two large concerns. As to the religious life, little that was new was said, but several items were judged of particular importance

as means to furthering that life in the Society. They were: the making of a full tertianship; few outside visits, especially for young Jesuits; observance of the rule of companion on going out; care for all the rules of the Society, especially the account of conscience; the granting of few exceptions, "even to preachers and operarii;" concern for the lay brothers; care for observing the rules of modesty. Granted that all of these items were admirable, even the most sympathetic observer might wonder at their being all gathered together in one decree.¹⁰² Surely there should have been some order of importance; for example, observance of the rule of having a companion on journeys or allowing few visits for young Jesuits were not and could not be as central to the life of the Society as the account of conscience or the experience of a good tertianship.

The decree on education tried to deal with the troublesome but certainly ever more necessary question of how Jesuit schools and their Jesuit teachers were to be supported. Although by now there was a dispensation for taking tuition, still, the delegates debated "whether we could take payments from students or their parents for our sustenance" in schools which had no endowment. They decided that in these cases we could take payments, not for our ministries themselves, but for our sustenance. They passed no decree but left decision for particular cases to the general, confiding "that in God's providence this situation will be only temporary."¹⁰³ As to boarding schools, the provinces were cautioned against opening them unless they had beforehand satisfactory buildings and sufficient sustenance, boarders, and Jesuits. But given the realities of this situation, the congregation affirmed that in the case of such schools without endowment, we could, without violating poverty, take to support us the boarding fees as such (i.e., what was paid, not for teaching, but for room and meals).¹⁰⁴

A new assistancy came into being at this congregation, too, the English Assistancy, in response to the postulata of the Province of England, the Province of Maryland, and the Vice-Province of Missouri.¹⁰⁵

Throughout the years from 1853 to 1883, Beckx built on the work of Roothaan; and until Pius IX's death in 1878, he had the pope's unswerving support, followed by that of Leo XIII. Beckx saw the Society more than

double in members, from 5,209 to 11,480, in provinces from ten to nineteen, in missions to the point where almost 2,500 Jesuits were laboring there. He also saw expulsions and persecutions, one of which forced him from Rome to Fiesole near Florence, where a presumed brief period of residence for the general lengthened into twenty-two years for succeeding generals, too.

28. General Congregation XXIII, Sept. 16--Oct. 23, 1883. 72 Members

After thirty years of service as general, at the age of eighty-eight, Beckx called a congregation to elect for the Society a vicar-general. The election took place at Rome, thanks to a temporary surcease in the anti-clerical vendetta. The delegates listened to Beckx' reasons for a vicar, his advanced age and his failing health, and then decided to elect a permanent vicar-general with the right of succession (as had been done for Goswin Nickel at the Eleventh Congregation).¹⁰⁶

Anton Anderledy, a sixty-four year old Swiss, was elected on September 24, 1883, on the first ballot by almost three-quarters of the votes. He was the first and until Father Arrupe the only general to have been directly and personally connected with the United States. When in exile from Switzerland, he had studied at St. Louis University (as had also Father Arrupe, in the University Divinity School then at St. Marys). After ordination, Anderledy had worked as a parish priest in Green Bay, Wisconsin, for one year and had then returned to Europe, where later for many years he had been a superior in Germany.

Two subjects especially occupied the delegates of the congregation. The first was the Syllabus of Errors of Pius IX and Catholic liberalism, understood in its nineteenth century continental meaning. The other was education; this time, the education of Jesuits.

It may come as somewhat of a surprise upon first reading the decrees of the congregation to see it concerned about two documents, the Syllabus Errorum and the encyclical *Quanta cura*, which were by that time already nineteen years old. But as a prelude to the concern two tendencies existed, both wishing quite sincerely to serve the Church with complete fidelity. Some Jesuits, by far the greater number, and most vocal in Europe, saw in the errors condemned by Pius IX a ringing condemnation of

the spirit and tactics of the world so reprobated by the Gospel; and to this they wished to associate themselves. Others, a very small minority, acknowledged that errors did indeed exist, but that there was no hope of preaching the Gospel to all men unless those men were understood thoroughly, approached sympathetically, and appreciated in the good that underlay that error, the good which they were trying to do, albeit in so deformed a way. Only if that was done, they contended, could modern man even be brought to consider Christ and the Church, which was in existence not primarily to condemn errors, but to save persons. In the siege mentality inherited from the French Revolution, and all too often rearoused by the tactics of the nineteenth century anti-clericals who picked out the Jesuits as the archfiends of the Church and acted accordingly, the second attitude had little hope of a hearing in the Society.

The congregation ringingly affirmed the Syllabus:

Since amidst such a congeries of errors which spread absolutely everywhere and which have often in our times been proscribed by the Holy See, we could fear lest even some of our members have been touched by this plague-bearing disease, this general congregation, taking this first opportunity, declares: that our Society fully adheres to the teaching set forth in the encyclical *Quanta cura* of the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX, on December 8, 1864, and that it reprobates and always will reprobate all the errors proscribed in the Syllabus of the same Pontiff.

Since however some provinces have formally asked that the teaching of liberalism which is called Catholic liberalism be condemned by name, the congregation eagerly accedes to the requests and especially commends to Very Reverend Father General that by every means he take care to keep this plague out of the Society.¹⁰⁷

At the same time, the congregation had to recognize that the most extravagant ideas were abroad about the supposed views of the Society on the relationship of the papacy with secular governments, due in part to its strenuous defense of the papacy. So it replied to a postulatum asking for abrogation or moderation of Vitelleschi's prescription "that our members not treat either in books or in writings or publicly dispute or teach anything on the power of the pope over temporal rulers." Its decision was to leave it to the general to decide the matter.¹⁰⁸

On the subject of education, the congregation had to deal with four

matters: the question of "Thomism," the relation of the natural sciences and philosophy in the course of Jesuit studies, the ordering of theological studies for the scholastics, and the problems of civil degrees and certificates necessary for teaching.

The delegates affirmed the adherence of the Society to Leo XIII's encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*, on studying St. Thomas, "so that he be completely regarded as our own proper teacher." At the same time, in another decree, it said that the members of the Society "should hold in high regard and diligently consult those approved and outstanding teachers of the Society, the praise of whom exists in the Church."¹⁰⁹ It also intended to reinforce the decrees of former congregations on the study of philosophy. This method of proceeding was to have repercussions in the next congregation.

In the same decree, it said that lest the professors of physics, contrary to the norms of the Institute, destroy what the professors of metaphysics drew from the Institute, the congregation decided that experimental physics was so to be taught that nothing was to be asserted which ran against the principles and make-up of corporeal bodies as set down in previous decrees of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Congregations.¹¹⁰ Despite the fact that the congregation afterwards urged that young Jesuits who were adept at the natural sciences should receive time for further study of them,¹¹¹ its fifteenth decree above presented even further problems in the nineteenth century than the similar decrees had done centuries earlier.

In the period of theological studies, canon law and church history were to become a part of the curriculum. Requests were presented for other additions to the course, but the congregation did not take them up. The mirage of some kind of a uniform curriculum attracted the delegates, and while they left each provincial free to work one out for the present, each was to send his to the general in Rome, where he was to set up a commission to draw up one unified schema from all of them. This was then to be subject to comments and revision. Finally, the general was to examine and approve it. Then at the end of this decree on uniformity, a change enters in; the general is to approve that which works for unity in substantials and for the freedom of variety in non-substantials in accord

with the needs and customs of the various provinces.¹¹²

Turning to the Jesuit schools, the congregation explicitly recognized that agencies other than the Society and the Church were gaining a say in those schools, and it sanctioned the acquisition by Jesuits of public teaching certificates, with the condition that the *Ratio Studiorum* was to be kept intact. It also recognized the need for further civil degrees in order to teach the natural sciences, but again prescribed that to get them no time was to be taken from the three years of philosophy for all Jesuits. The next decree urged preparation of young Jesuits for higher studies, and acknowledging that the *Ratio* said nothing about such studies in subjects such as philology, ethnology, archaeology, history, higher mathematics, and the natural sciences, it nonetheless commended them highly and asked the general to deal individually with the provincials on this matter.¹¹³

Contrary to the Nickel-Oliva arrangements for a vicar-general at Congregation XI, this assembly left Beckx the possibility of keeping some authority. This he did for several months, but declining health made it a problem, so he resigned all powers to Anderledy in May, 1884. On March 4, 1887, Beckx died, and for only another five short years Anderledy was general. He died on January 18, 1892. The anti-clericals were at the time out in full cry again, and for fear of a hostile demonstration, there was some hesitancy about bringing his body from Fiesole to Rome to bury it. Perhaps the memory of the attempt fourteen years previously to throw the body of Pius IX into the Tiber was still vivid.

29. General Congregation XXIV, Sept. 24--Dec. 5, 1892. 73 Members

That same difficult situation in Rome persuaded the Society to hold a general congregation for the first and only time so far outside of Rome. Martín, the vicar-general, could not even designate the day or the place of Congregation XXIV in the letter on March 23, 1892, which officially announced it. The assistants surveyed all the problems and proposed to Leo XIII that it be either at Tronchiennes in Belgium or at Loyola in Spain. Leo agreed to the need to go somewhere other than Rome, and another letter went out on July 20, 1892, designating Loyola.

A week and a half after the congregation opened, it elected on

October 2, 1892, Luis Martín, the vicar-general, as the twenty-fourth general of the Society. Martín was a Spaniard, forty-eight years old, former professor of theology, provincial of Castile, and substitute Spanish assistant. As is usual, the pope was notified before anyone else, but this time from Loyola by telegram. Apparently there were no newsmen around to score a beat from a telegraph office.

Among the first postulata to be considered was that requesting the general to return from Fiesole to Rome as soon as possible. The congregation recommended that he do so, leaving the date to his judgment and the permission of the pope.¹¹⁴ Martín did move the headquarters of the Society back two and a half years later, in January 1895. Next, the three American provinces, Maryland, Missouri, and New York, asked that they be put on the same legal basis as the European provinces. Up to this time, there were some differences, for instance, in the Formula for Provincial Congregations; but, as the congregation agreed almost unanimously, "they were now to be ruled by the common law of the Society." So, too, now that travel was not as difficult as in the previous centuries of the Society, the congregation decided that a dependent mission would be more closely following the general rules of the Society if someone from it was to be part of a provincial congregation.¹¹⁵

A series of legal questions arose on poverty. For instance, it was asked how a province as such was to be supported if it could not have fixed revenues (*reditus*) from its own capital (stable goods). The answer was through contributions from the colleges and residences which would have such capital.¹¹⁶ The by-now-usual question arose on how to sustain colleges without endowment and whether in good conscience we could live off of tuition. Again, the usual answer was the exemption under which the Society had been living since 1824.¹¹⁷ One delegate asked that the congregation explicitly express its sorrow that nowhere in the Society at that time did there exist a professed house. The congregation replied that "it was surely a thing to be grieved at, but had to be attributed to the evils of the times." Such houses were praised, but their existence seemed almost impossible. Again, the whole matter was left to the

general to look into.¹¹⁸

The general himself was interested in social questions and urged their study. So did the congregation urge work with the poor and the laborers, but curiously enough, in a decree that dealt with the maintenance of religious discipline and in the context of the establishment of sodalities, including those for workers.¹¹⁹

On theological studies, the usual things were said, except that, seemingly rather half-heartedly, the study of canon law and church history were finally to be required in the four-year course. For the course not leading to the examination "ad gradum," three years were to be required; and each provincial, with the approval of the general, was to decide whether and which of these three-year students would be "allowed" classes in canon law, church history, and Sacred Scripture.¹²⁰

Some beginning had been made on writing a comprehensive history of the Society, and the congregation commended it and urged its continuation.¹²¹ To Martín, every historian of the Society and surely every Jesuit interested in his heritage owe a great debt; to him is due the beginning of the great histories of the various assistancies and the editing and publication of the editions of the original documents dealing with the beginnings of the Society. The *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* is, in another sense of the word, a great monument to Martín's foresight and to his insistence that such historical work be of the highest scholarship possible.

In the last years of his life, Martín became a victim of cancer. He suffered greatly, even after several operations, the last of which involved the amputation of his arm. On April 18, 1906, he died after thirteen and a half years as general.

30. General Congregation XXV, Sept. 1--Oct. 18, 1906. 72 Members

The headquarters of the Society were now back in Rome, the atmosphere was peaceful, and the congregation was called to meet there, at the German-Hungarian College. On September 8, 1906, it elected as twenty-fifth general Franz Xavier Wernz. He was sixty-four years old, from Württemberg in Germany. His name is well known to canon lawyers; he was one of the leading authorities in that field in modern times. He was present at the

congregation as a delegate from one of the German Provinces, but was at the time the rector of the Gregorian University.

Five commissions or "deputaciones" were set up, on questions of the Institute, on vows and religious observance, on secondary studies, on higher studies, on the missions. This was less than the usual number, but they more than had their hands full. However, pride of place and concern had to be given right at the beginning to an unusual intervention by Pope Pius X.

The Pope sent directly to the congregation two postulata, with freedom, he made clear, in its deliberations on them. The first asked the Society to follow in its work in philosophy and theology the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas as set forth in the Apostolic Letter, *Gravissime Nos*. The second commended to the Society its old mission of Japan and "especially the foundation in that highly cultivated region of an institute for higher studies."¹²² Whatever may have been the occasion for the first request--and the recalling to mind by the pope--to hold as central St. Thomas and his teachings, the congregation responded by recalling the fifteenth and eighteenth decrees of Congregation XXIII, the first dealing with *Aeterni Patris*, and the second with the wisdom of also taking account of and consulting classic Jesuit theologians and philosophers.¹²³ As to the request for a mission in Japan, the congregation gladly accepted it; first, "because of the special vow of obedience with regard to missions"; and, second, because of the memory of St. Francis Xavier and so many illustrious Japanese martyrs. Since the pope was pleased with the response of the congregation, it, in turn, promulgated the response as a decree to the whole Society.

With great satisfaction, the congregation must have decided to bring into accord with the *Constitutions* and the rest of the Institute whatever was in opposition to the papal decree on frequent Communion.¹²⁴ In an earlier century it was the Jesuit support--frequent relative to those times--of such teachings that had brought down on the Society the opprobrium of the Jansenists. Even in the Society itself, the new Church legislation brought yet greater frequency of Communion than had been customary.

On secondary education, the congregation wisely recognized that it could not revise and impose a common *Ratio Studiorum*, despite more than

one postulatam for it. Each province should work this out for itself, then gather into regions with similar procedures, and finally go to the general for approval of its work. The congregation recognized the need for lay teachers, but it was still far from the age of the Catholic laymen when it praised "those provincials who, despite difficulties, have Jesuits get civil degrees in order that they are never or rarely forced to take on the help of non-Jesuits."¹²⁵

The problems raised by Modernism were evident indirectly in several of the decrees. In the one on religious discipline, Jesuits were cautioned to watch out for dangers to the faith and "our members were to take care not to praise imprudently rationalist authors or those hostile to the Church."¹²⁶ In the course of philosophy, about which the usual things were said, it was added that "in their classes and lectures, teachers are to pay special attention to recent errors."¹²⁷ In theology, young Jesuits were urged to do special studies "and especially those which at present are highly honored and which modern unbelievers are accustomed to use to fight the Catholic Church, for example, Assyriology, Egyptology, physiology, and so forth." Great attention was to be given to papal teaching on Scripture. Liturgy and its history, methods of historical criticism, and Near Eastern languages were to be accessory subjects. Perhaps moved by the problems of the time, three-year course scholastics were no longer "allowed" but now "obliged regularly to attend classes in Scripture, church history, and canon law."¹²⁸

Directly responding to the Modernist problem, there was a particular decree telling Jesuits to stay away from rash novelties, which introduce into theology, philosophy, and scriptural exegesis poorly-founded opinions as certain, and which give more credit to their authors than to the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. In biblical studies and church history, such novelties prescinded from the supernatural. So superiors were to be vigilant against such freedom of opinion in classes, books, sermons, and even in private conversation. A special set of stringent rules was drawn up, anticipating in some ways the papal documents on Modernism. To express freely an opinion, it must not only not be condemned, but rather conformed

to the mind of the Church and the approved opinions. Nothing new was to be proposed which was not in accord with faith and piety or offensive to the faithful. Doubtful cases were to be submitted to superiors. Commentaries by non-Catholics were to be used very cautiously, lest Scripture come to be regarded as only a human book. Superiors were even to remove imprudent teachers from office if necessary. At the same time, the congregation avowed that it did not wish to stop a free and right use of erudition and critical methods which were most useful in more recent works. Positive means, too, entered into this struggle. The very best men were to teach philosophy and theology to the younger Jesuits; writers for Jesuit periodicals were to stay abreast of such matters. Most importantly, only an honestly excellent training in philosophy and theology would suffice, so that modern errors might be refuted and modern advances might be well accepted by the Society, and so that the young Jesuits would have full faith and confidence in such teachers.¹²⁹

Despite this concern for Modernism, and despite the general's zeal, indeed his great zeal and vigilance, there were constant attacks against the Society, against certain provinces, against particular superiors, and against specific Jesuits supposedly infected with Modernism. The shameful attacks of certain zealots, sure that they knew orthodoxy better than any other, went on and on.¹³⁰ Wernz, a year before his death, publicly said that, just as Ricci at the suppression had taken God as his judge that the Society was in good condition and had given no just cause for suppression, so now he, the general, not far from his own death was equally so convinced that the Society had given no cause for the calumnious attacks upon it.

A year later, on August 19, 1914, Wernz, subject to diabetes, died, less than two weeks after the hundredth anniversary of the restored Society. Two hours later, Pius X died, after having given his blessing, a dying pope, to the dying general.

31. General Congregation XXVI, February 2--March 18, 1915. 87 Members

A world was dying, too. The First World War had begun on July 28, 1914. In its midst, with all the virulent hatreds summoned up by competing nationalism, the general congregation, composed of Jesuits from both sides of the

warring nations, met six months after the war began, on February 2, 1915, in Rome.¹³¹ Nine days later, on February 11, it elected as general on the second ballot Wlodimir Ledochowski, a forty-nine year old Pole of Austrian nationality. He had been a writer for Jesuit journals, then provincial of Galicia in Austrian Poland, and finally German assistant since the previous congregation. When Italy entered the war on the side of the Allies, Ledochowski, legally an Austrian citizen, moved the headquarters of the Society to Zizers in neutral Switzerland, where he remained free to stay in contact with the whole Society.

As usual in congregations, one of the first acts was to elect the assistants, in this case all except the English Assistant, since there was a postulatum for the setting up of an American Assistancy. The postulatum was accepted by the congregation, and the establishment of the new and flourishing assistancy took place with more than the three-quarters votes it needed. The reasons for the move were the growth in the United States in men, houses, and works and the hope for even greater growth; the differences in the United States in characteristics, customs, and institutions; the hope that its own assistant would be an aid to the retention and increase of the spirit of the Society through joining such distinct provinces more closely to the head of the Society; and the petition by the four American Provinces of Maryland-New York, Missouri, New Orleans, and California. On March 1, 1915, the first American assistant was elected, Thomas Gannon, provincial of Maryland-New York.¹³²

Very important at the time, and to become a great help in years to come was the decree ordering a new editing and collecting of the law of the Society, "in order that our laws might be better adapted to a current and easier use" and to agree with pontifical law.¹³³ A new edition of the *Institute* was ordered, but it was never done. Perhaps most importantly, the congregation ordered an epitome of the *Institute* to be produced. This was the stimulus for the *Epitome* so familiar to subsequent generations of Jesuits, a masterful compendium of four centuries of the Society's legislation, an aid to the study of its *Institute* as a whole, and as such a help to the preservation of its heritage. The very legalistic approach

to the life of the Society which the *Epitome* sometimes seemed to stimulate is due not so much to the *Epitome* itself as to the way in which the presentation and explanation of its legislation have sometimes been divorced from its spiritual purpose and especially from the historical contexts of its origin and sources. The *Epitome*, ordered here, was to be accepted by the next congregation.

The usual comments on poverty were made, especially on the gratuity of ministries and more especially on the dispensation on tuition, now about one hundred years old.¹³⁴ The "transmarine" provinces were now all, by their very foundation, to be the exact equals of the European provinces, a situation legally not so before, despite earlier postulata and some earlier exceptions.¹³⁵

Again, Modernism came up, but this time without much detail. The "Society religiously adhered to all the pontifical documents by which Modernism was vanquished." Among those documents were mentioned not only those of Pius X condemning the aberration, but also that of the new pope, Benedict XV, recalling to a sane set of actions the integrist reaction against any and all who in its opinion might be suspected of Modernism. The former general, Wernz, was explicitly thanked for preserving the Society from the perils of Modernism.¹³⁶ Doctrine attracted the attention of the delegates, too, in their order to the new general that he send a letter to the whole Society on the teachings of St. Thomas. At the same time, the stand of the Society on grace (*de auxiliis*) and free will and God's knowledge (*de scientia media*) were to remain unchanged.¹³⁷

The congregation recognized that the war was cutting short its work, and so it left to the general several things to do, including the setting up of a final "biennium" for advanced studies and the general permission to suppress, if the need should arise, any houses or colleges.¹³⁸ The sessions ended on March 18, since the Italians had been called to the colors, and a declaration of war was expected almost any day. Despite the war and all the passions which it aroused, the congregation took place in an atmosphere of genuinely mutual fraternal love, and with heavy hearts the delegates returned to their homelands which were caught up now in the

mutually destructive folly of 1914-1918.

32. General Congregation XXVII, Sept. 8--Dec. 21, 1923. 102 Members

During Ledochowski's term as general, he summoned two general congregations, something not done since the time of Aquaviva. The first he summoned for September, 1922, basically to bring the Society's legislation into conformity with the new Code of Canon Law; the second, in 1938, was to elect a Vicar to assist him in governing the Society.

After a year of preparation, the Congregation XXVII met in accord with the wish of the previous one, which had left to the general the decision to call such a gathering at the proper time "in order to revise, approve, and promulgate our law." When the congregation opened, the general was ill, and Norbert de Boynes, a Frenchman, presided over the sessions up to October 6.¹³⁹ This was seemingly the first congregation to divide the results of its work into historical and dispositive decrees. The first thing to be dealt with was the establishment of the *Collectio Decretorum* mentioned earlier in this essay and the approval of procedures for bringing it into existence.¹⁴⁰ Put together at the order of and approved by this congregation, it was done "so as to adapt our laws to a more easy contemporary use and to make clear the full agreement of our law with the pontifical law now in force." In order to do this, "it revised the statutes of all the previous congregations, and the decrees so revised it put into a briefer form in the manner of prior congregations and collected them in a definite order." The congregation also declared its mind that "the statutes of previous congregations would not retain the force of law unless and insofar as they are referred to in the documents which this congregation has published, that is in their *Collection of Decrees*, in the *Formulae of the Congregations*, and in the Rules approved by its authority."¹⁴¹ This *Collection*, further revised by Congregations XXVIII, XXIX, and XXX, is a good brief aid toward understanding what had been set down as legislation currently in force up to the most recent Congregation XXXI.

In order to expedite the business of the congregation, its procedural methods were somewhat modified from those of previous assemblies. *Postulata*

and schemata of decrees were assigned to ten different commissions, which then prepared a position paper for all the members, who then were invited to comment on them. The commissions considered such comments, made a judgment about them, and returned in writing to all the members a definitive judgment on the proposition. For questions of greater difficulty, a vote was taken only some days after all the delegates had a chance to speak; for easier questions, only those requesting the right to speak did so; and this was immediately followed by the voting.¹⁴²

The commission on Jesuit formation and on religious discipline early recognized that it had far too much to do, and so it was divided. The two groups received the unusual authority to edit proposed decrees; to propose deleting from or adding to a decree, even if it changed its substance (but only for this present congregation); to take something from the schema for the *Epitome* and propose it as a decree; and finally to propose as a new decree something entirely new, but not without first going through the commission on selection of postulata ("Deputatio ad postulata secernenda").¹⁴³

After this work of setting up the machinery for procedure, the congregation turned to the election of several new assistants.¹⁴⁴ Those of France and England had asked to resign because of age. The general then set forth the "very grave" reasons for removing Belgium from the German Assistancy and putting it with the English, especially, it was said, because the German assistant asked for it since "he was almost overcome by the weight of too much work." Such was the reason given officially in the decree. No one could be unaware of other reasons. Germany had invaded and occupied Belgium during the World War. There was almost no way that Belgium could effectively remain in the same assistancy as Germany, and the problem was exacerbated by the fact that the assistancy itself bore the name "German." The decree gave no reason why Belgium did not become a part of the French Assistancy. Geography would seem to favor such a move; history was surely against it. The congregation voted to accept the recommendation that Belgium become a part of the English Assistancy. So it did, and so it has remained to the present. The creation of a new assistancy was also approved, the Slavic Assistancy, to be set up when the general thought it appropriate. It was to be composed of

the two provinces of Poland and the provinces of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, which had been resuscitated as new nations carved out of the old Austrian-Hungarian Empire. The provinces of that empire had previously also belonged to the German Assistancy.¹⁴⁵ The year 1973, then, is the golden jubilee of the approval of the Slavic Assistancy; its actual setting up by Ledochowski took place six years later, on April 17, 1929.

From early in the congregation until almost the end, the schemata of all the decrees passed through the procedure mentioned earlier; and when they were judged satisfactory and passed as decrees, they became a part of the new *Collectio Decretorum*. The *Summary of the Constitutions*, the Common Rules, the Rules of Modesty were again approved by the congregation with few and minor changes. In the *Summary*, the rules on dying were introduced. As to the minute details of the several Formulae of the various congregations, the assembly chose six "definitores," one from each assistancy, to work them out; and then it approved the new Formulae for General Congregations, for Provincial and Procurator Congregations, and for the election of a temporary vicar.¹⁴⁶ To these highly structured and minutely detailed rules the Society has had to conform in its assemblies all the way up to the last congregation.

The *Epitome of the Institute of the Society of Jesus* had been prepared by the general in the years since the last congregation. He had judged what principal regulations were to go into it from pontifical law common to religious orders, and what from the laws proper to the Society; he did the same from the main prescriptions of the *Constitutions*, (including the General Examen and the Declarations of both of them), all the decrees in the *Collectio Decretorum* approved by Congregation XXVII, and all the ordinations of the generals for the whole Society and actually in force.¹⁴⁷ Much of this recounting may seem dust-dry, but it has been according to the prescriptions there detailed that the Society was supposed to live out in the concrete the heritage and charism of its founder. The congregation, after having the opportunity to comment on and, if thought necessary, to revise the work of the general, approved the *Epitome*. Generations of tertian fathers have used it in the fifty years thence.

This congregation, too, while retaining the old decree prohibiting the admission of Jews and Moslems without special permission, took steps toward modifying it in the direction of mildness, as was mentioned in this essay when dealing with the Fifth Congregation.¹⁴⁸

As the congregation drew to a close, it especially wanted to thank the general for all the work he had done on this ordering of the legislation of the Society and on securing from Pope Pius XI his approval of the account of conscience as practiced in the Society, despite the seeming problems with it that arose from some of the provisions of the new Code of Canon Law. To Pius XI, too, went their thanks for this special mark of affection for and trust in the Society.¹⁴⁹

At this congregation, early in his pontificate, upon his insistence that the Gregorian University become truly international, the delegates, while leaving it a part of the Roman Province, ordered an internationalization in support from all over the Society in men and money.¹⁵⁰

Not forgetting even to thank the seminarians of the German College, who had given up their home to the congregation and who were "still at their country villa with winter now upon them,"¹⁵¹ this Twenty-seventh congregation closed. It had lasted three and a half months and save for the Sixth Congregation was the longest yet to be held in the Society. It was also among the most important in reinforcing in the Society the clarity, the order and, sometimes to a degree, the somewhat mechanical rigor which seemed to characterize many of its pronouncements in the years to come.

33. General Congregation XXVIII, March 12--May 9, 1938. 161 Members

In its very first decree, the congregation, using words of the *Constitutions*, commented upon the reason for which it had been called, "the urgent necessity to act,"¹⁵² also presented in the letter of convocation of October 10, 1937. To save time, and the times were perilous, the commission for selecting postulata and the commission on the state of the Society were each elected on a single ballot, rather than as previously on a ballot for each assistancy. The various other commissions were much the same ones as in previous congregations, but this time two new ones appeared, one on the fourth centenary of the Society's existence, a happy

event just two years away, and the other on the Oriental Rite, of which some Jesuits had now become members. The procedures were very similar to those of the previous congregation, except that this time on matters of importance a delegate need not talk when his turn came in seniority.¹⁵³

After these organizational preliminaries, the congregation turned to the primary reason for its convocation, the request by Ledochowski for a vicar-general. Forty-nine when elected in 1915, the general was now seventy-two years old, and the problems of the last years had imposed a great burden upon him. The First World War had not brought the peace that was hoped for, and in the unsettled condition of the world, members of the Society had suffered. The Society had prospered, too; and Ledochowski could look back from almost 17,000 Jesuits in 1914 to just about 25,000 in 1938. But in that same year, to take only one example out of twenty-three years, a persecution was raging in Spain in which more than 2,500 members of the Society were exiled and finally more Jesuits were killed than in any other persecution in the history of the Society.

Ledochowski asked for a permanent vicar-general, that is, one who would serve for the rest of the general's lifetime. This the congregation granted, but it did not grant to the vicar the right of succession, as had happened, for example, with Oliva as vicar for Nickel and Anderledy as vicar for Beckx. Ledochowski also asked that he be allowed to pick the vicar-general. This was a rather unusual departure, but the congregation acceded. So the general did so, but not without asking the written opinion of each of the delegates. Ledochowski picked Maurice Schurmans, provincial of the Province of Northern Belgium, the Flemish-speaking province.¹⁵⁴ Debate has gone on in the years since whether the general thought he was thus picking his successor. In any case, the vicar did not succeed; and when Ledochowski died, another was chosen to be vicar-general until a congregation could be called.

The decrees which came from this meeting were arranged in four categories, as indicated in the letter of convocation among the other reasons for calling it. First, there was the spirit of the Society to be fostered and strengthened in opposition to today's errors and blandishments. Second,

the Jesuits were to seek a more apt accommodation of their ministries to current needs. Then, the studies undertaken especially by younger Jesuits were to be ordered according to new regulations and the demands of the present time. Finally, the Society was to plan on how it might most worthily and fruitfully prepare for and celebrate the imminent commemoration of the fourth centenary of the Society.¹⁵⁵

Within four days of the opening of the congregation, from March 16 on, "grave changes in the political situation" forced the provincials and electors of the Provinces of Austria and of Upper Germany to leave the congregation for several days and then return again to Rome. Then on April 7 and April 29 the same two provincials had to leave again. They did not return. The same possibility of leaving was extended to others for similar reasons. Before the end of the congregation, twelve of its members had left.¹⁵⁶ These "grave changes," of course, included the invasion of Austria by Hitler on March 12, the day the congregation opened, and the plebiscite on April 10 supposedly legalizing the rape of that country.

A new assistancy, that of Latin America, was established.¹⁵⁷ The decree of the meeting urged devotion to the Sacred Heart, the cultivation of the Spiritual Exercises, in which the foundation of a good spiritual theology rested upon a good dogmatic theology, solicitude for the advancement of the lay brothers, severity in admission to, training in, and dismissal from the Society, and the better practice of poverty.¹⁵⁸

When the delegates heard the general for the last time that they would ever be with him, he recalled to them that this had in more ways than one been an unusual congregation. The political events of the day, of course, were one reason. But proper to the congregation itself, this was in the history of the Society only the fifth such assembly called not for the election of a general, but for the internal business of the Society, and it was special because rather than set its own agenda independently of the general, it had from the beginning dealt with the topics set out by him, and it had passed decrees in that order.

As war loomed ever closed and racial purity was used to justify the worst abominations, the congregation, in treating of the means to preserve

and foster the spirit of the Society, spoke of prayer, of love of Christ, of openness of conscience, of the example of those who were mature in the Society; finally, "as now more than ever so many errors exist about the unbridled cult of one's own race or one's own nation," it insisted upon "love for all men."¹⁵⁹

Ledochowski became general in 1915 during World War I. Twenty-seven years later he died as general on December 14, 1942, during World War II. Obviously, the war precluded a congregation. Alexis Ambrogio Magni was chosen vicar-general that same day of Ledochowski's death and served until he died sixteen months later, in April, 1944. Norbert de Boynes then was elected vicar-general on April 19, 1944 by a "congregation for the election of a vicar," until a new general congregation could be summoned by De Boynes in a letter of March 12, 1946.

34. General Congregation XXIX, Sept. 6--Oct. 23, 1946. 167 Members

In a Europe just recently rid of its most devastating war, but by no means yet recovered from it, the congregation met. It was only nine years since the last of Father Ledochowski's congregations, but the world had changed dramatically since 1938.

A very early indication of the import of some of those changes was the first decree of this congregation. Its horizons moved beyond the Western world, in giving for the first time to the delegates (procurators) from missions and vice-provinces (many of them in missionary lands, too) the full rights of electors in the assembly.¹⁶⁰

On September 15, 1946, John Baptist Janssens, the fifty-seven year old provincial of the Southern Belgium Province, was elected general on the first ballot by three-fourths of the votes. The congregation, through the general and the deputation to select postulata, went on to set up eleven commissions, none of them unusual. The procedures to be used in the meeting were basically those of the previous assembly, and they had been, with a few exceptions, the ones set down by its immediately previous Congregation XXVII. This latter assembly here again shows its importance in the influence it had on the way subsequent congregations would be run.

Two problems, one new, one old, surfaced very early in the meeting.

The first and new problem occasioned much discussion on the notable tendency, especially in younger Jesuits, to "infirmittatem capitis," perhaps best rendered into English by "mental illness." According to the Constitutions, this was already an impediment to entrance into the Society.¹⁶¹ Current problems arose in practice in these present troubled times and from the insights amassed by progress in psychology. So the congregation attempted to explain the impediment more fully, reaffirmed it as a bar to entrance, and made clear that if such an illness came on after entry into the Society, the admission was valid, but vows would not be so if taken in that situation.¹⁶² The second problem was that of the "impediment of origin," which had been introduced into the Society by Congregation V, prohibiting the admission of men of Jewish and Saracen background without special permission. This paper has treated the question at greater length when dealing with that meeting and with Congregation XXVII. Suffice it to say here that the impediment was simply and totally repealed.¹⁶³

The most important acts of the rest of the congregation can be grouped under seven headings: execution of what is to be decreed, studies, poverty, missions, governance, devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and that rare object, a really new topic, the social apostolate.

Many postulata had come to Rome asking that new decrees not be multiplied, but that old decrees be put into practice. This the congregation decreed, in urging execution of the decisions of the previous congregation, many of which were not able to be implemented because of the wartime difficulties.¹⁶⁴

Solicitude for solid doctrine was a refrain in the work on studies. In contrast to earlier congregations, Scripture was explicitly singled out for special mention as the delegates urged an ever deeper knowledge of it. Beyond this particular, there was general concern about the implementation of the *Ratio Studiorum* for the studies of Jesuits in the way decreed by the previous congregation. The faculties of philosophy and theology came in for some worried comments (minuscule compared to what was to emerge in later years). The general assumed responsibility for prolonging experiments and for bringing to completion a version of a plan of studies con-

formed to the mind of the congregation. That mind became rather complicated, in some instances almost picky, in the details into which it descended. While there were general worries about the relaxation of studies, there seem to have been, also, a certain number of "laudatores temporis acti." In general, variety should be more encouraged; in particular, the general was commissioned to decide whether dispensation was necessary to study Sanskrit rather than Greek in the juniorate of India. In general, a serious discussion of the meaning of academic grades or notes took place; in particular, the delegates voted down a proposal that examinations might be in two parts, one oral and one written.¹⁶⁵ When it came to studies of non-Jesuits in Jesuit schools, some even questioned the legality, the right, that the Society might or might not have to admit women to Jesuit institutions of higher learning. The congregation kept away from that dispute, decided to issue no decree, and tossed the decision back to the general, since, as they said, it only happened in some provinces and was "not against the Institute, but at most beyond the Institute."¹⁶⁶ Later, the question was asked as to how to regard colleges or universities which had in their governance not only a rector, but also a president or chancellor. Again, the matter was left to the general, because, again, it only affected some colleges.¹⁶⁷

The ever-recurring question on the meaning and practice of poverty in the Society received what had been and was to be an ever-recurring solution. The congregation told the general to set up an investigatory commission and then to submit the results to the next congregation.¹⁶⁸ It was finally Congregation XXXI which made substantive decisions, and even then only over the persistent opposition of a very determined minority.¹⁶⁹

The congregation recalled the extensive concern for the missions in the work of the previous assembly and the adaptation of Jesuit ministries to current needs, and in the present meeting asked the general to take care of specific problems which were sure to arise, especially questions about the missions in China and India. It concerned itself with Jesuits in Oriental rites; spoke of the social apostolate in the context of the missions and strongly urged a stand against Communism.¹⁷⁰

On governance, there was a concern for the various Formulae of the several congregations, as there had been in the previous congregation, too, because "from their wise ordering depends in great part right order in the elections and in carrying on business, both of which contribute greatly to the good of the whole Society."¹⁷¹ Surely this was true, but the delegates were somewhat caught, perhaps without recognizing it, in the ambivalent situation of seeing the need for changes in the way these assemblies were held, yet unwilling to work at any fundamental change. So they tinkered. An example of this unwillingness was the response of the congregation to the request that the elections to a general congregation be proportioned in number to the number of members of a province. Desirable or not, the delegates could not even discuss the proposal, because since the then current method of representation was in the *Constitutions*, there had to be a preliminary vote on whether the subject should even be taken up, and the congregation voted "no" to this preliminary question. Perhaps even more revealing of this immobilism was the reaction to a proposal to discuss another point in the *Constitutions*, but not one of central importance. There was a request that the members of the general congregation be allowed to say Mass on the day of election of the general. The response was again negative, not for any liturgical or ascetical reason, but because the congregation did not want to change the text of the *Constitutions*.¹⁷²

To the requests that the congregation go on record as urging the definition of the doctrine of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, the delegates acceded. The request that it do the same for the doctrine of Our Lady as Mediatrix of all graces, they refused, since while the number was growing who thought that the doctrine was contained "in some way in the deposit of revelation," yet there was still controversy about it, and so a declaration was not opportune. In answer to a request for a furtherance of devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary by consecration of the Society and a decree on the devotion, the congregation agreed; and the consecration took place on the eve of the end of the congregation.¹⁷³

The social apostolate was the object of an extended decree for the first time in the history of the congregations. In a variety of ways,

long before this present meeting, the apostolate had been carried on, and increasingly so in the years of the suppression and up to and through World War II. Individual, separate comments had been made about Jesuit work in this area before. Long before that, too, it had had its charter and its theological basis in the social encyclicals. But explicit recognition and firm acceptance of the apostolate, as well as organization of the works which it had involved, had never before been touched by a congregation. It is no disservice to say that the experience of the now defeated Nazism and Fascism, and especially the experience of the increasingly menacing Communism, helped move the delegates to these actions. The congregation itself acknowledged that it was because of the almost general overthrow in so many peoples, not only of the Christian constitution of society, but also of the very foundations of the social order, that no effort was to be spared to implement the social principles of recent popes for the love of Christ the King and his spouse, the Church, and to help restore the right order of society.¹⁷⁴

In every province of a region or assistancy, a "center" of social action and study was to be set up; talented men were to be applied to these centers, and whatever was needed in the way of material resources was to be provided by the provinces. The centers were to receive from the provincials approval for their methods of working; from the general for serious matters and unusual methods. The goal of these centers was to form leaders of society and "to join the working class to Christ and the Church." All the other ministries of the Society also could and should exercise in those very ministries the social apostolate. Jesuit scholastics in training were explicitly to be taught the social doctrines of the Church; these teachings were to be a part of their studies; they were to be ordered to the young Jesuit's later teaching of them or acting on them in his other work. In the long run, too, the witness to the sincerity of this undertaking by the Society depended on the simplicity and austerity of the lives of the Jesuits themselves.¹⁷⁵

At this congregation of 167 members, among the assistants and provincials, the man longest professed, the Latin-American Assistant, had

pronounced his final vows in 1907, forty years before; and he was seventy-two years old. The most recent profession was that of the forty-year-old provincial of Naples, in 1944. Among the elected delegates, the longest professed was an eighty-five year old Jesuit from Rome, professed forty-nine years, since 1897. The most recent profession was that of the thirty-seven year old procurator from Madagascar, one year before, in 1945. Young or old, from an era before World War I and even before the twentieth century began, the delegates had been a part of a congregation that had legislated for the Society, as Janssens said, in times not too different from those of Ignatius and Paul III.

35. General Congregation XXX, Sept. 6--Nov. 11, 1957. 185 Members

Just a little more than ten years after he had been elected general, Janssens, whose health had been in decline, on December 8, 1956, called a general congregation for the purpose of electing a vicar-general to help him in the duties of his office. The congregation began on September 6, 1957.

Hardly had it begun, when four days later, the pope received the delegates in audience on September 10. To them he gave an allocution "which indeed the delegates always had before their minds, especially in fashioning and passing decrees."¹⁷⁶ In the address, the pope ranged widely over general principles and into specific details of the life of the Society, details which had obviously been provided to him by persons very familiar with the Society. Among the most salient points were the following, in the order in which they appeared in the speech. The Society should do everything to ensure correctness of doctrine. Fidelity in obedience was to be central to its life. (Here in the presentation there seemed to be a misunderstanding of attempts among some members of the Society to decide in common on plans of action.) Humility and abnegation were part of religious discipline, which itself could and should be defended from the charge of mere formalism. Jesuits should willingly carry the cross. They were thus "instruments conjoined to God." In the practice of poverty, certain specific practices should be looked to with a view to correction, for instance, holidays outside a religious house, excessive travel, too many

private instruments for work. Among the things that ought to be cut back was the use of tobacco. Jesuits in giving up tobacco, among other things, would be an example to others. By all means, modern methods and modern instruments were to be used and adapted to the work of the apostolate, but we should remember the Gospels and fallen human nature. Among the substantial in the Society was the monarchic form of government. The Society should, above all, be faithful to what it is; otherwise, it would not be the Society.¹⁷⁷

In all honesty, it is difficult even to attempt a brief sketch of the history of this congregation; and, of course, of the next one too, for the influence, the presuppositions, the actions, the backgrounds of so very many men still living or at least very alive in our memory entered into that event. The Thirtieth Congregation, especially, is in a sense too recent for real history and too far past for a newspaper or journal account. This holds true very vividly of Pius XII and all that went into his intervention at the beginning of this congregation. According to some accounts, the delegates were thunderstruck by the speech, and some at least felt that the field of action by the congregation was severely limited by the tone, manner, and substance of the pope's address, as well as by the loyalty of the Society to the Holy See. Perhaps if the delegates had been more aware of previous involvements of the popes with some of the congregations (indeed, far more direct involvements than this), and of the loyal and respectful but direct and determined responses of those congregations to the popes, they would not have considered themselves unable to discuss certain questions which had concerned them even before they had come to Rome. Of course, every past congregation had been completely willing to have its work judged by the then reigning pope, approved, modified, rejected, as the case may be. But the members felt that a part of their service and loyalty to the church was in the interior of the congregation, in the holy freedom of the sons of God and the frank assessment of how best they might serve that church. If reports are correct, the speech of Pius XII put a brake on that holy freedom and inhibited that frank assessment before the congregation had gotten very far under way. Is

this true? Contemporary accounts differ; future research may well clarify this.

The general had given an account of the state of the Society, of the constant increase in members, provinces, and houses, of the persecutions, often bitter persecutions, which Jesuits were undergoing in parts of the world, of the condition of religious life in the Society, of some difficulties, for which remedies were to be found.¹⁷⁸ Then came the allocution of Pius XII. The delegates voted to have it put in the *Acta* of the congregation and published along with the rest of its decrees.¹⁷⁹ As vicar-general, the first purpose for which the congregation was convoked, the delegates chose John L. Swain, a Canadian, the first Jesuit from a non-European background to have so responsible a position in the Society.

Twelve commissions were set up by the congregation to look into the life and work of the Society. Again, they were the usual ones, except perhaps for the addition of one specifically concerned with Jesuit missions among non-Christians.¹⁸⁰ Procedures were very much those of the last several congregations, except for a few innovations. In the interest of time, each delegate could speak only once at each session on the same business; the public votes were to be taken no longer by voice, but by an electric signal board; the *Acta* were no longer to be read to the whole congregation, but multiplied and distributed, with two days allowed to comment on and correct them. After that time, the *Acta* were to be considered approved.¹⁸¹

Because of practical problems with what came to be regarded as too complicated a decree of the previous congregation on the problem of emotional and psychological difficulties ("infirmetas capitis"), this assembly went back to the simple words of the *Constitutions*, and also said that for such an impediment to entrance to be essential, it has to be manifest or obvious. A further clarification was made of another impediment to admission, that of prior entrance into a religious order or congregation or communal society without vows, when the congregation determined that this also applied to a rather recent phenomenon in the Church, secular institutes.¹⁸²

As to carrying out what the congregation determined, it decided to

formulate no new laws. It did order that the time-hallowed and refectory-read *Common Rules* were to be revised. As to the *Summary of the Constitutions*, it did not want it to be redone completely, but it did ask that it be recognized that most of the *Summary*, as it then existed, was drawn from the third part of the *Constitutions*, which deals with candidates and novices and was hardly representative of the whole document nor of the ordinary life of a formed Jesuit. Historians had been trying to get that across for years. So the congregation decided that the *Summary* should be revised and promulgated with contents drawn also from other parts of the *Constitutions*. It was no longer to be read in public every month, but several times a year. Lastly, since Congregation XXVII had revised the whole body of Society law and the two following congregations had adapted it to current needs, there was no need for a special dispositive decree on this matter of keeping the Society's laws current.¹⁸³ The whirlwind was to come in a few short years!

After eighteen years as general, the last seven of them with a vicar-general to help him, Janssens died on October 5, 1964.

The Society had been restored for 150 years in 1964. Fifty years before, in 1914, it had had almost 17,000 members. Now, in 1964, it had more than 35,000. This was almost the zenith in the numbers of Jesuits. In 1965, there were 36,038 Jesuits; in 1966, there were 35,929, the first substantial loss in 150 years. The world, the Church, the Society, the province, the Jesuit community, the individual Jesuit, were to face problems--and opportunities--never faced since the time of Ignatius. The Second Vatican Council opened windows on the world, and the breeze which blew through became a whirlwind. It might be the breathing of the Holy Spirit; the most recent congregation was to test that inspiration.

36. General Congregation XXXI

Session I, May 7--July 15, 1965. 224 Members

Session II, September 8--November 17, 1966. 226 Members

A. Introduction

Vatican Council II was in the third session of its progress when John Swain, the vicar-general of the Society, sent out on November 13, 1964, the letter calling for the Thirty-first General Congregation of the Society

of Jesus. The fourth and final session of the Council was yet to be held, but the influence of the Council had already permeated the Church in a way that both enthusiastic advocates and its worried opponents could never have imagined before it began. The Society of Jesus had felt those influences, too; and it was to feel even more of them in the future.

Because of the fourth session of the Council and because time was needed to complete the preparations for a congregation begun by Father Janssens before his death, the November letter of convocation indicated no date for a beginning of the congregation. Two months later, on January 13, 1965, the date of opening was set for May 7, 1965.

Properly speaking, a history of the Thirty-first Congregation cannot yet be written. Even this brief sketch presents the same difficulties which a fuller history would involve. The congregation is too recent. The varying importance of its decrees cannot yet be assessed by the impact they have had on the Society, and the reality signified by the symbolism of certain of its actions is still open to a variety of judgments. Some of the participants in the congregation have written sketches of all or part of it, but a proper balance would demand further research and interviews from other participants who would represent backgrounds, temperaments, presuppositions, and judgments across a spectrum not yet fully filled out. Perhaps most central to the problem, the congregation was so unusual, in this author's judgment by far the most unusual in the history of the Society, that it cannot easily be rendered manageable by the technique normally used to order and thus render intelligible the mass of data necessarily generated by any such gathering.

No history has yet been written. No memoirs have yet been published. The *Newsletters* from the Congregation, a welcome, well-done, and very significant departure from the complete secrecy of past congregations when in session, furnish more information than can be summarized in these pages. They are recommended to anyone wanting to go into detail on what happened in 1965 and 1966, and they surely ought to be available in their entirety to those who will go to Rome as members of the Thirty-second Congregation, the provincials and the elected delegates. Also important and, it is to

be hoped, to be available are the accounts from 1965 through 1968 in *Woodstock Letters*. Always good, and even better in its latter years, *Woodstock Letters* surpassed itself in service to the Society in a variety of materials on the congregation, especially its survey of the first session and the letters written from Rome originally by a member of the French-Canadian Province. There are first, several articles by participants in the meeting; the survey is just that, a careful account of the proceedings, shorter than the *Newsletters* and therefore more readily accessible; the letters are a perceptive attempt to present thorough observations of one man an account of the more personal, the more human side of the congregation. The delegates become in the letters not simply "representatives of the Society" legislating in assembly for its well-being, but individual Jesuits personally acting in and reacting to a gathering of fellow Jesuits as a whole and as individuals, in whom we can recognize the strengths and weaknesses of our own Jesuit selves, too.¹⁸⁴

Despite all those caveats, the following pages will attempt, if not to write a history, at least to chronicle this most recent congregation. The account will draw very heavily on the material in the *Acta Romana*. Above all, the decrees themselves give better than anything else a sense of the importance and the uniqueness of this congregation. A rereading of them is the best way to know this latest congregation, and it will surely locate this meeting in the reader's mind as one of the very most important in the history of the Society.

B. The Opening

The congregation began on May 7, 1965, after the delegates had been received in audience by Pope Paul VI. All the members were present, except for several from Eastern Europe. The unprecedented number, 224, strained the housing facilities of the Curia. The general sessions were held in the large *aula* meant for this purpose, but numerous committees met in both the Curia and the adjacent House of Writers.¹⁸⁵ Among the delegates at the first and second sessions the one longest in the Society and the longest professed was Father Azcona from Spain. He had joined the Society of Jesus sixty years earlier, in 1903, and had pronounced

final vows in 1921, more than forty years ago. The delegate who had most recently entered the Society was Father Pasupasu from Central Africa. He had been a Jesuit only twelve years, since 1953, and in the first session he was the most recently professed, as of February, 1965, less than four months before the congregation opened. In the second session, he was a relative veteran of more than a year compared to Father Giraldo from Colombia, professed on August 5, 1966, a little more than a month before the session began.

The vicar-general exhorted the delegates "to peace, to concord, to fidelity, through which in the midst of differences of opinion this one will might flourish in all, that the Society of Jesus, in service to the spirit of its founder, St. Ignatius, might fully respond to the needs of the Church."¹⁸⁶

Since there were postulata which proposed that the lifelong term of the general should be changed or at least questioned, the congregation thought that in order to "provide for a tranquil election" it ought to consider them beforehand. Hence the congregation made this its first item of business; and through five sessions it deliberated about two intertwined questions, (1) whether the general should be elected for life or for some determined period (such as fifteen years) and (2) the question, logically antecedent, whether the congregation even had the power to legislate at all before it had elected a general as its head. During these debates a solution of the first question gradually emerged, that of electing the general for life while providing "cautions" making an honorable active or passive resignation sufficiently easy in case of need. Through a straw vote consensus on this solution became so manifest that the delegates felt they could now proceed intelligently to the election; and weeks after it the congregation, now having its head, voted that solution into carefully phrased law, the present decree 41, on July 15, 1965. Another question intertwined with the two above was also discussed in those sessions before the election, namely, what the congregation could and could not discuss; for many delegates thought that the congregation was bound by restrictions in the Institute which forbade even the discussion of topics

pertaining to the substantial. Swain, the vicar-general who presided until the election of the new general, toward the end of this debate told the delegates that in an audience with the pope before the congregation began, Paul VI had answered him that the fathers of the congregation should be absolutely free to discuss anything pertaining to the life of the Society.¹⁸⁷

The usual gathering of information and other preparations for the election of the general took place in the next four days; and finally, on May 22, 1965, the congregation chose on the third ballot Pedro Arrupe, the fifty-seven year old provincial of Japan, originally a member of the Spanish Assistancy, and the first Basque since St. Ignatius to be elected general of the Society.

Questions, too, had arisen about the number and duties of assistants to the general. Finally, a plan strongly supported by Arrupe even before his election as general was adopted. There were to be four general assistants, elected by the congregation without regard for territorial designation. There were also to be general consultors, and general consultants and finally, in addition, regional assistants to be appointed by the general. The four general assistants were elected in three sessions. Dezza, an Italian, had been a participant in previous congregations, had been rector of the Gregorian University, and was highly respected in academic circles in the Church. O'Keefe was president of Fordham University in New York; Swain had been vicar-general; and Varga was provincial, with headquarters in New York, of the dispersed Hungarian Province. "The Europeans, at least some of them, think that the upper echelons of the government of the Society is too Americanized . . . three of their men belong to the Big Four, . . . Fathers Swain, O'Keefe, and Varga (whom they regard as Americanized)."¹⁸⁸

The *deputatio ad secernenda postulata* had its hands full as never before in the history of the congregation. More than 1,900 postulata eventually came to the congregation, by far most of them on hand as the meeting began. By contrast, the previous congregation in 1957 had received between four and five hundred postulata. Six major commissions were set up: on governance (39 members, Swain chairman), on the ministries

and apostolate of the Society (59 members, Carrier, French-Canadian rector of the Gregorian, chairman), on the formation of Jesuits, especially in studies (54 members, Dezza chairman), on religious life (33 members, Ganss, St. Louis University and the Institute of Jesuit Sources, chairman), on the preservation and renovation of the Institute (24 members, Oñate chairman), and on the mission of the Society today, a special commission set up by the general, especially in the light of the pope's request that the Society face the modern problem of atheism. Each of these, except the last, had from three to seven subcommissions. All of the members of the congregation were asked to indicate on what group they wanted to serve "in order that the distribution of the fathers might be done easily and more satisfactorily." Later, other subsidiary commissions were set up; for instance, to help in the actual writing of the texts of the decrees, to devise better methods of procedure in the sessions, to answer canonical questions, to revise the various Formulae.¹⁸⁹

C. The Procedures

The unprecedented number of postulata, the size of the congregation, and the recognized need for an expeditious use of time prompted several new procedural rules. At first, each delegate could speak only once in a session on the same topic of business; later, this was cut down to a speech of seven minutes length, and in the second session to five minutes if requested at the session and seven minutes only if requested beforehand. Still, the number of individual speeches was enormous. Red and green lights on an election board were used in voting. (Toward the wearying end of the congregation, some of the delegates wagered on who could most quickly put names to lights.) The *Acta* were not read publicly, but given out in mimeographed form. But even with such changes in the first session, there were still centrally important ways of conducting a large deliberative meeting, long in use in the contemporary world, as yet unknown to or at least untried by a general congregation. A commission on procedure produced suggestions on these matters for the second session. When adopted, they allowed for the first time in a congregation the raising of a point of order and the proposing of and voting on an amendment to a text being dis-

cussed. This latter was an immense improvement; previously, a text had to be considered, accepted, or rejected as a whole. Father General was allowed to nominate three vice-presidents of the congregation; as a result, he did not have to spend day after day, week after week, presiding over every session of the congregation. For the first time in the history of this assembly, the second session allowed "open meetings" of the commissions and sub-commissions, open to any delegate and conducted less formally than the plenary meetings. To help write the *Acta* of the congregation, non-member Jesuits were called in and allowed to attend full sessions. Latin was no longer the obligatory language in which speeches were to be given; English, French, Spanish, and Italian were also allowed. (The Americans especially were surprised when a poll of the delegates showed that a greater percentage understood French than English.) Simultaneous translation came up for discussion; although not installed for the congregation as such, it was allowed in the open commission meetings and as an experiment in six of the general sessions. Finally, the rule of iron-clad secrecy, in effect for centuries, was abrogated so that an Information Office was set up, staffed by non-member expert Jesuits who attended the sessions and were responsible for the *Newsletter* published to the other members of the Society in several languages.¹⁹⁰

Gradually, the commissions and their twenty-four subcommissions settled down to a pattern of work in which a subcommisssion of three to seven members would study and discuss the postulata dealing with a particular problem, write a draft decree on the subject, and get it accepted by a majority of its members. Then the draft would, in dittoed copies, be sent to the thirty or forty members of the full commission. (The duplicating and copying facilities at the beginning left a lot to be desired; as for long-range fast communication, the general-to-be reportedly caused surprise--and wonder at what he was talking about--when on his arrival at the Curia he asked where the teletype was.)¹⁹¹ Commission members returned written comments to the sub-group, which then revised the text (*relatio*). Then it was submitted to all the chairmen of the subcommissions and, after approval by them, distributed as a tentative

draft (*relatio praevia*) to all the members of the congregation. The whole membership in turn had three or four days to submit comments and suggestions for change. The subcommittee then prepared a final draft (*judicium definitivum*) for discussion at one or more plenary sessions by the whole congregation. If accepted with whatever changes were deemed necessary, that draft was retouched and several days later submitted to a final vote.¹⁹²

D. The First Session (May 7-July 15, 1965)

All of this procedure was ultimately under the supervision of a board of presidents or chairmen of the several commissions. Obviously, much preliminary work had to be done in the sub-commissions; and after the high point of the election of the general on May 22, there were several weeks from May 24 until June 7 before the next general session was held. In that time, the all-important work was going on, indeed, "the most important work of the congregation . . . in the private conversations and in the discussions within the subcommissions or commissions."¹⁹³ But it was almost inevitable that discouragement should set in, as so little seemed to be getting accomplished finally or definitively.¹⁹⁴ Once the general sessions began again on June 7, the sense of movement bounded back, only at times to fade into the distance as one speech succeeded another.

One could treat of the material of the congregation day by day; but for the present purposes, that would be too long. Instead, what follows will be first, a short chronological comment, followed by a topical treatment involving both the first and the second session; for some decrees were preliminarily discussed in the first session and passed in the second. Suffice it to say here that the congregation made history when it decreed such a second session.

As morale grew with the accomplishments through the latter part of June, so did fatigue also grow and, in addition, the realization that the congregation could in no circumstances complete the work which the Society was expecting of it in the time usually spent in such a gathering. The length of the congregation had already encouraged a boutade that "the Jesuits from now on have a general *ad tempus* and a congregation

ad vitam."¹⁹⁵ By July 1, there was serious concern about what to do: continue on to the end (through the Roman heat),¹⁹⁶ give power of decision to a small group of *definitores*, adjourn and call another congregation in a few years, recess soon and reassemble with the same delegates in a later second session--all were discussed. On July 6th, a vote was taken, and the decision was made to recess on July 15 and to reassemble in a second session beginning in September, 1966. That could get the delegates home for needed business and for contact with the members of their provinces eagerly awaiting direct and personal views of the congregation. It would allow a year of further study, reflection, preparation, and discussion. Vatican II would by then be concluded, and the second session could take account of its total work.

In the last week or so of the first session, the amount of work accomplished was exhilarating to the delegates. Between July 7 and July 13 alone the fruit of two months of heavy labor became apparent as the congregation passed the final texts of the decrees on studies, on atheism, on the office and term of the general, on poverty, on the tertianship. In addition, the decree on apostolic ministries was finished. There yet remained, for example, the work to be done on the renewal, understanding, and appreciation of the life of the brothers, on grades in the Society, and, most importantly, on the spiritual life in the Society, especially in the light of Vatican II.

On the evening of July 14, the night before the end of the first session, perhaps the most unusual event in all congregations took place. On the roof of the Curia, the *patres graviore*s of the congregation produced an entertainment for each other "in which just about every assistancy played some role"¹⁹⁷ and which ranged from skits to songs, to updated versions of classics, to a complete synthesis and parody in a recondite Latin speech of every cliché used in the course of seventy days of speech-making, to two tenor solos, one in Basque and the other in Japanese, by Father Arrupe.

On July 17, the Holy Father received the general and his assistants, congratulated them on the first session, and asked of them three things:

that the Society be faithful to itself, that it adapt itself courageously to the needs of the times, and that it be true to the Church and the Holy See.¹⁹⁸

Between the sessions, work would be carried on, with over-all supervision of preparation for the second session entrusted to General Assistant O'Keefe. A list of all the work to be done was prepared, ranging from those decrees which needed only a final definitive vote to others which were only in the first or second report stage. Mixed commissions of delegates and experts met frequently in the intervening year in Rome, for instance, and in Paris. The date for the opening of the second session was set for September 8, 1966, and the general sent to superiors general of more than seven hundred orders and congregations a letter requesting prayers for the success of the next session, with more than three thousand additional copies later sent out. In the meantime, a special commission had modified procedures for the session in accord with contemporary insights and practices, in order to facilitate the work of the delegates, as described earlier in this paper.

D. The Second Session (September 8-November 17, 1966)

The second session began on September 8, 1966. The general had invited the delegates to come early for a triduum if they so wished. He had earlier suggested the triduum and asked who might give it; the congregation replied by asking him to do so. Most of the members were able to be present, and Father Arrupe suggested in the triduum that they put themselves in place in the *Deliberatio Primorum Patrum*, that they see as a special character of a Jesuit his instrumentality in the hands of God, and that they seek ardently union in the Society and, specifically, personal union in the congregation. He even referred back to the concern of St. Francis Borgia, the third general, if the members of the congregation of his time did not let bygones be bygones and forget the debates as they left the congregation.¹⁹⁹

On the opening day, he set four tasks for this second session. They were: to affirm basic principles in a clear and intelligible fashion, to seek to clarify the concrete application of these principles to the

situation of today's world, to search out how to form and develop such a Jesuit as the congregation envisioned, to build up among themselves and for the Society a sense or understanding of common life and of real community.²⁰⁰

The first two general meetings dealt with procedural questions, especially with those mentioned earlier, the introduction of the possibility of points of order and amendments, and the appointment of three members of the congregation to help at presiding, Dezza from Italy, Calvez from France, and Klubertanz from the United States.

To turn now to a topical view of the decrees of the congregation as a whole, again it must be emphasized that the best knowledge of the extraordinary accomplishments of this meeting comes 'from a reading, especially a prayerful reading, of those decrees. Here there will be a brief account of some of the more important or illuminating circumstances in which the decrees were produced, not as a substitute for them, but as a help to a greater understanding of them in the light of their history.

F. On the Institute in General

The commission on the conservation and renovation of the Institute had to face right away the goodly number of postulata asking that it be easier to deal with changing the substantials of the Institute. Others were equally insistent that it could not or at least should not be done. So the congregation had to deal with numbers twelve to sixteen in the *Collectio Decretorum* mentioned earlier, which summarized the actions of the congregations on substantials all the way from the fifth to the most recent. Two papers were prepared for the first session, but not discussed. In the interval, a draft of a decree was prepared; and the second session dealt with it at great length. Here, as in many other instances in the congregation, the serious differences became apparent in the way two groups approached the problem of preserving the genuine spirit of the Society, an overriding goal to which both subscribed. Briefly, some would find solutions in fidelity to documents and to legal precedents; others would find it in the study of and adaptation to concrete contemporary circumstances. After involved discussions, the decree on the preservation and adaptation

of the Institute was approved. It makes clear a definition of the Institute and of "substantials," abrogates the old decree 13 of the *Collectio*, (which is found also in *Epitome Instituti*, no. 22), that is, the detailed list of substantials of the first and second order, and quite simply recognizes that the "congregation can declare the meaning of the substantials," that in non-substantials "the *Constitutions* can and sometimes should be changed by the general congregation," and that it is their duty "to provide for the continuing adaptation of them to the needs of the times" (decree 4).²⁰¹

The question of the distinction of grades between the professed and the spiritual coadjutors occupied the congregation in as vigorous discussion as almost any subject in the meeting. Some postulata asked for an abolition, pure and simple, of distinction of grades. Others said the distinction was inopportune; others wrote heatedly against the norms in use for profession. A lot of research into the origin, history, and progress of grades in the old Society took place. Finally, in the first session, by a series of votes, the congregation decided, first, not to abolish the grades; second, to revise the norms for profession; third, to recommend to the general that he set up a commission to go into the whole question in depth, including the advantages and disadvantages of solemn profession for all formed members of the Society, both priests and brothers.

Between the two sessions, the Vatican II decree on religious life, *Perfectae caritatis*, and the subsequent letter of Paul VI, *Ecclesiae Sanctae*, appeared, and disagreement arose whether the distinction of grades was or was not congruent with them. Experts prepared papers; and at the second session, the feeling among some delegates was so much against the present state of profession in the Society that speakers strongly urged a whole reopening of the question. There was even some talk of a third session if this matter should delay the rest of the work. Finally, after all the speaking and a day for quiet consideration and prayer, on October 7 the congregation decided again not here and now to suppress the grade of spiritual coadjutor and not to set up *definitores*

to decide the matter finally, but right after the congregation to go into the whole question of that grade and to let the next congregation deal with it (decree 5).²⁰² There is not the least question that it will be there to be faced up to by the next congregation.

The permanent diaconate was asked for by some. The congregation decided against it, but asked the general to work at removing obstacles which would impede its later introduction.²⁰³

The coadjutor brothers were the subject of a long discussion, which eventuated in no decisions in the first session. In the interval, a new draft decree was prepared. The apostolic nature of their tasks was made clear: they might serve in any office in the Society, except for those requiring "jurisdiction" in the technical canonical sense. Social distinctions in Jesuit life were not to exist; the brothers were progressively to participate in consultations; they now had a voice in provincial congregations (decree 7).²⁰⁴

G. On the Formation of Jesuits

On the spiritual formation of Jesuits, there were more than one hundred and sixty postulata. Among them, of course, there were some which vigorously complained about the current training of young Jesuits. A draft decree was prepared and given to the delegates near the end of the first session. This was a very difficult subject on which to write a decree, and it got no further in that session. In the interim, there were many meetings of novice masters and tertian instructors. Taking account of their work, a new draft was prepared, and received quite a few comments. This draft was the subject of one of the open sessions with simultaneous translation. Revisions followed, with the final version noting that it meant to be "a kind of spiritual pedagogy," and not a doctrinal decree. The congregation voted approval on November 4 and 5 in the second session to a long decree involving both general norms of spiritual formation and particular suggestions for all the stages of formation with a special note that it was a process ongoing even after the completion of formal training (decree 8).²⁰⁵

The training of scholastics, especially in studies, was the subject

of about three hundred postulata. The commission recognized quite clearly that while it was willing to recommend changes in decrees of previous congregations, it could not change Church law; and it counselled waiting for the post-Vatican II revision of that law before anything definitive was laid down. Also, different regions were so varied in needs and structures. So, the decree here gave general norms, leaving further specifications to a possible new plan of studies and to regional orders of study. The general, too, received permission to revise decrees of previous congregations with the help of a commission on studies. The decree was approved toward the end of the first session, on July 15, 1965 (decree 9).²⁰⁶

There had been some question of treating of the vows of scholastics and of dismissal from the Society; but once it was decided that this involved the pontifical law of the Society, the question had to be asked whether the congregation even wanted to deal with the subject. The majority decided in the negative, and the subject was dropped.²⁰⁷

The tertianship as such was not so much the subject of postulata as were the ways in which it was presently structured. A subcommittee of eight tertian instructors, after study of its intent and purpose, decided that the external structure which now existed was not a necessity. Indeed, it grew up over the centuries through the ordinations of congregations and generals for particular circumstances and could be changed with a change in those circumstances. In addition, there was a clear recognition of diversity in the various parts of the world where the Society existed, and consequently the congregation could hardly realistically set down the same absolute details for the whole Society. So, a decree was proposed which reaffirmed the importance of tertianship, saw it as a prayerful synthesis of previous training, a final preparation for the apostolic life and an opportunity for the formation of the affections,²⁰⁸ set down general norms on how to renew its structures, approved experimentation, and gave the general the power to decide later, on the basis of the norms and the experimentation, what was to be set down for the whole Society. The decree passed near the very close of the first session, on July 13, 1965 (decree 10).²⁰⁹

The norms for admission to final vows were gone over thoroughly, as the general congregation desired "to meet requests of very many postulata that the claim to profession of four vows should be based more on the overall religious and apostolic capability of a man, supposing, of course, that he has suitable knowledge of theology. . . ." ²¹⁰ The old details of decree 158 in the *Collectio Decretorum* were reworked, and the new decree set down the norms by which aptitude for profession as well as for the grade of spiritual and temporal coadjutor was to be judged. The congregation also recommended a thorough study and review of the process for gathering and using personnel reports. As to the ceremony for pronouncing vows, the congregation entrusted to the general the task of drawing up a regulation for it, taking account of concelebration, the vernacular in first vows, and the presence of at least close relatives, heretofore excluded at first vows (decrees 11 and 12). ²¹¹

H. On Religious Life

On the religious life, a whole section of the documents of the congregation deals in general and in detail. The section includes eight decrees, from 13 through 20, some of obviously central importance, such as that on prayer, and at least one that a person could, at best, call peripheral, on reading at table.

The commission had planned a longer introduction on religious life in general, but there was not enough time to accomplish everything; and so the brief decree 13 was passed on November 16, 1966, the day before the end of the second session (decree 13). ²¹²

On prayer, in the first session, there was a treatment of the teaching on Jesuit spiritual life, followed by comments and discussion in three general meetings. Time ran out, and in the interim, many experts in history, spiritual theology, and psychology were queried, with the responses sent to all the delegates. A central point on which opinions differed was the statutory full hour of prayer which dated from Congregation IV of 1581. All--both those for and those against retention of this statutory hour--agreed on the importance of prayer truly fruitful; but they differed about the means likely to obtain it. In the second session, a

new treatment on prayer was drafted, and discussed for almost five full meetings with more than eighty speakers. The subcommission worked on it again; an indicative vote was taken on the question of the ardently debated statutory full hour. Then came further revisions, discussion, more revisions and amendments, and a vote on November 14, 1966. There were then three more interventions on the much-disputed section 11 on the length of time for prayer; two were rejected on November 17, the very last day of the congregation, and one accepted into the text of that section. The decree as a whole does not at all make prayer of less account in the life of the Jesuit; as a matter of fact it asks more than usual and makes quite explicit recommendations on time and type and length of prayer in certain circumstances. The congregation did, however, go back in principle to the norms set down by Ignatius and later modified in the times of Borgia and Aquaviva. This modification reads in part:

11. The general congregation wishes to remind every Jesuit that personal daily prayer is an absolute necessity. But the congregation, recognizing the value of current developments in the spiritual life, does not intend to impose upon all indiscriminately a precisely defined universal norm for the manner and length of prayer.

Our rule of an hour's prayer is therefore to be adapted so that each Jesuit, guided by his superior, takes into account his particular circumstances and needs, in the light of that discerning love which St. Ignatius clearly presupposed in the *Constitutions*.²¹³

The whole decree as it now stands was adopted by a great majority of voters on this last day (decree 14).²¹⁴

There were many postulata on devotion to the Sacred Heart, but what they sought implied long, involved research beyond the scope of the congregation. Hence the subcommission first recommended that there be no final decree, except for a recommendation to the general to further study and promotion of the devotion. In discussion it became obvious that this did not satisfy many of the delegates. So again in the last general meeting, the text of the present decree was approved (decree 15).²¹⁵

On chastity, the appropriate subcommission consulted moral and spiritual theologians, canonists and psychologists and, in the interim, pre-

pared a draft which was sent to the delegates. The point of the discussion in the second session was whether in a brief time an adequate document could be written which would satisfy many of the delegates. The majority wanted the decree which resulted, but also it was to be complemented later by studies by experts, a task committed to the general (decree 16).²¹⁶

The so-called "crisis of obedience" in the Society was the subject of postulata, some asking that the congregation reaffirm the Society's principles on the matter, and others asking that the relation of those principles to the insights of biblical studies, psychology, sociology, and the like be made clear. Others asked that the general set up a special commission to study the matter thoroughly. An attempt at a draft decree was made. It became clear that after Vatican II a meeting of experts was needed, and such a meeting of eleven members of diverse opinions and tendencies was set up. The usual sequence of comments, draft to all the delegates, further comments and final draft took place. Many of the delegates did not approve of the omission, in this version, of what is now in section 10, treating of the obligation of fidelity to one's own conscience and the manner to deal with the matter if such an obligation was in opposition to a superior's will. On November 11, the decree without that section was voted on. Then on November 12, the delegates approved of the insertion into the decree of the present section 10 (decree 17).²¹⁷

To fashion the decree on poverty involved more time, effort, and perhaps debate than almost anything else in the congregation. The two previous congregations had set up post-congregational commissions to deal with the question. Experts on this knotty topic, working for several years under Father Janssens' direction, had prepared extensive position papers for the present congregation. Then the subcommission, aided by these, worked out a multiple-section report, most of which was incorporated into the final decree. The most controverted points in the report dealt with the vow of not relaxing poverty, the fruit of labor, and the gratuity of ministries, but the whole decree underwent extensive debate, and convictions and feelings on all sides were of the very deepest. As to the special vow taken by the professed on not relaxing poverty, after thorough historical

investigation which nonetheless still remained indecisive, the congregation bypassed the long debated and virtually insoluble problems by deciding authoritatively that henceforth by that special vow "the professed are obliged only to this: not to grant a stable income to professed houses and independent residences, notwithstanding other more general expressions which are found in the same declaration" [on *Constitutions*, (554)].²¹⁸

Since 1824, the Society had had a dispensation to accept monetary recompense for its works, and this dispensation functioned as somewhat of a symbol in the discussions on the fruit of labor and the gratuity of ministries. As recently as 1957, the provinces had been questioned as to whether they could function financially if they gave up the acceptance of Mass stipends. Fifty-two out of fifty-four said "no." The question was now very bluntly asked: "What does it mean to have a dispensation from a law for one hundred and forty years and--something which is more serious still--*without any hope of returning to the law?*"²¹⁹ On the other side, the proponents of no change continually cited the supposed wishes of St. Ignatius, the texts of the *Constitutions*, the decisions of previous congregations. At one point, after a determined resistance to change on the part of delegates from a particular province, a speaker from another told them that they should then stop relying on the help they received from other provinces, stop asking that their scholastics be educated gratis in other provinces, and stop suggesting that a central common fund should be set up, for the money needed would "come from forbidden fruit, that is, from the revenues of the work done by members of other provinces."²²⁰ One delegate who was becoming discouraged by the length and complexity of the debate found solace in this thought: "The veterans--those who took part in previous congregations--tell me: You haven't seen anything. In 1957, it was ten times worse, and that lasted three weeks, and without coming up with any solution."²²¹

Finally, the vote on the final draft of the decree on poverty took place on July 10, 1965. The expert, Delchard from France, who had worked on preparing the groundwork on this subject both before and during this congregation, told the assembly that if it refused approval, then the

whole question was back to the zero mark. The whole subject of the decree was carefully divided, so that everyone knew exactly what was being voted on. As a result, it took fifteen distinct votes to pass what is the present decree. At the actual voting, the great surprise was the smallness of the opposition. Apparently, in the opinion of some, it never exceeded 10%, and several times was only 5%. This minority had, in good faith and honest conviction, for long effectively blocked by its labor, its tenaciousness, and its repeated interventions any changes in the legislation on poverty to meet modern circumstances. On the other side, many of the delegates shared the conviction of one of the experts who had been working on the question for years that "this congregation has accomplished more than any other one for four hundred years."²²² Three days later the delegates approved the idea of four *definitores* who, with the general, were to draft a document for the adaptation and revision of the legislation on poverty, for experimental use until the next congregation (decree 18).²²³ Since the decree touched the Formula of the Institute of the Society, the congregation informed the Holy Father, who heard the opinion of the Congregation for Religious. By letter of June 6, 1966, it was approved and confirmed.²²⁴

On community life and religious discipline, there was no opportunity to discuss the draft decree in the first session. In the interim, there was a new report, consultation of experts, comments, and a new draft. In discussion in September 1966, it became clear that the delegates wanted another revision. So the subcommittee redid it again. The draft came up for discussion again in November, and the congregation approved it on November 17, in its last two session (decree 19).²²⁵

The subcommittee on knowledge of the Institute thought that reasons advanced in postulata for changing the current directives for reading at table, in the light of diversity of circumstances in the Society, should be dealt with by the general, and it turned the matter over to him. They also asked him to see to it that whatever changes were made would not bring a decline in knowledge of the Constitutions (decree 20).²²⁶

When one looks back at the eight decrees which make up the work of

the congregation as it dealt with religious life, it is striking how much was accomplished to face the realities of the present day and still to do so within the framework of the history and tradition of the Society. Perhaps here most strikingly is verified the central characteristic of any successful renewal, historical continuity and contemporary discernment. These were only decrees of course; this success would be tested by how they were lived out.

I. On the Apostolate

The Society of Jesus was not founded and does not exist primarily for itself or even for its own members. Its end is twofold--the Society exists to help its own members grow in the love and service of God, but each should remember that "he is a member of the Society founded chiefly for this purpose: to strive especially for the defense and propagation of the faith and for the progress of souls in Christian life and doctrine. . . ."227 Therefore, as a matter of course, the apostolate exercised by the Society would come in for long and serious consideration by this congregation, as it had been considered by past assemblies too.

As to the Jesuit priestly apostolate, some postulata contended that members of the Society had too far involved themselves in the temporal order, pertaining to laymen rather than priests, and so they asked that the priests of the Society work mainly and especially in the ministry of preaching the word of God and administering the sacraments. Exactly to the contrary, others asked the congregation to declare quite explicitly that the priesthood in the Society could be exercised with legitimacy not only in the direct care of souls, but also in works ordered even if only indirectly to the good of the Church, works such as scholarly research, education, social ministries. The commission on the mission of the Society in the contemporary world prepared a draft decree which the delegates deemed unsatisfactory. During the fourth session of the Second Vatican Council special meetings were held with some of the Jesuit experts present there, and with their help several of the delegates prepared a position paper to be sent to all the members of the congregation. Comments followed. In the second session, a special subcommittee was set

up to deal with this question of the priestly apostolate. It undertook a revision of the whole draft of the decree, and it was this revision which with a few changes the congregation approved on October 19, 1966. A little later there was a request to clarify what responsibilities ordination itself conferred, and this was done on November 7 in section 6 of the decree (decree 23).²²⁸

To be considered in conjunction with the above decree were the two decrees which preceded it, the one on the better choice and promotion of ministries, and the other on the commission to be set up specifically for promoting such a better choice of ministries. The first of these set down the places in which to look for norms of renewal, the dispositions required for such adaptation, cooperation with others in the apostolate, and some fields which today deserve special attention. These areas of special attention were higher education, labor and professional groups, the education of youth, international organizations, certain geographical regions which demanded strong apostolic efforts without delay, the "neo-pagans" in regions which are traditionally Christian (this undoubtedly influenced by Paul VI's commission to the Society in regard to atheism) and works calculated to implement the work of Vatican II.²²⁹ The second of these decrees ordered the setting up of a commission on the choice of ministries by each province under the authority of the provincial to aid him in his responsibilities. Interprovincial commissions, too, were urged, either as coordinating groups or as a single body.²³⁰

More than one question had arisen on the purpose and nature of one of the Society's traditional ministries, foreign missions, and the congregation decided to treat these aspects together in one decree. A draft was prepared during the first session, but again there was no time to discuss it. After the session, Vatican II promulgated the decree *Ad Gentes*, On the Church's Missionary Activity, and the apostolic letter *Ecclesiae Sanctae* followed. Experts in missionary work from the whole Society were consulted and the congregation adopted a revised decree on October 22, 1966. A brief decree also dealt with journeys home by missionaries. Several postulata had asked for this, one of them signed by all the Jesuit

superiors in East Asia. This too was accepted, with the general and the provincials to set norms for practice (decrees 24 and 25).²³¹

The promotion of the spirit of ecumenism and of work in it was a natural concern of the congregation, given not only the work of Vatican II but also the growth of this attitude and work in the Church. The usual procedures occurred, position paper, draft, new position paper in the interim. In the second session a new subcommittee considered not only the comments but also the great variety of regions and customs within which the Society worked. It presented a revised text which was discussed. After the discussion, the general took the unusual step of inviting Cardinal Bea, Jesuit Chairman of the Secretariat for the Union of Christians and former Rector of the Biblical Institute, to speak to the congregation. After an impressive meeting, the delegates a few days later approved the decree on ecumenism on November 2, 1966 (decree 26).²³²

In the first session there had been an investigation into and a discussion of the acceptance of parishes by Jesuits. For some, regular parochial care in this sense was, if not contrary to the Institute, at least not in accord with it. Two position papers came out during the interim, one on pastoral institutions, especially the Apostleship of Prayer and the Sodalities (at some places beginning to be called Christian Life Communities), and the other on apostolic work in parishes. Following on comments from the delegates and consultation of the secretariats on the Apostleship and on Sodalities, three separate groups wrote the three chapters of the decree dealing with pastoral services, residences, and parishes. As one commentator remarked, if the operation of parishes was not in accord with the Institute, it would be hard to justify the more than twelve hundred of them entrusted to the Society throughout the world.²³³ The decree on these three services and on recommendations to superiors, including one on setting up institutes for the training of directors of the Spiritual Exercises, was passed on November 14, 1966. Because of the changed circumstances in the Church, acceptance of curacies of souls in a parish is no longer to be regarded as contrary to *Constitutions*, [324, 588] (decree 27, no. 10).²³⁴

The apostolate of education occasioned "not a few postulata," asking for an explicit declaration that teaching in schools of lay students was an apostolate of the Society in the light of the Jesuit vocation and of the more recent theological teachings on the character and office of the priest in the Church. The whole matter was mulled over in the first session. In January, 1966, some of the delegates met and prepared a position paper which took account of the work already done on the matter and of comments from directors of studies and experts throughout the Society. It went to all the delegates, and because of its importance it occasioned many comments, some of them quite directly calling into doubt the general usefulness of this apostolate of education and others looking to solutions for particular problems. The subcommission deputed to deal with the matter had a difficult subject on its hands and in a long draft decree tried to incorporate not only norms adapted to our own times but also norms given in decrees of previous congregations.

The second session engaged in prolonged discussion of the draft, one of the discussions experimenting with simultaneous translations of the speakers' remarks. In all, about forty delegates spoke on the subject and almost sixty amendments were offered to the draft. Near the end of the congregation it was approved, on November 12, 1966 (decree 28).²³⁵ As part of this decree, the old decree, 141 of the *Collectio Decretorum* was abrogated. In its then current form it had come from Congregation XXV, and had set down that all professors in Jesuit schools should, if possible, be Jesuits; but if necessity urged otherwise, they could be non-Jesuits if they were of proven faith and virtue.²³⁶

Probably for the first time, there was an explicit decree from a general congregation on scholarly work and research, and surely for the first time a decree on cultivating the arts in the Society. The question of scholarly research had arisen, both directly and indirectly, in many postulata. The first session started to look into this; the second set up a special subcommission which in a two part draft justified such a decree, and then set down the norms of the decree itself. The archives of the Society provided help in the justification of research which was

said to be "entirely in accord with the age-old tradition of the Society from its earliest times."²³⁷ The sacred sciences came in for special mention as having "the first claim on the scholarly potential of the Society." But the decree also applied itself to "those sciences which are called positive, both those which look to men and society, and the mathematical-natural sciences, as well as the technical sciences proceeding from them, which profoundly affect the mentality of our times."²³⁸ The delegates approved this decree 29 on November 2, 1966. Some of the delegates had wanted a decree acknowledging the apostolic value of "the liberal arts." A subcommittee looked into the place of arts in the history of the Society and in the doctrine of the Church, especially in the recent pastoral Constitution of Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, On the Church in the Modern World. It contended that the arts may exercise today a great influence for "they provide a special pathway to the human heart." Specific mention was made of poetry, music, the theater, and architecture in which members of the Society achieved greatness. Then the whole apostolate of artistic activity, going far beyond simply the liberal arts, was commended and encouraged, something never before done so explicitly. This decree 30 was passed on November 15, 1966.²³⁹ On the same day a decree was approved which made better provision for those houses of the Society in Rome which as international houses were directly dependent on the general (decree 31).²⁴⁰

Three previous congregations XXVIII, XXIX, and XXX, had spoken of the social apostolate. At this congregation the questions came up with greater urgency, and a decree was necessary in order both to respond to postulata and to bring more up to date and remedy certain defects in the present legislation on social matters. Presupposing previous teaching and confirming it, while going beyond it more distinctly in several instances, the congregation passed a decree relatively early in the first session, on July 1, 1965. It reiterated the priorities in this matter of Congregations XXVIII and XXIX, again urged the establishment of social centers, and tried to see that in the course of Jesuit training social dimensions of the whole modern apostolate be taken into account (decree 32).²⁴¹

In many of the decrees of the congregation the relationship of the

Society and lay persons is referred to. Some of the delegates, however, felt strongly that there ought to be an explicit decree, especially in the light of the teachings and prescriptions of Vatican II. Finally, near the end of the first session a subcommission was set up to deal with the proposal. Near the beginning of the second session, the subcommission thought that two decrees would be desirable. The one would treat more generally of these relationships; the other would try to deal with a closer juridical bond of the Society to certain lay people. This second decree was proposed in order to respond to the strong desires of some of the delegates to fashion such a bond, a desire, they averred, which was a response on their part to the wish of some lay persons so to join themselves to the Society while remaining truly lay. Other delegates seemed to be notably unenthusiastic about the whole matter. In any case such a provision would touch upon some aspects of the Institute, and so a separate decree would be in order. The first and more general decree was passed on October 14, 1966 (decree 33). After much discussion, because of the great differences in the various regions of the world where the Society found itself, the congregation finally approved on November 10, 1966 a brief decree commending the matter to study by the general (decree 34).²⁴²

In the light of the postulata on the communications media and the ordinations of the previous general, Janssens, on the same subject, as well as the Vatican II decree, *Inter Mirifica*, On the Instruments of Social Communication, the delegates early in the first session thought it opportune to have a decree which would collate and put into order the currently existing norms as well as strengthen the apostolate through mass media by further commendation and legislation. Then special mention of the Vatican Radio, an apostolate entrusted to the Society by the Holy See, was urged upon the delegates. Finally several postulata dealt with the opportuneness of setting up an information center at the Jesuit headquarters in Rome. All three matters became the subject of separate decrees passed in the first session (decrees 35, 36, 37).²⁴³

J. On the Congregations

A whole section of the work of this assembly dealt with congregations

in the Society, preparation for a general congregation, congregations of procurators and provincials, and the province congregation.

Some postulata had asked for general congregations at stated intervals, for example, every six years. The subcommission charged with examining the question finally concluded that the reasons for not having such regular congregations were as valid as they were when St. Ignatius had set them forth. On the other hand, the inconveniences mentioned by the postulata could be taken care of, for example, by the congregation of procurators and the congregations of the provinces, the tasks of which were now to be enlarged. In addition, it was averred, the improved communications between the general and the members of the Society made regular general congregations even less necessary. There were those who disagreed and, asking why among all the religious orders the Society was probably the only one which did not hold regular general meetings, they thought we had much to learn from such other orders and congregations. Further reasons were adduced for both positions, but eventually on July 14, 1965, the last day of the first session, the congregation decreed that there would not be general congregations at stated times.²⁴⁴

Other postulata asked that the number of delegates to a general congregation be reduced, that there be a more equitable representation of provinces varying vastly in number of members, that the *ex officio* right of provincials and vice-provincials to come to a general congregation be subject to revision. Even before Congregation XXXI had convened, research on these matters had been done by a specially appointed expert. In the first session, there was an abundance of comments on the first position paper, and revisions in its provisions tried without success to solve what was a very difficult question.²⁴⁵ Some insisted that any kind of proportional representation smacked too much of political democracy, and that the real question to be considered was not quantity but quality of delegates. This brought a firm reply that what was at stake had nothing to do with the civil political order but was fundamental fairness, that no one could really justify a province of three hundred members with three delegates and another province of twelve hundred members equally with three

delegates. Why should the members of the former have effectively four times the voice of the members of the latter? As to numbers of delegates, they had been going up inexorably from the twenty present in Congregation I. Only in 1923 did the number for the first time reach one hundred, and now in just a little more than forty years it had risen to more than two hundred. In the second session there was again long discussion in several plenary meetings. Finally, on September 22, 1966, the congregation decided that at least for the next general congregation the same norms for apportionment of delegates would apply as then existed.²⁴⁶ Experience and a good number of postulata convinced the congregation that expert preparation, too, was needed for a general congregation, and without further ado the general and his assistants were instructed to take in hand the details of such preparation (decree 38).²⁴⁷

Before the second session began, the decree of the Council on religious life, *Perfectae caritatis*, was expounded by the letter of Paul VI, *Ecclesiae sanctae*. This new document prescribed, among other items, that every religious institute should hold a general chapter within two or three years of the Council, "to further a suitable renovation" of the religious life of the institute. Did Session II of Congregation XXXI fulfill that prescription? The delegates naturally raised that question. The congregation, after hearing a group of six experts, decided that it was not its place to make such a decision. It asked an opinion of the Sacred Congregation of Religious, and on November 12, 1966, the reply came that it did so satisfy the provisions of *Ecclesiae sanctae*, since this session was being held after the effective date of October 11, 1966.²⁴⁸

Some postulata wanted simply to suppress the congregation of procurators; others asked that it be revised. Janssens had already had the question researched before the congregation began. The usual procedures by a subcommission followed, and the general congregation finally decided on July 9, 1965, that the congregation of procurators was not to be abolished, but to be revised, as it now stands in decree 39, with the addition of a congregation of provincials. In the second session, the subcommission had some new historical information and wanted to reopen the

question. Some of the delegates still thought that the congregation of procurators ought to be abolished. The attitude was expressed by one of them in the comment that any institution was pretty useless which in more than four hundred years and sixty-four meetings had only once called for a general congregation, the very possibility for which it was set up.²⁴⁹ On the other hand, the general remarked that one of the advantages of the congregation of procurators was that it regularly could send to Rome Jesuits whom he had not appointed and who could give him a different view of the state of the Society. In any case, the general congregation refused to reopen the question, and on October 24, 1966, kept what it had decreed earlier (decree 39).²⁵⁰

For a long time the rules by which provincial congregations were structured and took place had displeased many, and the postulata showed it. The mildest thing it was called was a "gerontocracy," and statistics were cited to prove it.²⁵¹ Again, Janssens had already set on foot a study of the problem. The subcommission charged with the question proposed three solutions: a limit on the age of the members of a provincial congregation, a predetermined set of proportionate age groups in the congregation, and an election of delegates by members of a province. On July 9, 1965, the congregation decided not to abolish the provincial congregation but to prepare a reform of the legislation dealing with it. The same number of delegates would be retained, but an election of delegates antecedent to the congregation would take place. When the matter came to a vote in the second session, the previous question of whether formally to treat the subject had to be considered since it was part of the Institute. The necessary two-thirds majority agreed to consider it, and on October 22, 1966, the congregation passed the new legislation, adding to it on November 12 the provision that not only could brothers vote but they could also be elected (decree 40).²⁵²

K. On Government

On government in general a document had been prepared, but it became clear that questions here would be better treated in the decrees on the religious life, especially in the section on obedience. So no

separate decree was written.

For the government of the whole Society, the question of the duration of the general's term of office has already been treated in this paper. The congregation confirmed a life term, but the possibility of resignation was made easier (decree 41, no. 2, § 1).²⁵³ More than one postulatam asked that the general visit the Society in the various regions of the world. This would change radically the custom so far maintained of the general journeying away from Rome very seldom. The decree was eagerly passed and has been implemented by Father Arrupe in the years following the congregation (decree 42 in the English, 41 in the official Latin *Acta* which were edited later).²⁵⁴

Several decrees followed on the office of vicar-general and his relation to the general assistants, and on the assistants and consultors of the general. Again, this latter item has already been treated in part. Succinctly put, four general assistants were to be elected by a congregation "to carry out the Society's providence with respect to the general."²⁵⁵ They were also the canonical "consultors" required by Church law. In addition, there were to be general consultors chosen by the general, regional assistants, and expert consultants. Father Arrupe told the congregation that for this present time he would name as general consultors the four Jesuits elected as general assistants. There was some question of the duration in office of the general assistants, but the two-thirds majority necessary to change the *Constitutions* could not be gathered, so the term remained coterminous with the life of the general. These determinations were decreed on July 1, 1965 (decrees 43 and 44).²⁵⁶

Official "visitors" had long existed in the governmental structure of the Society. The decree in the *Collectio Decretorum* dealing with this was slightly revised. In the course of the discussion the delegates made clear that they wanted no essential changes, but they did not want "visitors" to stay too long in the province to which they were sent, nor to stay too long in office, nor to enjoy an indefinite authority or jurisdiction (decree 45).²⁵⁷

The government of provinces and houses came in for consideration as

a result of many postulata. As usual, they were in some instances at opposite ends of the pole, some for more power to provincials and other superiors, some for less. The congregation revised some decrees in the *Collectio* on permissions needed from the general, commended to him the granting of broader faculties to provincials, urged that provincials after some time in office go to Rome to help in being better prepared to govern, commended to provincials in turn a greater use of expert advice.²⁵⁸

Once superiors are appointed to govern, they need help and advice if they are to govern well. So the election of consultors occupied the attention of the congregation too. For house consultors, provincials were to inquire into the opinions of members of the community and take them into account. For province consultors, local superiors were to consult their own communities on their opinions of such consultors, and let those consultors know the results. The same was to be true of house consultors. In all of this, the delegates thought that the Society should accommodate itself to the mind of the Holy See as expressed in the recent *Ecclesiae Sanctae*. The decree was passed on November 10, 1966. Later, an intervention was made by several delegates to get the words *vere efficacem* into the first part of the decree where it treats of the members of the Society taking "an effective part in the selection of those who make up councils. . . ." (decree 47).²⁵⁹

Beyond houses and provinces, there was the question of interprovincial cooperation. Like motherhood, the flag, and the *Rules of the Summary*, everyone was for it. But there was a lot of concern on how that concern itself could best be translated into action. The first session took no action, despite a discussion of the question, because some of the delegates thought that the question was not yet mature. In the second session, a decree was finally passed on October 25, 1966. It involves such cooperation in general, economic cooperation, cooperation among neighboring provinces and, among other measures, suggested the setting up of boards of provincials. Into this decree, too, went some provisions on the establishment and regulation of common houses (decree 48).²⁶⁰

The last set of decrees, involving several specific details of government in the Society, are gathered together in an appendix in the English edition of the documents of the Congregation. The delegates gave to the general the power to answer difficulties about and adapt provisions of the various Formulae for the several types of congregations in accord with what had been set down in the decrees of the present congregation. Practically this involved, for instance, how postulata were in the future to be proposed and treated, what ceremonies were to be involved in the election of a general, whether the general congregation actually had deliberative power before it elected a general, and changes especially in the Formulae for provincial congregations (decree 48).²⁶¹

Censures and precepts were not a popular topic of concern among the delegates. They determined that the whole catalogue of them in the Society ought to be reviewed, in the light not "of fear of offense," but rather "of love and desire of all perfection." So a decree delegated to the general the faculty to review them and to "abrogate the canonical penalties and those precepts that are imposed by the Society's own law." He also could abrogate penalties laid down by the *Constitutions* and could petition the Holy See for such "abrogation of penalties established by particular pontifical law." To realize what a change this was, one must look back upon congregation after congregation which as a matter of course regularly confirmed the censures and precepts then in existence, and often enough added to them (decree 53).²⁶²

Just as with censures and precepts, many postulata asked for revision of the directives for censorship by the Society of books written by Jesuit authors. The congregation did not quite know what to do; further research was needed, some delegates said, especially about the doctrines to be held in the Society. This was supposedly to be done by the committee on studies. Then too, the congregation did not know what was going to be done on this matter in the revision of the Code of Canon Law. As a result, the delegates gave to the general the faculty of adapting the norms of Jesuit law in this respect by way of experiment. It also recommended that boards of provincials propose to the general modifica-

tions appropriate to their own assistancy or region (decree 54).²⁶³

Finally, in the light of what had been done in the congregation, certain decrees of past such meetings had to be abrogated and revised, and the delegates gave the power to do so to the general (decree 55).²⁶⁴ So too, certain positive powers were delegated to the general, as has long been usual at the end of congregations. There, for instance, he was given the power to suppress under certain conditions colleges and professed houses (a very regular and common delegation despite the fact that St. Ignatius uses this in the *Constitutions* as an explicit example of the powers and responsibilities of a congregation), to approve minutes of congregation sessions that could not be distributed, to make obvious corrections in and edit with regard to style the decrees passed by the congregation (decree 56).²⁶⁵

The Thirty-First General Congregation now drew to a close, to the delight and the sorrow of its participants. Delight in accomplishing so very much, far beyond their original expectations, and in being able to return to their native lands. Sorrow at the parting of a group whose members, for all their real and deep differences, had come to know and respect each other. Just as Pope Paul VI had spoken to the delegates on May 7, 1965, at the opening of the congregation, so now at its end he gave another sign of his interest and affection. On November 16, 1966, the day before the congregation ended officially, he concelebrated Mass in the Sistine Chapel with the general and five other of the delegates, with all the other members of the congregation present, and spoke of both his anxieties about the renewal of the Church and his confidence in the Society.

The next day the Thirty-First Congregation ended, the twelfth since the Restoration. It had met in one-hundred and twenty-three plenary sessions, along with innumerable meetings of committees and subcommittees during the two sessions and during the interim. It had lasted one-hundred and forty-one days, seventy in the first session, seventy-one in the second.²⁶⁶ The very fact of two sessions had made history. Much more importantly, what it had accomplished had made history. Beyond

that history lay the future--the future of the Society in carrying out the will of the congregation for the service of the Lord.

M. Comment

Almost inevitably, a reader of this survey of the history of the general congregations may wish to ask for a commentary of them in the light of that history. If it was difficult to compress such a history into so few pages, it is even more difficult to do an extended commentary on the congregations from that material. The following remarks are only tentative. They point once more to the need for a full history and a detailed evaluation.

As an assembly the purpose of which is to be the ultimate, indeed strictly speaking the only, legislative body in the Society of Jesus, the congregations have maintained that purpose intact. The members seemed regularly to regard this practical function as primary, with a pastoral function next in order, and a doctrinal function less obvious. (Strictly speaking, a general congregation, unlike an ecumenical council, does not have doctrinal authority, although doctrine manifestly lies beneath its decrees.) The Thirty-first Congregation was a conspicuous example of the pastoral approach. It was more so than any other congregation (perhaps because it had to face more new situations than any other congregation). As a matter of fact, its decrees are really quite unlike those of any other congregation in their amplitude, orientation, and tone. Whatever the reason, it succeeded in embodying this pastoral approach in its decrees far more successfully than any other congregation had ever done. The chief reason for this is, no doubt, the atmosphere created by Vatican Council II.

In pursuing the goal of service of the Church and in it especially of the Holy Father as head of the Church, the congregations have regularly been followers rather than leaders. They have been very cautious about new theories or new policies for action. Very little daring has ever been exhibited by the congregations; they have been regularly conservative; perhaps the most recent one is one of the very few examples of an innovating congregation. The members of past congregations by and

large reflected much the milieu, religious, social, and intellectual, of which they were a part. At times this has led the congregations to a maintenance of the status quo or an inability to grasp the fact or the implications of change, either on-going or imminent. On the other hand, this conservative stance has had the advantage of maintaining intact the bedrock values of the Society. Some would maintain that this is true as far as the words of formal legislation goes, but that in a contemporary context, the meaning of those words has undergone at least some changes since the sixteenth century. Here is where the most serious historical investigation of a past and of its progress to a present would be of great service to the Society in its future.

The structure of the congregation and of the provincial congregations feeding into it has remained the same until very recently. Yet, underneath that structure changes in the world around it had really influenced the make-up, and so the functioning, of the congregation. One obvious example was the constantly increasing life expectancy and longevity of modern man. Given that fact and the prescription until recently that the oldest professed made up the provincial congregations, it was inevitable that their membership would effectively grow older and older, far older than in the first decades or even first centuries of the Society.

The membership involved in this structure has grown in size more than ten times over, from twenty delegates to more than two hundred and twenty. This obviously changes many of the dynamics of such an assembly. This does not seem to have been sufficiently recognized until fairly recently. It took the overwhelming number of postulata of the last congregation to induce changes in procedures which already for generations had been recognized as a help to accomplishing the work of large groups. The apportionment of membership has also not received the serious consideration that history might give it. A fixed number of delegates from each province, regardless of the size of the province, must be looked at in the light of the size of the provinces throughout the history of the Society. If there was not substantial variation in province size, no problem arose. What has that variation been? Has the Society ever before been confronted with

some provinces more than four times the size of others? If so, what was done and why? If not, what should be done now and why?

The frequency of congregations has not in theory changed. They are convoked only to elect a new general or for reasons of serious importance. In practice, in the old Society the shortest interval between congregations was two years (between IX and X), the longest was twenty-nine years (between VII and VIII), the average in the 200 years between the convocation of the first and the nineteenth was ten and one half years. In the restored Society, the shortest interval has been eight years (between XXVI and XXVII), the longest thirty years (between XXII and XXIII), the average interval is slightly more than twelve years. Ease of communication at present might argue against any attempt to set regular intervals for congregations; head and members are in touch with each other so much more easily and regularly than in the time of Ignatius. Ease of travel, on the other hand, might argue for congregations at regular intervals; the striking difficulties of travel in the sixteenth century simply do not obtain today. A journey to Rome was an enterprise fraught with danger, as all too many accounts testify of delegates delayed, lost, shipwrecked. That hardly obtains today, when the Society seems to be one of the very few organizations, lay or religious, with a legislative body which does not meet at set intervals to conduct routine business in an atmosphere untouched by the exceptional or the crisis-ridden situation.

Structure, procedure, frequency, membership, must be judged in the light of what the general congregations are there for. What have they hoped to accomplish? Obviously, the congregation is a legislative body, but to what end? It legislates structures; it serves as the communal voice of the Society; it explains to ourselves our ideals, what we are and what we want to be, in contemporary terms; it reasserts the belief of the Society and members in certain values.²⁶⁷ It attempts to help us, individually and corporately, to be better witnesses to the Gospel, better servants of the Church, better helpers of our fellow man, better followers of Jesus Christ. Any congregation, all congregations, must be judged in the light of how well they accomplish this. Their history

should free us from their history. That is, a serious investigation into and knowledge of the congregations should help us both to rid ourselves of whatever it is from their own past acts that hinders us in our present situation as well as to embrace whatever from those congregations aids us in serving the Lord more generously.

PART IV. TOWARD GENERAL CONGREGATION XXXII

The following paragraphs do not play the prophet. Rather, they are simply an attempt to return to the beginning of General Congregation XXXI, to its very first decrees (so far unmentioned in this study), and to point out that through them the basic thrust of General Congregation XXXI can well serve the members of the Society as they prepare for General Congregation XXXII.

History is all of a piece, and the Society could not have gotten to Congregation XXXI, nor could it have been so successful, without the past that helped to shape it even before it began. We will not get to Congregation XXXII, nor make it successful, without that past also, and the immediate past for us is Congregation XXXI and all that it wanted to and did accomplish. What it saw was a world in transition. Reread the first decree to see that. What it wanted was to help make the Society as capable as possible of bringing to that world the message of the Gospel of Christ. Look at both the first and second decrees to see that. What it judged the greatest obstacle to that goal was a world that had lost the consciousness of God, and so was incapable of even knowing that there is a Christ or a Gospel or a Church. Ponder the first, the second, and the third decrees to see that.

The very first words of the first decree acknowledge a "new age in which the human race now finds itself."²⁶⁸ The congregation acknowledged not only problems but also opportunities in the new developments of the world, and this acknowledgement was in itself far different from the way in which the Society since the Restoration had been accustomed officially to regard the world.

The origin of the Society of Jesus is in the first members' experience of the Spiritual Exercises. We all know that. But that first decree of the last congregation goes on to see an historical development from that origin on, and therefore an historical development of the Society itself as it helped to carry out the mission of Christ our Lord through the Church. "The history of four centuries, with its fluctuations between honor and humiliation, has cast a rather penetrating light upon the nature of the Society and its originating idea."²⁶⁹ That history has not ended, and "today . . . our Society along with the whole Church, finds the conditions of human society profoundly changed."²⁷⁰ In the midst of the conditions described in that decree, we need to revitalize the mission of the Society, and in doing so we are no more exempt from the laws of history than any other organization, the Church included, though we may be subject to yet further laws that go beyond history. One of those laws of history is that we renew and adapt ourselves to service in this world, this world in transition. Insofar as we have known how to do that in the past, we have added to our effectiveness in the service of the Lord. Insofar as we have tied ourselves too tightly to a given cultural condition, or canonized a particular milieu, or through an implicitly assumed optic judged ourselves, the world, and God's revelation, we have been less effective. This is true of past general congregations too. The most recent one went far toward freeing us from those constricting contingencies and opening us up to a return to the liberating resources of the Gospel and, more modestly, of our Jesuit origin and spirit. The Thirty-second Congregation will have to continue that work.

Such renewal of ourselves as Jesuits must come, at least in part, through the renewal of the structure that is part of the Society. That structure helps to sustain us in our way of living and acting by its spirit, purpose, and laws, and we in turn by our lives and our actions impart substance and vitality to the structure. So it is both Jesuit self and Society of Jesus which need to make themselves as capable as possible of bringing the Gospel to mankind. Unquestionably the Thirty-first Congregation wanted such a renewal. Judged at least by comparison with past

congregations it succeeded far beyond expectations. In part it did so because of the circumstance that for the first time in the history of the Society a congregation took place in the full current of an ecumenical council, from which it would almost inevitably draw direct inspiration and guidance. To everyone's great good fortune, including that of the Society of Jesus, the council was Vatican II. In part it succeeded through the determination of delegates who would not be put off from change and renewal, even if it were to be painful. In part it did so through an overwhelming sense on the part of Jesuits all over the world that they had a personal stake in that congregation. The Thirty-second Congregation will in all likelihood not have a contemporaneous Council. It will therefore even more need such delegates determined on continued renewal (not a thing to be feared, but indeed commended by the Church). It will need, too, such a sense of personal involvement in its work by Jesuits today.

We do not renew ourselves, nor the Society, directly for ourselves or for the Society. We are an apostolic order, and it is for the service of God that we seek to be renewed. But how shall men serve him if they do not love him? How shall they love him if they do not know him? It is here that in the present world in which we preach the Gospel we come upon its currently greatest obstacle, the non-knowledge of God, the non-recognition of him, the absence of love, the denial of service, all going back to knowing him not. The third decree of the congregation deals with that phenomenon.

Atheism is not a word which in English well describes the phenomenon. Secular humanism as set forth in a recent humanist manifesto may be better. But whatever the word, there are decent, kind, generous, patient, loving, sacrificing Godless people. It does no good to deny it. Why they are so we must know before the Jesus of the Gosepl can be more than simply humanly attractive. How they came to be that way we must humbly inquire before we can enter into a dialogue of mutual esteem with them. More importantly, whatever it is in us, in the Society, in Christians, and indeed even in the Church, which is an obstacle, a stumbling block, literally a scandal, we must come to know and, more importantly, root out.

If this--and no other--is the world in which we are to preach Christ, then we shall have to understand that world, rejoice with its citizens in good times and weep with them in bad times, serve them in all times, and love them even beyond time. The Thirty-first Congregation saw that. Being human, it did not do everything that might have been done to make the Society credible to modern man; we individual Jesuits have hardly done so either. But it went farther than any other congregation toward doing so. It is there, in the Society and in individual Jesuits, that we start to make the Church credible and the Gospel too, and God. There we start dealing with the atheism, the absence of God, in the lives of so much of mankind. The Thirty-second Congregation will have to carry even further this enterprise of bringing our structure, our laws, ourselves to the point of greater credibility. The faith is, of course, ultimately a mystery, but we need not add our own obscurities to make it less credible to modern man. Only if the Thirty-second Congregation builds on the accomplishments of the Thirty-first in renewing the Society in the context of this present world will it be able to provide for the Society and for individual Jesuits the possibility, the desire, the means of working not only "toward our own salvation and perfection with God's grace, but also with the same grace toward the salvation and perfection of our fellow men."

FOOTNOTES

- 1 (a) "Decreta Congregationum Generalium Societatis Jesu" in *Institutum Societatis Jesu*, Vol. II, *Examen et Constitutiones, Decreta Congregationum Generalium, Formulae Congregationum* (Florence, 1893), pp. 147-524, and added pp. 1-14, "Canones Congregationum Generalium Societatis Jesu," *ibid.* pp. 525-566. These "canons" are set out separately for the first eleven congregations.

References to material throughout these footnotes will be given by congregation number in Roman numerals and decree number in arabic numerals, e.g., GC II, d. 29.

(b) *Acta Romana Societatis Iesu*, Romae: Apud Curiam Praepositi Generalis, (1906-).

(c) *Collectio Decretorum Congregationum Generalium Societatis Jesu a Congregatione Generali XXVII approbata et a Congregationibus Generalibus XXVIII, XXIX, et XXX retractata.* (Romae: Apud Curiam Praepositi Generalis, 1961).

(d) *Acta Romana Societatis Iesu*, XIV, fasciculus VI, *Decreta C. G. XXXI* (Romae: Curia P. Generalis, 1967), 806-1020; and *Documents of the Thirty-first General Congregation* (Woodstock College Press, 1967).

2 GC I, d. 47.

3 GC I, d. 97.

4 GC I, d. 16. On the problem of the substantials and their history, see G. E. Ganss, S.J., "The 'Substantials of the Institute' . . .," in *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, IV, (October, 1972), 117-126.

5 GC I, d. 114: "An barba sit nutrienda?" "Et eam [barbam] non esse nutriendam visum est."

6 GC II, d. 8.

7 GC II, d. 14.

8 GC II, d. 6.

9 GC II, d. 5.

10 GC II, d. 20. The "nations" were: Italy (sic), France and Germany, Spain, Portugal and the Indies.

11 GC II, d. 29. See also DeGuibert, *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice* (1964 and 1972), p. 194 (abbreviated hereafter as *DeGuiJes*).

12 There is a fine, nuanced discussion of this whole matter, with references to fuller treatments, in William V. Bangert, S.J., *A History of the Society of Jesus* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1972), pp. 48-51. See also, for a compressed account of the whole later history of this legislation up to the present day, the references given in fn. 2 on page 261 of St. Ignatius, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus, Translated, with an Introduction and a Commentary*, by George E. Ganss, S.J. (St. Louis,

The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970), (hereafter abbreviated as *ConsSJ-IntComm*), especially those to *DeGuiJes*, pp. 86-89, 169, 192-196, 205, 222, 227-229, 237, 552-554, and further to M. A. Fiorito, "St. Ignatius' Own Legislation on Prayer in the Society," *Woodstock Letters*, XCVII (1968), 149-224.

- 13 See *Documents of the Thirty-first General Congregation*, Decree 14, "Prayer," no. 11, pp. 43-44.
- 14 GC III, d. 21.
- 15 GC IV, d. 5.
- 16 GC IV, d. 19.
- 17 GC IV, d. 21.
- 18 GC IV, dd. 23, 27.
- 19 *Constitutions*, [680].
- 20 GC IV, d. 10.
- 21 What is here to be described so sketchily about these difficulties of Congregation V is set down in fascinating and sobering detail in over almost 200 pages in the great work on the history of the Society in Spain, Antonio Astráin, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España*, 7 vols., (Madrid, 1902-1925), Vol. III, 400-597 passim. Among the decrees dealing with all these problems are GC V, dd. 54-55, 64, 70, 73, 74.
- 22 GC V, dd. 52, 53. See also GC VI, d. 28, and GC XXVII, d. 27, for further developments here, and especially GC XXIX, d. 8, for the very quiet and discreet but effective abrogation of this impediment to entrance into the Society. Instead, the provincials are urged, according to the mind of the *General Examen*, to "be attentive to the cautions to be used in the admission of candidates to the Society, in the cases where because of a hereditary trait or a lack of Catholic education one might doubt whether a person is suited to the life of the Society or to persevering in it." The basic purpose of the original decree is safeguarded; the intolerable stigma automatically imposed on particular groups of people is removed.
- 23 GC V, d. 44.
- 24 GC V, dd. 47, 48.
- 25 GC V, d. 79.
- 26 GC V, dd. 21, 28.
- 27 GC V, d. 44. See, also, GC XVI, d. 36, for further development.
- 28 GC VI, d. 2.
- 29 GC VI, d. 1.
- 30 GC VI, dd. 11, 12, 19.
- 31 GC VI, d. 9.
- 32 GC VI, d. 6.

- 33 This was the college of Messina in Sicily. After his decision (*deliberado ya*) to send ten Jesuits to found it, St. Ignatius assembled the thirty-six members of the community, including the cook, (*toda la casa*) and explained his reasons for acceding to the request of the viceroy and other petitioners of Sicily. Then he requested written answers from each member about his indifference and attitude (*Epistolae Sti. Ignatii*, II, 50; see also J. Brodrick, S.J., *St. Peter Canisius, S.J.* [London, 1935]). Father F. Trossarelli, S.J., in "La Pedagogia dei Gesuiti della Tradizione ad Oggi" (*Didattica*, [Rome: nos. 193-194 September, 1973]), page 7, took this as an instance of communal deliberation used by St. Ignatius after the founding of the Society. But the primary sources do not seem to support this inference, since Ignatius apparently had made his decision before assembling the community.
- 34 The history of this topic has been extraordinarily illumined by the research, (which is also of great value on the whole topic of the Society's poverty) of Father L. Lukács, S.J., "De origine collegiorum externorum deque controversiis circa eorum paupertatem obortis, 1539-1608), in *Archivum Historicum S.J.*, XXIX (1960), 189-245, XXX (1961), 3-89. An English digest by G. E. Ganss is in *Woodstock Letters*, XCI (1962), 123-166, and a compressed summary in *ConsSJIntComm*, p. 166, fn. 19.
- 35 As Father Bangert says, *op. cit.*, p. 176, "he made *periculosus* a favorite adjective." For comments on the reciprocal relations of the period and the Jesuits, see Bangert's suggestion: Michel de Certeau, S.J., "Crise social et réformisme spirituel au début du XVII^e siècle: 'Une nouvelle spiritualité chez les Jésuites Français,'" *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, XLI (1965), 354-355.
- 36 GC VII, d. 13.
- 37 GC VII, d. 40.
- 38 GC VII, d. 83.
- 39 GC VII, dd. 7, 24.
- 40 GC VIII, dd. 4, 5, 60. Also, in GC VIII, d. 27, the Society decided that it could in certain cases found or keep colleges only able to support twenty Jesuits, a reduction in numbers from previous legislation.
- 41 GC VIII, d. 21.
- 42 GC VIII, d. 12.
- 43 GC IX, dd. 5, 25.
- 44 GC IX, d. 24.
- 45 GC IX, dd. 23, 31.
- 46 GC IX, d. 42. See also GC XIII, d. 9, and GC XVI, d. 20, for further developments after Congregation IX.
- 47 GC XI, d. 30.
- 48 GC XI, dd. 18, 22, 19.
- 49 GC XI, d. 12. See, also, GC XII, d. 2, and GC XIV, d. 4.

- 50 GC XII, d. 2. See, also, GC XI, d. 12, above, and GC XIV, d. 4.
- 51 GC XII, d. 15.
- 52 GC XII, d. 28.
- 53 GC XII, dd. 45, 55.
- 54 GC XII, d. 19.
- 55 See Bangert, *op. cit.*, p. 178, for further details of the ridiculous but grave demands made on the general as to protocol visits to the Roman embassies of Spain and France.
- 56 Referring to Louis XIV: "a prince so perfectly just will find our fathers submissive to his orders in every circumstance"; "in this, as in everything else, the most Christian King will find us completely obedient." Letters quoted in Bangert, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-79.
- 57 See footnote 43, above.
- 58 GC XIII, d. 18.
- 59 GC XIII, d. 10.
- 60 GC XIV, Proemium.
- 61 GC XIV, d. 4. See, also, GC XI, d. 12, and GC XII, d. 2.
- 62 GC XIV, d. 5.
- 63 GC XIV, d. 19.
- 64 GC XIV, d. 28.
- 65 GC XI, Proemium.
- 66 GC XV, d. 9.
- 67 GC XVI, dd. 2, 6.
- 68 GC XVI, d. 15.
- 69 GC XVI, d. 33.
- 70 GC XVI, d. 84.
- 71 GC XVI, d. 36. See also, GC V, dd. 41, 44.
- 72 GC XVII, d. 11.
- 73 GC XVII, d. 13.
- 74 GC XVIII, d. 10.
- 75 GC XVIII, dd. 11-14.
- 76 GC XVIII, d. 22.
- 77 Bangert, *op. cit.*, p. 365. He quotes Giulio Cordara, a very close Jesuit friend of Ricci, in saying that "because of his gentle nature he was less well equipped to be at the helm amid violently tossing waves." Cordara said that he "was convinced that exceptional daring was essential and that

not an inch of ground should be yielded. Others held a vastly different view. Nothing save silence and patience, they said, should be pitted against the rising storm. Resist but a bit and all would deteriorate even more. This judgment prevailed." Ricci indeed is to be admired for the Christlike way in which he suffered through this passion; he was a Jesuit of whom we can all be proud. But it is legitimate to do a serious historical investigation to see if this was the best way to serve the Church. Only God knows His own ultimate designs, but that does not dispense us from judging as well as we can on the level of human actions. Even on that latter level, Ricci may have been right; it would be good to find out as well as we can.

- 78 GC XIX, d. 11.
- 79 Catherine was supposed to have told the vice-provincial there, Father Czerniewicz, that he was too scrupulous. The Czarina was not usually given to spiritual direction.
- 80 IntC I, d. 2.
- 81 Bishop Benislowski wrote up and signed on July 24, 1785, a formal document attesting to his interview with Pius VI and included the pope's explicit words of approval in his account.
- 82 IntC II, d. 4.
- 83 IntC II, d. 2.
- 84 IntC II, dd. 6, 7.
- 85 Intc II, d. 6, "intuitu sacri ministerii." The congregation's beginning had to be delayed because several of the delegates were delayed by "the terrible cold" of a northern winter.
- 86 IntC III, d. 7.
- 87 IntC IV, d. 4.
- 88 IntC IV, d. 5.
- 89 IntC IV, d. 6.
- 90 IntC V, d. 4. Much earlier, of course, Ignatius had stated in the *Constitutions*, [266], that "for the sake of decorum and propriety . . . arms should not be kept in the house, nor instruments for vain purposes"; and he gave as examples "instruments for games, and those for music and profane books and similar object" ([268]). Ganss rightly observes, however, that "Ignatius himself approved the use of music to comfort the sick" (*ConsSJIntComm*, p. 160, fn. 9).
- 91 GC XX, d. 4.
- 92 GC XX, dd. 6, 9. Censures, precepts, and reserved cases were excluded from this decree, but a later congregation, GC XX, d. 24, brought them back with all their original force.
- 93 GC XX, dd. 7, 8, 12, 16.
- 94 GC XX, d. 8.

- 95 GC XX, d. 10. The early congregations of the restored Society were conspicuously cautious about what a Jesuit could teach, or hold, or read.
- 96 GC XX, d. 12. Also "no one, unless mature in age, was permitted to go to the convents of nuns or girls schools, and if one did go, it was only to give the Spiritual Exercises or be extraordinary confessor." It is understandable that some of the delegates said that this provision was impossible, for in post-Revolutionary Europe, the Society was much involved in the foundation of and assistance to many of the religious orders of women that then arose. So, the congregation backed away and said if such Jesuits did go to convents, it was only to be for "grave and just causes and with the special permission of the superior."
- 97 GC XX, d. 19.
- 98 The Society was still short of manpower, and operated under some unusual geographical arrangements for the congregation. For instance, besides the provincial, there was in the Neapolitan Province only one professed father, so he was automatically admitted to the congregation. (Already the misunderstanding in the restored Society of the diversity of grades and the criteria for profession, so ably documented by Father Lukács, was starting to be felt.) Another instance, for this one congregation's election of assistants, the members of the Irish Mission were to belong to the Italian Assistancy (GC XXI, d. 5). On the grades, see Note B, pp. 349-356, of *ConsSJIntComm*, which summarizes the extensive original article by Father L. Lukács, S.J. "De diversitate graduum inter sacerdotes in Societate Jesu," found in *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu*, XXXVII (1968), pp. 237-316.
- 99 GC XXI, d. 15.
- 100 GC XXI, dd. 14, 13, 18, 17.
- 101 GC XXI, d. 26.
- 102 GC XXII, d. 44.
- 103 GC XXII, d. 42.
- 104 GC XXII, dd. 19, 42, 43. Another concern for poverty was in the decree permitting members of the Society now to have watches, provided they were not gold or high-priced (GC XXII, 24).
- 105 GC XXII, d. 11. This must have been a special consolation to Father Miede, the procurator of the Vice-Province of Missouri, who had had his and the Province's wrists figuratively slapped when at the beginning of the congregation he had had to wait for admittance because of questions about defects in the way he had been chosen deputy in Missouri. Nonetheless, the congregation did accept him as a delegate "in a manner, however, that this affair will not turn into an example [of the way to act]" (GC XXII, 5).
- 106 GC XXIII, d. 3. Immediately, question arose as to the rites of election. What reverence was to be shown to a vicar-general? The congregation decided that upon election he should receive an embrace and be kissed on the hand by each delegate, but that he should not receive the genuflection

due to a general after he had been elected (GC XXIII, 5).

107 GC XXIII, d. 12.

108 GC XXIII, d. 14.

109 GC XXIII, d. 15, 18.

110 Ibidem. The particular decrees referred to are GC XVI, d. 36, and GC XVII, d. 13. In a later decree, the present congregation tried to determine what it meant in these decrees by "physics" and decided that for its present purposes it meant "all natural sciences" (GC XXIII, d. 17).

111 GC XXIII, d. 17.

112 GC XXIII, d. 16.

113 GC XXIII, dd. 21-23. It should be recalled that despite the insistence on the *Ratio*, the 1832 revision had never been formally approved by a congregation.

114 GC XXIV, d. 8.

115 GC XXIV, dd. 9-10.

116 GC XXIV, d. 17.

117 GC XXIV, d. 18. This question and the preceding one were to bedevil congregations all the way up to the last one, the Thirty-first. It seems to have settled the matter.

118 GC XXIV, d. 23.

119 GC XXIV, d. 20.

120 GC XXIV, d. 24. It may come as a surprise that Scripture was only to be "allowed" for such students. The tempest of Modernism, with its heavy involvement with Scriptural studies, broke on the Church during this generalate.

121 GC XXIV, d. 21. This congregation also had right from the beginning a special commission (*deputatio*) for correcting the Vulgate Latin version of the *Constitutions*, to make it accord with the Spanish autograph version. The congregation gave a proposed list of corrections, recognized that it had neither the time or the leisure to deal with the matter, recommended that the general publish these in a separate text for the present, without at present officially changing the Vulgate, and decreed that this new version was to go to the next congregation for discussion and possible approval (XXIV, 27). The publication of another collection of Jesuit sources of the greatest importance took place during this generalate, the Florentine edition of the *Institute*. Leo XIII took the occasion of the publication of the *Constitutions* in this edition to confirm solemnly all the privileges of the Order from its foundation in the pontificate of Paul III to that date in 1893. The decrees of this congregation are in a supplement to the Florentine edition of the *Institute*.

122 GC XXV, d. 6.

123 See footnote 109.

- 124 GC XXV, d. 9.
- 125 GC XXV, d. 12.
- 126 GC XXV, d. 12.
- 127 GC XXV, d. 13.
- 128 GC XXV, d. 14.
- 129 GC XXV, d. 16.
- 130 It is instructive to remember that even Angelo Roncalli, later Pope John XXIII, got into the dossiers of these zealots as one suspected of Modernism.
- 131 The decrees of this congregation are to be found in *Acta Romana Societatis Jesu* II (1915-18), 13-46 and 27-41. A first for congregations is the chronological compendium of events included as part of the *Acta* of this congregation, *ibid.* on pp. 42-44.
- 132 GC XXVI, dd. 7-9.
- 133 GC XXVI, d. 11.
- 134 GC XXVI, d. 15.
- 135 GC XXVI, d. 16.
- 136 GC XXVI, d. 18.
- 137 GC XXVI, d. 19.
- 138 GC XXVI, dd. 22-23.
- 139 This is the same De Boynes who was to become vicar-general at the death of Ledochowski. The decrees for this congregation are to be found in *Acta Romana Societatis Jesu*, IV (1918-24), "Statuta Congregationis Generalis XXVII," 3-23.
- 140 See footnote 1, (c), above.
- 141 *Collectio Decretorum*, 1, 1 and 1, 2. 1, §1 and §2.
- 142 GC XXVII, d. 3.
- 143 GC XXVII, d. 4.
- 144 GC XXVII, d. 6.
- 145 GC XXVII, d. 6, and 20 in the *decreta dispositiva*.
- 146 GC XXVII, dd. 8-13.
- 147 GC XXVII, d. 14.
- 148 GC XXVII, d. 27, in *decreta dispositiva*.
- 149 GC XXVII, d. 16. Pius XI was one of the greatest friends that the Society every had among the popes. Over the years of his pontificate, he gave the Oriental Institute and the Russian College to the Society, helped in building the new home of the Gregorian University, opened new mission areas to the Society, canonized almost a dozen Jesuits and beatified more than fifty,

made Bellarmine and Canisius Doctors of the Church, and publicly urged the Spiritual Exercises. He also did not hesitate to call on the Society for great support.

- 150 GC XXVII, d. 21, in the *decreta dispositiva*.
- 151 GC XXVII, d. 19.
- 152 GC XXVIII, d. 1; *Constitutions* [689].
- 153 GC XXVIII, dd. 2-4.
- 154 GC XXVIII, d. 5.
- 155 GC XXVIII, d. 9.
- 156 GC XXVII, d. 15.
- 157 GC XXVIII, d. 19.
- 158 GC XXVIII, dd. 20, 21, 23-25.
- 159 GC XXVIII, d. 22.
- 160 GC XXIX, d. 1. The decrees are in *Acta Romana Societatis Jesu XI* (1946-50), "Decreta Congregationis Generalis XXIX", 7-68.
- 161 *Constitutions*, [175] and *Examen*, [29].
- 162 GC XXIX, d. 8. This came up again in 1957 in the next congregation.
- 163 GC XXIX, dd. 2, 31. See also GC V, dd. 52-53, and GC XXVII, d. 27.
- 164 GC XXIX, dd. 10, 23-24.
- 165 GC XXIX, d. 11.
- 166 GC XXIX, d. 12. There had in preceding years been more than one anguished complaint to Rome about this supposed lapse from the mind of St. Ignatius. It was not hard to determine in what part of the world these schools were located.
- 167 GC XXIX, d. 17.
- 168 GC XXIX, d. 14.
- 169 See GC XXXI, d. 18, for this epoch-making decree on poverty.
- 170 GC XXIX, d. 15.
- 171 GC XXIX, dd. 16, 37-38.
- 172 GC XXIV, d. 16, 3 and 16, 5. See *Constitutions*, [697].
- 173 GC XXIX, dd. 18, 34.
- 174 GC XXIX, d. 29.
- 175 *Ibid.* In the United States, a national center was set up, the Institute of Social Order, and research work and a series of publications began. Jesuits in several countries, especially in Europe, had long antedated the American Jesuits in this type of enterprise. An example would be the

- Centre d'Action Populaire in France, in existence even before World War I.
- 176 Introduction to decrees in *Acta Romana Societatis Jesu*, XIII, fascicle 3 (1958), "Congregatio Generalis XXX, 1957," 287-378.
- 177 Ibid.
- 178 GC XXX, d. 1.
- 179 GC XXX, d. 2.
- 180 GC XXX, d. 4.
- 181 GC XXX, d. 5.
- 182 GC XXX, d. 6.
- 183 GC XXX, d. 8, in *Acta Romana SJ*, XIII (1958), 306. On the changes made in Rules 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 33, and 40, see *ibid.*, 826-829.
- 184 The decrees of this congregation can be found in *Acta Romana Societatis Jesu*, XIV-6 (1961-66) "Decreta Congregationis Generalis XXXI," 806-1020. The "Proemium Historicum ex Actis Congregationis Generalis XXXI" occupies pages 813-848. The substantive decrees, 1-48, take up pages 849-984. Various subsidiary decrees (49-56), such as regulations for the second session, changes in Formulae, censures, and precepts, are on pages 985-995. Finally, *Documenta Pertinentia*, such as Pope Paul VI's speech and the list of members of the congregation, take up pages 996-1020. English Edition: *Documents of the Thirty-first General Congregation* (Woodstock College Press, 1967). The *Woodstock Letters* (hereafter abbreviated *WL*) material can be found in the following articles: Kakalec, Joseph M., S.J., "The Thirty-first General Congregation," *WL*, XCIV, 2 (Spring, 1965), 153-164; Arrupe, Pedro, S.J., "A Letter of Very Reverend Father General to the Whole Society on the Thirty-first General Congregation," *WL*, XCIV, 4 (Fall, 1965), 365-371; Ganss, George E., S.J., "Impressions of the Thirty-first General Congregation," *WL*, XCIV, 4 (Fall, 1965), 372-395; Sponga, Edward J., S.J., "The General Congregation: Its Atmosphere and Hopes," *WL*, XCIV, 4 (Fall, 1965), 396-406; Jurich, James P., S.J., ed., "The Thirty-first General Congregation: The First Session," *WL*, XCV, 1 (Winter, 1966), 5-79; Jurich, J.P., S.J., "The Thirty-first General Congregation: Between the Sessions," *WL*, XCV, 4 (Fall, 1966), 467-490; Anon., "Letters from the First Session," edited by James P. Jurich, S.J., *WL*, Part I, XCVI, 1 (Winter, 1967) 5-34; Part II, XCVI, 2 (Spring, 1967), 143-195; Jurich, J.P., S.J., "Letters from the Second Session" ed. by J.P. Jurich, S.J., *WL*, XCVIII, 1 (Winter, 1969), 5-32. Unfortunately, *Woodstock Letters* suspended publication before it could publish its survey of the second session of the congregation.
- 185 GC XXXI, Proemium Historicum, (hereafter abbreviated as P).
- 186 GC XXXI, P 1.
- 187 GC XXXI, P 3, 35.
- 188 "The 31st General Congregation: Letters from the First Session," *WL*, XCVI, 1 (Spring, 1967), p. 153.
- 189 GC XXXI, P 4, P 5.

- 190 GC XXXI, P 7. The old rule, in the Formula Congregationis Generalis, no. 25, explicitly reaffirmed as late as 1923 in Congregation XXVII, had said that "no one was to communicate to others outside the congregation the actions taken in the congregation."
- 191 WL, "Letters," XCVI, 1 (Winter, 1967), June 8, 1965.
- 192 WL, Ganss, XCIV, 4 (Fall, 1965), 387.
- 193 Ibid., 388.
- 194 A longer range view was taken by one of the members of the Jesuit curia permanently stationed in Rome. "Brother . . . marvelled [at the peanut butter, supplied for the meager continental breakfast by the American delegates]. 'It always does some good to have a general congregation. After the last one, we had an apple at breakfast. Now they've added a little piece of ham, and next it is peanut butter. This will be something for us who'll still be living here after you're gone.'" WL, "Letters," XCVI (Winter, 1967), June 3, 1965.
- 195 Ibid., June 13, 1965.
- 196 Even the recently-inaugurated Pepsi-Cola dispenser at the Curia could not quite make up for the Roman heat, although it was a cause of wonderment to the old timers there. Even more unusual to them was the presence of the general at these Pepsi breaks. One delegate suggested that Coca-Cola might be "prepared to defray the entire cost of the congregation if it is willing to adopt a decree recommending coke in all the houses of the Society." Ibid., June 27-28, 1965.
- 197 WL, Ganss, XCIV, 4 (Fall, 1965), p. 391.
- 198 WL, Kakalec, XCIV, 2 (Spring, 1965), pp. 369-70.
- 199 WL, "Letters," XCVIII, 1 (Winter, 1969), September 8, 1966.
- 200 Ibid.
- 201 GC XXXI, P 9. Henceforth, the references in parentheses to decree numbers are to the English translation, *Documents of the Thirty-first General Congregation* (Woodstock, 1967).
- 202 GC XXXI, P 10. How strong the feeling was among some may perhaps be captured by the account of part of a speech by one of the Indian delegates in the second session: "If non-Christians, inspired by human motives, were able to make such a gesture [the abolition of caste], how is it that we who are Christians and who ought to be inspired by supernatural motives would not dare to abolish the caste system that prevails in the Society?" He then shouted, "Ego dico ABOLENDAM EST ista distinctio graduum," and applause followed. WL, XCVIII, 1 (Winter, 1969), September 17, 1966. Earlier, in the first session, a not untypical remark along the same line was "The distinction smacks of aristocracy and has become entirely useless." WL, "Letters," XCVI, 2 (Spring, 1967), July 5, 1965.
- 203 GC XXXI, P 11.
- 204 GC XXXI, P 12.

- 205 GC XXXI, P 13.
- 206 GC XXXI, P 14.
- 207 GC XXXI, P 15.
- 208 *WL*, Ganss, XCIV, 4 (Fall, 1965), p. 390.
- 209 GC XXXI, P 16.
- 210 GC XXXI, 11.
- 211 GC XXXI, P 17.
- 212 GC XXXI, P 18, 1.
- 213 GC XXXI, 14.
- 214 GC XXXI, P 18, 2.
- 215 GC XXXI, P 18, 3.
- 216 GC XXXI, P 18, 4.
- 217 GC XXXI, P 18, 5.
- 218 GC XXXI, 18, 14. See also the perceptive footnote 4 in Ganss' edition of the *Constitutions*, p. 252. As he well remarks, "the matter covered by the promise is determined juridically not by what Ignatius meant but by the authority of a general congregation."
- 219 *WL*, "Letters," XCVI, 2 (Spring, 1967), July 5, 1965.
- 220 *Ibid.*, July 7, 1965.
- 221 *Ibid.*, P. 165, July 5, 1965.
- 222 *Ibid.*, July 12, 1965.
- 223 GC XXXI, P 18, 6.
- 224 See Document 3, *Appendix, Acta Romana*, "Acta Congregationis Generalis XXXI," pp. 1006-07.
- 225 GC XXXI, P 18, 7.
- 226 GC XXXI, P 18, 8.
- 227 "The Formula of the Institute of the Society of Jesus," [3], in *Cons SJIntComm*, p. 66.
- 228 GC XXXI, P 20.
- 229 GC XXXI, P 21.
- 230 GC XXXI, P 22.
- 231 GC XXXI, P 21.
- 232 GC XXXI, P 22.
- 233 "The First Session" *WL*, XCV, 1 (Winter, 1967), pp. 59-60.
- 234 GC XXXI, P 23; and dispositive decree 27, section 10.

- 235 GC XXI, P 24. The many amendments to this decree demonstrated the wisdom of the procedural changes for the second session allowing for the introduction of amendments.
- 236 *Collectio Decretorum*, 141; GC XXV, 12, 3.
- 237 GC XXXI, 29. From the archives came an *Ordination on Training Mathematics Teachers* by Father (Saint) Robert Bellarmine, promulgated in 1539 by Aquaviva (Archivum Romanum Societatis Jesu, *Epp*, NN 113, fol. 184).
- 238 GC XXXI, P 29, 1.
- 239 GC XXXI P 25-26. The decree on the arts has surely entered into the success of the recent Jesuit Institutes on the Arts, started by American Jesuits and held now for four summers for Jesuit participants from whatever lands they can come from.
- 240 GC XXXI, P 27.
- 241 GC XXXI, P 28.
- 242 GC XXXI, P 29.
- 243 GC XXXI, P 30.
- 244 GC XXXI, P 31, 1.
- 245 GC XXXI, P 31, 2.
- 246 Ibid.
- 247 GC XXXI, P 31, 3.
- 248 GC XXXI, *Acta*, Doc. 4.
- 249 *WL*, "The First Session" XCV, 1 (Winter, 1967), p. 26.
- 250 GC XXXI, P 32.
- 251 *WL*, "Letters" XCVI, 2 (Spring, 1967), July 8, 1965. For instance, in New England in 1965, those professed in 1939, twenty-six years earlier and more than forty years in the Society, were still too young in the Society to attend the provincial congregation. In New York, the youngest man in the provincial congregation had professed his vows in 1940, a quarter of a century earlier. One delegate cried out that we should "stop glorifying the wisdom of old men," and reminded the delegates that when it came to Susanna and the elders her champion was a young man while everyone knew what the elders were like.
- 252 GC XXXI, P 33.
- 253 GC XXXI, P 35, 1.
- 254 Ibid. This is the point where the numbering of the decrees begins to differ by one in the English and the later official Latin. The English did not count the matter on visits by the general as a separate decree; the *Acta* did. We shall follow the *Acta*, by adding one to each number of the English up to Decree 48 of the Latin. After that the difficulty ceases.
- 255 GC XXXI, P 44, 1.

- 256 GC XXXI, P 35, 2, 35, 3, and 35, 4.
- 257 GC XXXI, P 35, 6. One postulatam asked the Society to "bring to their senses all those disturbers. . . . Let them name visitors to travel through the provinces and throw out these undesirable elements." *WL*, "Letters" XCVI, 2 (Spring, 1967), July 8, 1965.
- 258 GC XXXI, P 37, 1.
- 259 GC XXXI, P 37, 3.
- 260 GC XXXI, P 37, 4.
- 261 GC XXXI, P 38. In the discussion on the ceremonies of election (e.g., the genuflection before the general after his election) it became clear that the delegates did not and could not know either the circumstances of future elections or, especially, how liturgical law was to be changed as a result of Vatican II. So, the vicar-general was to determine these details for the next time in which they were to be necessary.
- 262 GC XXXI, P 39. In the Latin text of the *Acta* there are four decrees, 49 to 52, not numbered nor included in the English text. Decree 49 deals with setting up the second session; decree 50 and 51 with specific changes in the various formulae of general and province congregations in accord with the decrees of this present congregation; decree 53 concerns itself with "perfecting the formulae of congregations."
- 263 GC XXXI, P 40.
- 264 GC XXXI, P 41.
- 265 GC XXXI, P 42.
- 266 A long congregation indeed, but despite the common impression, not the longest--by four days. That somewhat dubious honor goes to Congregation VIII with its 145 days in one continuous session through the cold of a Roman winter and the glories of a Roman spring from November, 1645, to April, 1646.
- 267 Useful reflections on all these items are found in Ladislav Orsy, S.J., "Some Questions about the Purpose and Scope of the General Congregation," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, IV (June, 1972), 85-113, esp. pp. 88, 99, 101, 103, 113.
- 268 GC XXXI, 1, 1.
- 269 GC XXXI, 1, 5.
- 270 *Ibid.*

Abbreviations

- ActRSJ*—*Acta Romana Societatis Iesu*
AHSJ—*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*
Colla—*Collectio decretorum Congregationum Generalium Societatis Iesu* [XXVII-XXX (1923-1957)]. Rome, 1961
Cons—*The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*
ConsSJIntComm—*The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*. Translated, with an Introduction and a Commentary, by G. E. Ganss, S.J.
DeGuiJes—DeGuibert, *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*
EppIgn—*S. Ignatii Epistolae*. See s.v. MHSJ
InstSJ—*Institutum Societatis Iesu*. 3 vols. Florence, 1892-1893
MHSJ—MONUMENTA HISTORICA SOCIETATIS JESU, the Historical Records or Sources of the Society of Jesus in critically edited texts.
This scholarly series, which now contains 100 volumes, was begun in Madrid in 1894. The project was transferred to Rome in 1929. Most of the manuscripts on which these volumes are based are in the Archives of the Society of Jesus in Rome. The series is being continued by its publisher, the *Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, Via dei Penitenzieri 20, 00193 Rome, Italy.
- MI—Monumenta Ignatiana. The writings of St. Ignatius of Loyola.
EppIgn—*S. Ignatii...Epistolae et Instructiones*. [Edd. M. Lecina, V. Agusti, F. Cervós, D. Restrepo.] 12 vols., Madrid, 1903-1911. The letters and instructions of St. Ignatius.
- MonNad*—*Epistolae P. Hieronymi Nadal*. 6 vols. Vols. I-IV, ed. F. Cervós, 1898-1905. Vols. V, *Commentarii de Instituti S.I.*, 1962, and VI, *Orationis observationes*, 1964, ed. M. Nicolau. Letters and instructions of Ignatius' companion, Jerónimo Nadal.
- RAM*—*Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*
RazFe—*Razón y Fe*
WL—*Woodstock Letters*

Editor's Note about an Index

An alphabetical INDEX to the present work would obviously be highly desirable. But to prepare one would require much time. In present circumstances early appearance of this study seems more important.

However, other indices exist which give at least some help toward use of the present work:

(1) For General Congregations I through XXIV, one can use the extensive index in Volume III, pages 553-739, of *Institutum Societatis Iesu* (Florence, 1893). Suppose, for example, that someone wants information on "the substantialials of the Institute." This index, under "substantialials," informs him that they were treated in Congregations I, IV, V, VI, and VII; and then he can see what the present study of Father Padberg states about them under the respective headings of those congregations.

(2) For General Congregations XXV through XXXI, help can be gained from the indices to *Acta Romana Societatis Iesu*, Volumes II (1915-1918) and later, to the end of General Congregation XXXI.

THE INSTITUTE OF JESUIT SOURCES *announces*

CONTEMPORARY TRENDS
 IN
 STUDIES ON THE CONSTITUTIONS
 OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS
 ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ORIENTATIONS

by

IGNACIO IPARRAGUIRRE, S.J.

Translated by

DANIEL F. X. MEENAN, S.J.

* * * * *

Very Reverend Father General Pedro Arrupe, S.J.

on

THE STUDY OF THE CONSTITUTIONS

as a

Preparation for General Congregation XXXII

"Before all else, this whole year of immediate preparation for the General Congregation should be a time given to the reading and study of the Constitutions. All should strive to know them in depth. These should be the principal subject of our reflection and prayer. The Provincials should strive to make available experts in the Constitutions, as well as other appropriate means, to help all to an intelligent and fruitful reading of them, and to a deep assimilation of their essential parts. This renewed knowledge of the Constitutions will help greatly to prepare true deliberations and decisions in the Congregations, Provincial and General, and particularly to foster a genuinely Ignatian spirit in the whole Society."

This is from his letter of September 8, 1973, convoking General Congregation XXXII for December 1, 1974

CONTENTS (abbreviated)

PART I. EDITIONS

- A. Bibliography (entry number 1)
- D. Sources and Composition (nos. 11-12)

PART II. GENERAL COMMENTARIES

- A. In the Society before the Suppression (nos. 13-22)
- B. In the Restored Society (nos. 23-33)

PART III. MODERN STUDIES OF GENERAL ASPECTS (nos. 34-38)

PART IV. STUDIES ON PARTICULAR TOPICS

- A. Principles of Interpretation for the Constitutions (nos. 49-50)
- C. The End of the Society (nos. 54-56)
- F. Apostolic Activity (nos. 59-60)
- L. Communitarian Discernment and Deliberation (nos. 77-83)
- Q. Prayer (nos. 94-95)
- R. The Vows (nos. 96-124)

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS

* * * * *

PAPERBACK. Price: \$1.60 a copy

PAGES: approximately 75

AVAILABLE: approximately March 25, 1974. Orders are acceptable now.

* * * * *

ORDER FORM

The Institute of Jesuit Sources
 St. Louis University, Fusz Memorial
 3700 West Pine Blvd.
 St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Gentlemen:

As soon as this book becomes available, please send me _____
 copies of Ignacio Iparraguirre—Daniel F. X. Meenan, S.J., *Contemporary
 Trends in Studies on the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus: Anno-
 tated Bibliographical Orientations*, at \$1.60 per copy.

 Please PRINT your name here

 Address

 City

 State

 ZIP CODE

The Numbers Published So Far Are These:

- Vol. I, no. 1 (September, 1969). John R. Sheets, S.J. A Profile of the Contemporary Jesuit: His Challenges and Opportunities.
- I, no. 2 (November, 1969). George E. Ganss, S.J. The Authentic Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: Some Facts of History and Terminology Basic to Their Functional Efficacy Today.
- Vol. II, no. 1 (February, 1970). William J. Burke, S.J. Institution and Person.
- II, no. 2 (April, 1970). John Carroll Futrell, S.J. Ignatian Discernment.
- II, no. 3 (September, 1970). Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J. The Response of the Jesuit, as Priest and Apostle, in the Modern World.
- Vol. III, no. 1 (February, 1971). John H. Wright, S.J. The Grace of Our Founder and the Grace of Our Vocation.
- III, no. 2 (April, 1971). Vincent J. O'Flaherty, S.J. Some Reflections on the Jesuit Commitment.
- III, no. 3 (June, 1971). Thomas E. Clarke, S.J. Jesuit Commitment--Fraternal Covenant? John C. Haughey, S.J. A New Perspective on Religious Commitment.
- III, no. 4 (September, 1971). Jules J. Toner, S.J. A Method for Communal Discernment of God's Will.
- III, no. 5 (November, 1971). John R. Sheets, S.J. Toward a Theology of the Religious Life. A Sketch, with Particular Reference to the Society of Jesus.
- Vol. IV, no. 1 (January, 1972). David B. Knight, S.J. Saint Ignatius' Ideal of Poverty.
- IV, no. 2 (March, 1972). Two Discussions: (1) Spiritual Direction. (2) Leadership and Authority.
- IV, no. 3 (June, 1972). Ladislav Orsy, S.J. Some Questions about the Purpose and Scope of the General Congregation.
- IV, no. 4 (October, 1972). On Continuity and Change. A Symposium, by Fathers Ganss, Wright, O'Malley, O'Donovan, and Dulles.
- IV, no. 5 (November, 1972). John Carroll Futrell, S.J. Communal Discernment: Reflections on Experience.
- Vol. V, nos. 1 and 2 (January and March, 1973). Vincent J. O'Flaherty, S.J. Renewal: Call and Response.
- V, no. 3 (April, 1973). The Place of Art in Jesuit Life. Very Rev. Pedro Arrupe, S.J., and Clement J. McNaspy, S.J.
- V, no. 4 (June, 1973). John C. Haughey, S.J. The Pentecostal Thing and Jesuits.
- V, no. 5 (October, 1973). Ladislav Orsy, S.J. Toward a Theological Evaluation of Communal Discernment.
- Vol. VI, no. 1 (January, 1974). John W. Padberg, S.J. The General Congregations of the Society of Jesus: A Brief Survey of Their History.



THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, FUSZ MEMORIAL
3700 WEST PINE BLVD.

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63108
Assistancy Seminar: (314) 652-5737
Fusz Memorial: (314) 652-3700

PRICES AND SUBSCRIPTIONS

Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits, as the masthead inside the front cover explains in greater detail, is published by this Seminar. From the nature of the case these studies are focused on Jesuit problems and interests. But others who find these essays interesting or helpful are cordially welcome to read them.

Presently the PRICE is 25 cents per copy, plus the mailing costs.

SUBSCRIPTIONS will be accepted for the issues of one academic year. The number of issues each year cannot be stated definitely now, but probably it will be five. These subscriptions must run from each November through the following October, because changes in our mailing list can be made only once a year. Subscriptions must be paid in advance, at \$1.65 inside the United States and \$1.85 outside.

TO THOSE WHO DESIRE TO SUBSCRIBE:

It will greatly facilitate our office work if you use the form below.

----- Cut off here -----

American Assistancy Seminar
Fusz Memorial
3700 West Pine Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Dear Father:

For the enclosed \$_____, please add the following name to your list of subscribers for Volume VI, from November 1973 through October 1974. I understand that any numbers of this Volume VI which appeared before the date of my subscription will be mailed to me.

PRINT your name here

Address

City

State

ZIP CODE

The American Assistency Seminar
Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University
3700 West Pine Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Non-Profit Organization
U. S. POSTAGE

PAID

St. Louis, Mo.
Permit No. 134

Rev. John J. McEleney, S.J.
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

