

STUDIES

in the Spirituality of Jesuits



The Fourth Vow in Its Ignatian Context
A Historical Study
by
John W. O'Malley, 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. XV

January, 1983

No. 1

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:

- Joseph A. Appleyard, S.J., Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts
02167. 617-969-0100
- Gregory I. Carlson, S.J., Champion House, 518 North 19th St., Omaha, Nebraska
68102. 402-341-2408
- Philip C. Fischer, S.J., Secretary of the Assistancy Seminar, Fusz Memorial,
3700 West Pine Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri 63108. 314-652-3700
- George E. Ganss, S.J., 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. 314-652-5737
- Howard J. Gray, S.J., Weston School of Theology, 3 Phillips Place, Cambridge,
Massachusetts 02138. 617-492-1960
- Gerald R. Grosh, S.J., Loyola University, 6525 N. Sheridan Road, Chicago,
Illinois 60626. 312-274-3000
- Robert J. Henle, S.J., St. Louis University, 221 North Grand Blvd., St. Louis,
Missouri 63103. 314-658-3067
- E. Edward Kinerk, S.J., Jesuit Novitiate, 1901 Eudora St., Denver, Colorado
80220. 303-320-6297
- John W. O'Malley, S.J., Weston School of Theology, 3 Phillips Place, Cam-
bridge, Massachusetts 02138. 617-492-1960
- William C. Spohn, S.J., University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, California
95053. 408-984-4256
- Joseph A. Tetlow, S.J., Jesuit House of Studies, 6318 Freret Street, New Or-
leans, Louisiana 70118. 504-865-2725

Copyright, 1983, by The American Assistancy Seminar
Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University
3700 West Pine Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

STUDIES

in the Spirituality of Jesuits



The Fourth Vow in Its Ignatian Context
A Historical Study
by
John W. O'Malley, 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PART I. St. Ignatius and Doctrine	8
PART II. St. Ignatius and Orthodoxy	14
PART III. St. Ignatius and the Church	21
PART IV. St. Ignatius and the Fourth Vow	33
CONCLUSIONS	43
APPENDIX: Early and Official Texts Pertinent to the Fourth Vow	46
ABBREVIATIONS Used in the Appendix and Footnotes	50
Footnotes	50
CHECK LISTS: The Publications of the INSTITUTE OF JESUIT SOURCES and of the AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR	60 61

THE FOURTH VOW IN ITS IGNATIAN CONTEXT

A HISTORICAL STUDY

by

John W. O'Malley, S.J.
Weston School of Theology
3 Phillips Place
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

INTRODUCTION

The text of the vows which the professed members of the Society of Jesus are permitted to take reads thus:

*I, N, make profession, and I promise to Almighty God
. . . poverty, chastity, and obedience; . . .*

*I further promise a special obedience to the
sovereign pontiff in regard to the missions, according
to the same apostolic letters and the Constitutions.*

The Formula of the Vows, in the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, [527]

Jesuit interest in this "fourth vow" of special obedience to the pope has perhaps never been livelier. The desire of the 32nd General Congregation, 1975-1976, to extend the vow to all formed members of the Society and the refusal of the Holy See to acquiesce in this change focused attention on the vow in a new way and prompted some discussion in the secular press. Even non-Jesuits now often want to know what the vow means and how it functions. The most specific and urgent question raised in the past few years is how the vow relates to the papal magisterium. Does the vow obligate Jesuits to an adherence to that magisterium that is different from that of other Catholics, especially Catholic theologians, and is "special" to the members of the Society? That question, we must note right off, is asked regarding an *obligation* imposed by the *vow*.

In this issue of *Studies*, I want to examine the fourth vow by locating it in its historical context. The first step in such a study is an examination of the most pertinent and authoritative documents of the Society concerning the vow. To aid the reader toward this end I have provided in the Appendix (pp. 46-49 below) the relevant texts from the papal bulls *Regimini militantis ecclesiae* (1540) and *Exposcit debitum* (1550), the formula of the

vows of the first Jesuits (Rome, 1541), and relevant excerpts from the *Constitutions and Declarations*.

The second step, preliminary to a thorough examination of the Ignatian context in which the vow came into being, is a clarification of the state of the question. When the documents in the Appendix are analyzed and then synthesized into a composite statement of ideas that derive--in whole or in part, directly or indirectly--from St. Ignatius, two obligations of the vow emerge: (1) to go wherever sent by the popes, (2) to do whatever they order that pertains to the progress of souls and the propagation of the faith. It is around that second obligation that discussion swirls today.

From a historical viewpoint, the state of the question can be formulated thus: What did St. Ignatius and his first companions hope to accomplish for themselves and others by the vow? By formulating the question this way we are in a position to study the vow not as an abstraction divorced from time and place, and therefore susceptible of an almost infinite variety of interpretations, but as a historical reality consonant with the particular vision the first Jesuits had of the Society and its mission in the Church. Only thus is it possible to reduce the phrase "whatever they order" (*quidquid jusserint*) to some finite and manageable dimensions and begin to remove it from the realm of idiosyncratic speculation. This is the task I hope to accomplish and the method I intend to employ in the pages that follow. I do not pretend to answer all possible questions that might be raised about the vow, especially those of a canonical character, but I believe that the application of a rigorous historical method to the origins of the vow is the first and indispensable step to understanding it.

The vow must be placed, therefore, in the large context of Ignatius' thought on doctrine, orthodoxy, and Church. It must also be placed in the even larger context of the theological cultures of his day and our own. Recent literature about the vow must be reviewed as well. After these arduous tasks are completed, the way is cleared to understand the relevance of the vow for us today and to appropriate it in a correct way.

The most impressive studies on the fourth vow to date are by two German Jesuits--Burkhard Schneider and Johannes Günter Gerhartz. Unfortunately, none of their works has been translated into English, and they therefore remain inaccessible to many Jesuits. It is significant that neither author raises the question of any doctrinal implications of the

vow; that question is a quite recent development.

The several pieces by Schneider, published in the 1950's and early 1960's, are historical in their methodology.¹ Schneider proposes a bold thesis: The vow of special obedience to the pope is "the principle and foundation" of the Society. In Ignatius' view, that vow was the first and fundamental one, with the traditional vow of obedience to the general of the order subsidiary to it. The vow of obedience to the pope gives the order its character. Schneider bases these conclusions of his on a number of texts but especially those emanating from Ignatius and his companions that deal with their vows at Montmartre in 1534 and their first years in Rome, 1538-1540 (see Appendix, pp. 46-49 below).

In his book in 1966 Gerhartz approached the vow as a canonist and studied it as one example of the many special vows taken by members of different religious orders, for example, the vows of knightly orders to aid pilgrims to the Holy Land, or the vows of some nursing orders to care for the sick.² It may come as a surprise to some Jesuits to learn that other orders profess a special obedience to the pope that is similar to ours. The Franciscans and the Order of the Holy Spirit in Sassia provide in the early thirteenth century the first models for a direct relationship of orders to the Holy See. Others followed.³ Although the Theatines, founded in 1524 just fifteen years before the Society, do not take a formal vow to that effect, their constitutions bind them to serve God and lead the clerical life "under immediate subjection to and the special protection of the Supreme Pontiff and Apostolic See." Inasmuch as the origins of the Jesuit vow go back to Montmartre, Gerhartz thinks it highly unlikely that the early Jesuits had heard of the Theatine constitutions by that time. There was ample opportunity, however, for them to have been informed about those constitutions in Venice and in Rome, and they could have exercised some influence upon them at that time.

A large body of literature exists today that treats of Ignatius' thoughts on doctrine, orthodoxy, and the Church, and that has some bearing on the vow. This literature often takes the "Rules for Thinking with the Church" as its springboard. An issue of *Studies* was dedicated to this topic in 1975;⁴ and in 1980 the Centrum Ignatianum Spiritualitatis in the Jesuit Curia at Rome published a volume entitled *Sentire con la Chiesa*, a collection of articles in Italian by Mario Fois, Candido de Dalmases, Luis

González, Félix Pastor, Gerald O'Collins, and Paolo Dezza.⁵

There have been other studies besides those already mentioned dealing directly with the fourth vow, listed in Polgár's new bibliography, #2586-2601.⁶ The most prolific author specifically on the subject in the last five years, however, has been the Spanish Jesuit, José García de Madariaga. His articles in *Manresa* derive from his doctoral dissertation at the Gregorian University, 1975, "Carisma fundacional de Ignacio de Loyola y obediencia especial al papa en la Compañía de Jesús." The most pertinent of these articles has recently been translated into English and published in *Review for Religious*.⁷ Madariaga's thesis relating to our question is clear: ". . . matter which is doctrinal can indeed form part of the proper object of the Fourth Vow; and . . . therefore the pope can impose an order which is strictly or purely doctrinal in virtue of that Vow."⁸ This thesis is based on wide-ranging research in Jesuit sources and gathers pertinent texts to support it. I am not convinced, however, that the correct inferences are always drawn from the evidence or that the evidence is itself properly used, as I shall later attempt to show.

In this issue of *Studies* I do not intend, in any case, to deal with whether or not the vow has a relationship to doctrine in the broad sense that when Jesuits are sent on missions they are expected to teach and preach the Catholic faith. At times that seems to be Madariaga's point, and I simply take that for granted and find its alternative incomprehensible. I am asking, rather, as I stated above, whether the pope can command adherence to some specific teaching--even more specifically, some *papal* teaching--by virtue of the vow. In answering that question I arrive at conclusions quite different from those seemingly drawn by Madariaga.

All this is not to deny the special relationship of the Society to the papacy or its commitment to doctrinal orthodoxy. Those are certainly constitutive elements of our tradition. But here we are dealing with much more particular and technical questions involving juridical obligations of the highest import. In such matters it is important to be clear and precise; I shall strive to be both.

Before embarking on this task, however, I want to say a word about the historiography on St. Ignatius and the early Society. What struck me as I reviewed this literature was how dominated it is by Jesuit authors. This is perhaps only to be expected, and there is no denying that Jesuits have

advantages in this area of research that outsiders lack. Nonetheless, it is curious that St. Ignatius has not attracted many scholars from outside the Jesuit circle. This phenomenon is part and parcel of the general neglect of the Counter Reformation by historians to which I called attention in an earlier number of *Studies*.⁹ The result for Ignatius is regrettable for a number of reasons, but especially because it means that there has been little dialogue about Ignatius with authors who approach the saint from a different perspective than we Jesuits are inclined to have.

Jesuit scholarship is sometimes still influenced by hagiographical and apologetic aims. While making use of critical methodologies, that scholarship often falls short of the critical judgment that makes for a balanced portrait.¹⁰ This feature of our approach to Ignatius has two major sources. First of all, there is a natural disinclination to be openly critical of the founder of our order. It seems almost indecent to point out limitations in somebody who has given such shape to our lives and who is also revered as a saint. This reverence sometimes manifests itself even in attempts to defend all the actions of the saint and to see them as normative for the present.

A graphic illustration of this tendency occurs in both Madariaga's and Tacchi-Venturi's encomia of Ignatius for effecting the revival in his own day of Constitution 22, *Cum infirmitas*, of the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215.¹¹ According to that decree, doctors were not allowed to treat patients who refused to see a priest and go to confession. It is quite possible to admire the zeal for the eternal salvation of the sick that underlay Ignatius' successful efforts to have the decree reaffirmed, while at the same time questioning the wisdom of the decree itself. It is that distinction that Madariaga and Tacchi-Venturi fail to make. The decree, in any case, seems to have proved impossible to enforce.

A second source for the difficulty lies in the historical documents themselves. Most of the documents contemporary with Ignatius that deal with him are themselves encomiastic. This is professedly true, for instance, of Laínez' long *Epistola de S. Ignatio*, 1547. Laínez relates his story for the "edification" of his readers.¹² This same tendency permeates even the official correspondence of the early Jesuits. St. Ignatius repeatedly enjoined upon them that they were to write their letters with a view to edification, so that they might be shown to others outside the Society to

win or maintain their support.¹³ If these letters sometimes read like a series of victory bulletins, we need not suppose that there were not a number of defeats and defects as well simply because few are mentioned. The accomplishment of St. Ignatius and the first generation of Jesuits was indeed astounding. As one reads Ignatius' letters, one cannot but be impressed with the rapidity with which the Society achieved a mature organization and successfully undertook so many and such strenuous tasks. Nonetheless, the early Jesuits were human beings too, limited by their own culture and their not infinite powers and wisdom. The documents can, however, lull us into forgetting these realities.

Another problem with the Jesuit literature on Ignatius is that many of the standard works on him were done in the first half of this century. The parts of the *Monumenta* dealing with Ignatius were published just as the century began, thus providing scholars with a systematic access to the sources. It is no accident that the most fundamental studies and biographies were done or conceived shortly thereafter. I am thinking of the writings of Leturia, Dudon, Brodrick, Tacchi-Venturi, and, for Francis Xavier, of Schurhammer.

In some ways these studies will never be replaced or substantially improved upon because they marshal the major evidence for their subject for the first time with the use of critical instruments of scholarship. Nonetheless, they now often sound dated and clearly suffer, as all historical research does, from the limitations of the culture in which the authors wrote. In politics it was a time when fascism was in vogue on the continent and when in some sectors of the Catholic world nostalgia for monarchy was by no means altogether dissipated. Moreover, within the Church the authoritarian aspects of its polity were more emphasized and more uncritically admired than they are today. Catholic ecclesiology, too, had reached the culmination of a long development that, beginning with the Gregorian Reform of the eleventh century and brought to its height in the first half of the twentieth, increasingly identified Church with clergy, hierarchy, and especially papacy.¹⁴ "Triumphalism" is perhaps an unkind and even unfair way to describe the atmosphere in which many of these studies were produced, but the least that can be said is that there was little sympathy for our Protestant brethren and no suggestion that the path on which the Counter Reformation set the Church might deserve some reconsideration.¹⁵

The atmosphere has changed since the end of World War II and the summoning of Vatican Council II. We today perforce approach the documents with different questions and with a different mind-set. Moreover, new historiographical developments force us to examine our origins in a different light. For one thing, we now possess Hubert Jedin's massive history of the Council of Trent, completed in 1975, and the works of other scholars influenced by Jedin that deal with all aspects of "the Tridentine era." Ignatius and his first companions now have to be set in this context that we know for the first time in such rich detail.¹⁶

The many excellent studies in recent years on the Renaissance, and especially on Erasmus and Italian Humanism, are particularly relevant to this context. Whatever the accomplishments of the early Jesuits, we now know that they did not save the Church from "Renaissance paganism" because no such thing existed. The antipathy of Jesuit authors like Brodrick, Tacchi-Venturi, and most others to Erasmus sometimes surpasses that of the early Jesuits themselves, and they scold Erasmus almost as severely as they do the Protestant heretics. In the light of the researches of the past twenty years, Erasmus has emerged vindicated on many issues. Among other things, he voiced an intelligent concern for moderation in an age that was fast propelling itself into ugly bigotry and fratricidal excess. Scholars now recognize in Erasmus one of the great theologians of his age, who so towered above his contemporaries in his erudition and methodological presuppositions that they could not appreciate him. As a result, the discomfort that Ignatius seems to have felt with Erasmus must be re-evaluated and can no longer be justified as a perspicacious assessment of a man who was unorthodox, uncommitted, and fundamentally misguided.

Some recent studies on Ignatius, it is true, have avoided some of these pitfalls. I think especially of the book by Raymond Schwager, a Swiss Jesuit, *Das dramatische Kirchenverständnis bei Ignatius von Loyola*.¹⁷ This is not a perfect book, and reviewers have pointed out its weaknesses.¹⁸ Nonetheless, Schwager must be congratulated on a serious study that is willing to apply critical judgment to Ignatius and to the *Exercises*, and not simply to ratify everything Ignatius said, wrote, or did. We need more studies like his if we are to understand our origins for what they were and get the help we need in discerning what might be perennially authentic in our heritage. I hope that this issue of *Studies* will be a modest contribution along that line.

PART I. ST. IGNATIUS AND DOCTRINE

In a famous instruction at Alcalá in 1561 on the plan of studies in the Society, Jerónimo Nadal referred to St. Ignatius as "our father, the theologian."¹⁹ Hugo Rahner employed this statement as the fundamental premise of his *Ignatius the Theologian*, first published in German in 1964.²⁰ Rahner supports Nadal's description by adding the assessment of Ignatius by Martial Mazurier, "a learned Doctor of the Sorbonne" during Ignatius' years of study in Paris. Mazurier affirmed that he had never heard any man speak of theological matters with such mastery and power.²¹ Rahner constructs his book on the thesis that Ignatius was indeed a profound theologian; he establishes his position with a number of persuasive arguments bearing on the theological perceptions that grew out of Ignatius' mystical experiences.

In a recent issue of *Studies*, Avery Dulles has meanwhile observed that the answer to the question "Is there an Ignatian theology?" will depend on what one considers theology to be.²² Dulles' observation can be reformulated to state that the answer to the question "Was Ignatius a theologian?" will depend almost entirely on the same considerations. Dulles proposes his own position on this question with clarity: Ignatius was "not a professional theologian" in the accepted sense of that term today. But Dulles does then illustrate the theological vision or "horizon" that was a controlling factor in Ignatius' life and writings, thus vindicating a sense in which the title theologian can be attributed to Ignatius.

If one postulates that theology should be ordered as directly as possible to the spiritual good of the People of God, one has good grounds for suspecting that there is a theological depth to Ignatius that some other understanding of the theological enterprise will not yield. One motif that runs through his life, supported by almost every source about him that we possess, is that he was passionately devoted to "the good of souls." He promoted this good by presenting to people "the things of God"--in preaching, in lectures on Scripture and cases of conscience, in directing them in the Spiritual Exercises, and as Thomas Clancy has pointed out, in "spiritual conversation" on an informal basis.²³

Although the early Jesuits diligently urged frequent reception of the sacraments of the Eucharist and penance, and saw in a reception of those sacraments a palpable sign of the effectiveness of their labors "for the good

of souls," the most striking pattern in the works of the early Society can be described as "the ministry of the word." The phrase occurs prominently in the crucial opening lines of the papal bull *Exposcit debitum* (1550) and was frequently on the lips of the early Jesuits themselves.²⁴ Nadal indicates the decidedly Pauline inspiration for this ministry in a wonderfully suggestive statement about it,²⁵ and he has left us an important exhortation describing in detail the various forms it took in the early Society.²⁶

At this point we confront the major problem in any discussion of St. Ignatius and the teaching of the Church. Ignatius himself, and the sources that deal with him, are all somewhat vague in indicating specific doctrines for the "ministry of the word" that concerned him. Moreover, both the *Constitutions* and his correspondence were influenced by the views of Polanco, so that caution is needed even in attributing to Ignatius the few hints that these documents provide.

This lacuna is important. We possess an abundance of sources on Ignatius. Yet those sources tell us practically nothing about his ideas on the doctrinal issues that were of consuming urgency to his contemporaries. If we compare him with the contemporary with whom he is most often paired, Martin Luther, the contrast is dramatic. Luther also wanted to help others through the ministry of the word. Yet Luther tolerated no vagueness whatsoever about what that word was--the doctrine of justification by faith alone. That is at the heart of all his writings, and he is incomprehensible as a historical figure without it. The same is not true at all of Ignatius. Here is the problem, even the enigma.

Is it too much to state that Ignatius had no real interest in doctrine or theology in the conventional sense of those terms today? A strong case can be made for that position. We know that he undertook his theological studies largely out of the conviction that they would provide him with the professional credentials he needed to carry out a ministry of the word already begun. He experienced considerable harassment in his early ministry precisely because he was unlettered in theology. Although we must assume that some intrinsic appreciation for theology helped sustain him during his arduous efforts to obtain an education and later underlay his concern that members of the Society receive a superior academic training, he nowhere indicates what impact his own education at the University of Paris had on him. Not from his pen do we learn who some of his teachers might have been at Paris,

and we must rely on speculation as to why he transferred from the Collège de Montaigu to the Collège Sainte-Barbe.

When Ignatius arrived in Rome with Salmerón and Favre, the latter two were almost immediately assigned by the pope to teach theology at the Sapienza, the University of Rome. Ignatius did not participate in this undertaking but, rather, devoted his time to giving the Spiritual Exercises.²⁷ This bifurcation of ministry is significant, and is another indication of where Ignatius' real interests and competence lay--and where they did not.

Except for a single so-called sermon, or compendium of sermons, on "Christian doctrine," no other example of Ignatius' preaching has come down to us.²⁸ For our ideas about the content of his preaching, we should not make too much of one document, which probably in any case was more of a catechetical instruction than a sermon in the conventional sense. Nonetheless, it is the only such document we possess from him. It was probably constructed merely as a directive on how to go to confession, and the first part of it does in fact deal with what is required for the reception of that sacrament. Ignatius then goes on to deal with the Ten Commandments, the six precepts of the Church, the five senses, and the spiritual and corporal works of mercy. The document is, in its entirety, gentle and understated, but quite moralistic. This "sermon on Christian doctrine" does not deal with "doctrine" in our usual understanding of that term as referring to dogma or dogmatic theology, but with the "doctrine" of sin and virtue. In more elevated language (quite unlike the catechetical language of the document itself), it deals with the doctrine of the soul's conversion to God and the life of virtue that follows thereupon. Ignatius, we know, counseled one of his subjects that he should study those parts of Aquinas' *Summa* (or a compendium of them) that deal with the virtues and sacraments and that he could well afford to slight the rest.²⁹

Ignatius' correspondence is filled with information about the preaching activity of the early Jesuits and obviously demonstrates a keen desire on his part to promote it wherever a house of the Society was established. What is missing, again, is clear evidence about *what* the Jesuits preached, or what Ignatius thought they should preach. A notable exception to this generalization is his instruction to Jesuits in Portugal to avoid in their sermons "doubtful matters," and, instead, to "correct vices and sins."³⁰

He at times showed concern that "the errors of the heretics" be refuted

and sometimes proposed harsh measures against them, but except for the heretics' rejection of the papacy, he does not tell us what their errors might be. We know from the famous incident of the Lutheranizing preacher in Rome in 1538, as well as from similar cases, that he, or his companions, were not indifferent to the doctrinal controversies of their day over grace, faith, free will, and predestination, but his direct statements on these issues in the "Rules for Thinking with the Church" are quite general and are framed for pastoral practice rather than dogmatic precision.³¹ Indeed, aside from these "Rules," we find precious little in his writings that indicates even the areas in which the Protestant errors lay. From his correspondence it would be easy to reconstruct substantial pictures of education in the early Society, of Ignatius' style of government, and of his stance on a whole range of ascetical and spiritual topics. It would be impossible, however, to derive more than a few clues about his specific positions on the dogmatic issues of the day from those seven thousand letters collected in twelve volumes of the *Monumenta*.³²

Thus we return to our starting point. Ignatius conceived doctrine almost entirely with a view to pastoral effectiveness. Doctrine was to be presented in a way that brings the individual or congregation closer to "our Creator and Lord." That was what the Society was all about, and that was what its ministries were all about. That is, above all, the dynamism at work in the *Exercises*.

When we ask what is meant by pastoral effectiveness, we surface some typically Ignatian ideas about certain attitudinal and affective changes that lead to an ordering or reformation of life, a reform supported by the preaching and sacraments of the Church and expressed by one's frequenting of them. "Ordering" or "reformation" of life is the stated purpose of the *Exercises* ([21, 189]). The behavioral and attitudinal components emerge much stronger in this "horizon" than do more strictly dogmatic issues. This fact helps account for the flexibility and undefined character of the Jesuit theological tradition through the ages to which Avery Dulles has called attention: "The Ignatian paradigm, while it gives a basic horizon, does not dictate any particular set of theological theses. A variety of competing theologies, bound together by a loose family resemblance, can all legitimately claim, in one way or another, to be Ignatian."³³

Ignatius frequently instructed members of the order to preach by both

their words and their example.³⁴ This coupling of word and deed is something of a commonplace in the Christian tradition and was notably revived in Ignatius' own day by the humanists. But it seems to have a special significance for Ignatius in that he so consistently joins the two as almost to equate them. "Example" is a message to the affections and noble aspirations of men rather than directly to their minds, as the humanists never tired of saying, and it looks to behavior as well. Noble affections, aspirations, and behavior were what inspired Ignatius all his life, and were the objectives that he expected all "ministry of the word" to have.

This assertion finds support in the section of the *Constitutions* that deals with sermons within the house ([280]), where Ignatius enjoins that they are for "edification," and that domestic preachers should treat "of what pertains to the abnegation of themselves as well as of the virtues and all perfection." Although intended for a domestic situation, these words correspond precisely with what Ignatius expected of sermons in churches. As the *Constitutions* state, Jesuits "will exercise themselves in preaching and in delivering [sacred] lectures in a manner suitable for the edification of the people, which is different from the scholastic style of preaching" ([402]).

In his *Scholia in Constitutiones*, Nadal confirms this interpretation in his comment on the phrase "different from the scholastic style of preaching." He maintains that, whereas in the classroom truth is investigated in a speculative manner, elsewhere all truths "are brought to bear on practice, . . . [and are to be] applied in a spiritual manner and ought to excite devotional and genuinely Christian affections."³⁵

In an age so agitated by dogmatic controversy that such controversy is its distinguishing intellectual characteristic, therefore, St. Ignatius showed himself in practice singularly detached from such concerns. His interests led him to deploy his talents in other areas, and he conceived "doctrine" in a quite different way than did many other leading figures of his time, Catholic and Protestant.

Ignatius' interests focused on pastoral concerns, intimately related to his own spiritual experiences and interpreted in the light of them. These experiences were, in turn, related to and based on central Christian mysteries, especially the Trinity and the Incarnation. The experiences gave him an appreciation for the mysteries of the faith that surpassed the

doctrine "of the schools," in his own day and in ours. Joseph de Guibert, Hugo Rahner, and other commentators have frequently called attention to this mystical and personalized appreciation, and on the basis of it have justified for Ignatius the title "theologian."³⁶

Ignatius was not particularly skilled in articulating his mystical experiences into standard theological language, and the very nature of them presumably precluded it. This confirms our insight into the nature of his "theology." Nadal, we must remember, is the person who first gave him the title. In another passage where he conjoins "scholastic and mystical" ways of doing theology as proper to the Society, Nadal is the best interpreter of his own words.³⁷ He here in practice identifies theology with spirituality, with an inner relish for the mysteries of faith, accompanied indeed by as much intellectual clarity about them as they can be made to yield.

The personalized and experiential nature of Ignatius' appreciation for Christian mysteries locates him more centrally in the patristic and monastic tradition of theology than in the scholastic system that he had--relatively late in life, with the *Exercises* fairly well in hand--studied at Paris and commended so often to his order. It perhaps locates him more centrally with the theological vision of Vatican Council II, with its emphasis on "mystery" and affectivity rather than on doctrinal definition. For Ignatius the scholastic system was an overlay, a clarification and rationalization of an earlier and deeper experience; and the experience remained normative for him.

In the "Rules for Thinking with the Church" (*SpEx*, [352-370]), Ignatius counseled praise for "both positive theology and that of the Scholastics." In this passage he seems in fact to favor the scholastics--at least he has more to say about them. This is perhaps in part because the scholastics were in his day, especially at Paris, under such heavy attack from humanists and Protestant Reformers alike. Moreover, their clarity and their later vantage point from which they could make use of "the decisions of the Councils and of the definitions and decrees of our Holy Mother Church" also appealed to him.

Nonetheless, a strong case can be made for the opinion that his affinity was closer to "the positive doctors, such as St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Gregory, and others." For what was "characteristic" of them was "to rouse the affections so that we are moved to love and serve God our Lord in all

things." It would be difficult to improve upon this statement as an expression of the concerns that animated his life and of what he envisioned for the ministries of the Society. It is also an excellent expression of how, in the last analysis, he thought about theology and "doctrine." In his "horizon" there was a judicious blending of speculative, pastoral, and spiritual theology in accordance with a tradition that antedated the distinction among these realities that the academic theology, and even the spirituality, of his day in effect promoted. Insofar as his model differed from that earlier tradition, the difference lay in Ignatius' more notable emphasis on "service" in ministry and evangelization--properly pastoral concerns. That is the point at which the Pauline paradigm is important, as I will later try to show.

In fact, Nadal refers to Ignatius as "our father, the theologian" in a pastoral context. The passage is worth quoting:

Here, then, you see the necessity for the course of studies in the Society: to be able to preach and to become skilled in those ministries that the Church deems ordered for the help of our neighbor. . . . Here is our father, the theologian. His desires were always to seek how he might better employ himself in the service of God. When he saw that alone he could not do as much as he desired, he looked for companions [to help him].³⁸

PART II. ST. IGNATIUS AND ORTHODOXY

Ignatius was concerned, therefore, with "doctrine" that in style, objective, and content could be shaped to meet pastoral needs. How does this fact bear on his attitude towards dogma properly so called? How does it, thus, bear on his attitude towards orthodoxy? His most famous statement on such matters is, again, in the Rules for Thinking with the Church. In rule thirteen he enjoins upon us: "If we wish to proceed securely in all things, we must hold fast to the following principle: What seems to me white, I will believe black if the hierarchical Church so defines." Through the ages up to our own day, scholars have delighted in citing this quotation, either in praise or contempt of the saint. In fact, that "rule" is the only line from Ignatius that most persons outside the Society consistently ascribe to him.

The "rule" expresses, without doubt, one of Ignatius' deepest convictions. It is, at the same time, a quite conventional belief of his era that he shared with his Catholic contemporaries. Jesuit authors sometimes like

to suggest that this was not the case by contrasting Ignatius' statement with a cognate one by Erasmus in his reply to one of the attacks on him by Noel Beda. Erasmus said: "Nor therefore would black be white, if the Roman Pontiff thus pronounced--which I know he would never do."³⁹ That last clause is sometimes omitted by persons who want to stress the great difference that supposedly divided Ignatius from Erasmus. The fact is that, although the terms of the statements are practically the same and, indeed, were somewhat traditional in philosophical and theological discussions,⁴⁰ the points the two authors are making are quite different. Erasmus states that something that is in fact black does not become white, even if (*per impossibile*) the Roman Pontiff should so name it; he is certain that the pope would not make such a mistake. Ignatius looks not so much to the correctness of the statement, which he assumes, but, quite characteristically, to disposition of soul. According to him, a good Catholic will accept a clear definition of the Church, even if he would be inclined on his own to a different opinion. Erasmus would have agreed with him. In other places, indeed, Erasmus expresses sentiments similar to Ignatius', but with a nuance and care that his profound knowledge of theology and of the history of doctrine had taught him.⁴¹ He was also engaged in heated controversy with Protestants and others in which generalizations like the thirteenth rule of Ignatius did not suffice. He had to descend to cases.

At any rate, Erasmus and Ignatius both subscribed, along with other Catholics of their era, to a confidence in the truth of defined dogma that they opposed to what they believed was the Reformers' attitude, especially the Reformers' reckless rejection of the medieval Councils of the Church. Ignatius formulated his position in an uncompromising form, but we must note, despite that fact, how unspecified the formula nonetheless remains about the way it in fact should function. His "rule" emerges, therefore, more as an indication of a disposition of soul (*sentir*) than as a practical instrument for theological discourse. It thus reflects the attitudinal and affective intent that pervades Ignatius' writings.

We do not find in the rest of the Ignatian corpus any further commentary on this "rule." This is another significant omission. It tells us, I believe, that, unlike Erasmus, Luther, and many of his other contemporaries, Ignatius did not particularly enjoy running through the history of dogma and theology to discover *what* "the hierarchical Church" had defined, what it had *not*, and

how those definitions were to be *understood*. And if Ignatius had little interest in this kind of exercise, he probably also suffered from a certain hermeneutical naïveté as a result. He was not unschooled in the ways of academic theology, but he was unexercised in them and seems to have had few thoughts on controverted dogmas that were not reducible to some commonly held formulae.

This is, it seems to me, a fact rather than a criticism. There are many areas in which Ignatius displayed a subtlety and insight that are remarkable. These are, understandably, the areas in which he evinced a genuine interest--in government, in at least the formal aspects of education, and especially in spiritual direction. In these areas his injunctions transcend formulae and rigid precepts. Like the rest of us, Ignatius was nuanced in those thoughts and original and bold in those pursuits wherein he felt comfortable and experienced. He reinterpreted the tradition of religious life in the Church in such a radical way that some of his contemporaries thought he was destroying it. But, again like the rest of us, Ignatius was cautious, conventional, and even indiscriminating in areas where he had no deep interest. One of these areas was academic theology, and even the relationship of that theology to orthodoxy.

This consideration puts into perspective Ignatius' caution about certain authors. In the *Constitutions* he prescribes that only those authors be used by the scholastics who are "safer and more approved" ([358]). This prescription is confirmed and illustrated in his letters, where specific authors are sometimes mentioned by name. He several times warned against the works of Savonarola, Vives, and Erasmus.

Ignatius' misgivings about authors like these seem to have had a complex motivation. In part they seem to have been inspired by a desire simply to safeguard the reputation of the Society with as many persons as possible by not becoming embroiled in controversies in which Catholics were divided among themselves. But more than that, there was sometimes an intuitive, reflex, almost knee-jerk quality to his concern for orthodoxy that led him to take rash measures without, as far as the evidence shows, carefully examining the issues under debate.

Savonarola, who was executed with papal involvement by the city of Florence in 1498, was a wildly controversial figure in his own lifetime, and the attacks against him swelled again about 1548. In that year Ambrogio

Caterino (Catharinus), a Dominican zealot, launched a campaign against his fellow Dominican by publishing a book denouncing him. Many of Savonarola's other Dominican brethren, including the Master of the Sacred Palace (the official theologian of the papal court), Pier Paolo Giannerini, vigorously defended Savonarola. When the affair came to a climax in 1558, during the pontificate of Paul IV and at the pope's instigation, a cardinal publicly admonished Giannerini that his office as Master was to defend the Apostolic See and not to protect its enemies. To that admonition Giannerini hotly replied: "My office is to fight for the truth, and in that way protect the honor of the Holy See."⁴²

The Jesuits, along with the Franciscans, Carmelites, and Augustinians, were suspected by the Dominicans of exacerbating the crisis during these years. The crisis ended with the official examination of Savonarola's writings in 1558-1559 that failed to produce any substantial censure.⁴³ Be that as it may, Ignatius had held him in suspicion (*por muy sospechoso*) as early as 1549,⁴⁴ and in 1553 ordered that all his books in the Jesuit house in Rome be burned, ". . . since it seemed to him [Ignatius] that his spirit, rebellious to the Holy See, should in no way be approved, even though he might have said many good things."⁴⁵

Although Ignatius admitted that Savonarola might have said "many good things," he did not want him tolerated or even to have those "good things" examined or discussed. Some might ascribe this attitude to a blind fanaticism, but such an attitude does not pervade Ignatius' writings and actions viewed as a whole. Rather, as an instance of the pressures of the times, this incident exemplifies the lack of interest Ignatius had in carefully sorting out controversial matters, particularly where some immediate harm might ensue in education or in ministry "for the good of souls." Ignatius in fact on another occasion provides a significant account for his attitude towards Savonarola: "The reason for forbidding his books [in the Society] is not because some of them are not good, like *Il triumpho della croce*, but because the author is an object of controversy."⁴⁶ Curiously enough, he--or Polanco--seemed more indulgent towards the works of Melanchthon!⁴⁷

Ignatius' attitude towards the two humanists Vives and Erasmus seems to have followed the same pattern as that for Savonarola, though neither of them could be accused of open rebellion against the Holy See. In several instances Ignatius discouraged or forbade the use of their works, especially

in Rome, although he never issued to the Society a blanket prohibition of the works of Erasmus, as is sometimes asserted. Indeed, the placing of the *opera omnia* of Erasmus on the Index published in Genoa, 1557, caused considerable alarm in the Society, because his *Adagia* was a book widely used in the Jesuit schools.⁴⁸ In any case, two years later Pope Paul IV, who had failed in his case against Savonarola, succeeded in having the *opera omnia* of Erasmus placed on the first Roman Index of Prohibited Books, 1559.

Today we are less certain than ever about just what prompted Ignatius' apprehensions about Erasmus, and he himself gives us typically little help in resolving the matter. Perhaps we should assume that Ignatius subscribed to the viewpoint that Erasmus "laid the egg that Luther hatched," as a Franciscan contemporary of Ignatius had put it. In Spain and Paris during Ignatius' years in those places Erasmus was repeatedly attacked, and the saint had to be aware of such controversy. In Paris Ignatius may have been influenced by Pedro de Cornibus, an implacable enemy of Erasmus, whose lectures he at least occasionally attended.⁴⁹ But there were many other sources from which he could have derived his caution.

It is uncertain just how much Ignatius knew of Erasmus firsthand, probably little or nothing. If he ever did dip into the *Colloquies*, originally intended as models of Latin prose for schoolboys, he would here and there have found too sarcastic the depiction of certain pious practices, of scholastic theology, and of the failings of the mendicants. In other colloquies he would have found the language and stories too racy for his taste, and that, in fact, seems to be what most perturbed him, as his occasional linking of Erasmus with Terence suggests.

Once again, what we see here is a caution and a distrust that seems to be almost wholly extrinsic to the theology and doctrine of the works in question. It is a caution that completely ignored Erasmus' great lifework, his monumental editions of the works of the Fathers. One of the tragedies of the sixteenth century was that the positive accomplishments of Erasmus for a renovation of theology along biblical and patristic lines were not appreciated by those who should have been his most ardent defenders. This is especially sad for Ignatius, because his vision of what "doctrine" was, and of how it functioned "for the good of souls," was much closer to Erasmus' than to that of many other of his contemporaries whose works did not evoke in him the same apprehensions.

In any case, it is the extrinsic nature and peripheral quality of Ignatius' involvement with these authors to which I wish to call attention. That posture and quality illustrate the larger points I am making: Ignatius' concern for orthodoxy was general, not particular, and his interest in such questions was secondary to the other problems to which he addressed his talents. Unlike some of his early companions, he simply does not seem to have engaged himself in theological issues in any way that is significant enough for us to judge his attitudes in particular cases as anything more than conventional--and not always enlightened.

This phenomenon can also be illustrated by his attitude towards another group of persons, the so-called *spirituali* who gathered around Cardinals Contarini, Pole, and, to a lesser extent, Morone in the 1530's and 1540's. These three cardinals were among the most devoted friends of the early Society in the sacred college. Contarini is largely responsible for the first approbation of the Society by Paul III. Ignatius referred to him as "nostro padron osservantissimo."⁵⁰ Morone was a consistent advocate for the order in the papal curia all during his life, and was in effect the founder of the German College, a work of the Society to which Ignatius was particularly devoted.⁵¹ Although not without certain ambivalences, Pole also was a friend, and there was a substantial exchange of letters between him and Ignatius up to the very year of the saint's death.⁵²

The fact is that all three of these cardinals fell under suspicion of heterodoxy during Ignatius' lifetime, though Pole had been one of the three papal legates to the first period of the Council of Trent.⁵³ Yet we have not a word or deed from Ignatius that would indicate any concern over these suspicions, and his devotion to Contarini continued long after the cardinal's death in 1542. Morone's case is particularly interesting. Salmerón preached in his diocese of Modena in 1543. The sermons displeased some of his hearers, and Salmerón was summoned into Morone's presence as a result. An altercation ensued over the issue of justification. Morone forbade Salmerón to continue to preach in his diocese, and Ignatius then ordered him back to Rome.

In the processes of the Inquisition against Morone in 1555 and in 1557, Salmerón testified. The first process, you will note, occurred the year before Ignatius' death. It is not really clear from the records whether Morone had originally prohibited Salmerón from preaching because he disagreed

with the substance of Salmerón's doctrine on justification and himself held one that at least resembled (to Salmerón) Lutheran teaching, or because he was displeased with Salmerón's practice of naming from the pulpit individuals whom he regarded as heretics. The processes, in any case, went badly for the cardinal, and after the second trial in 1557, he was thrown into the papal prison of Castel Sant'Angelo, where he remained until released after the death of Paul IV in 1559. Morone thereupon became the official legate of Pius IV to the last period of the Council of Trent, 1562-1563, where he was more responsible than any other single person for the successful completion of the Council.

Once again, Ignatius' role in this affair shows curiously extrinsic concerns. Immediately upon Salmerón's recall from Modena in 1543, Ignatius went to Paul III to have Salmerón's name cleared or to discipline him if he had not preached correctly. After the pope made a faint effort to investigate, seemingly resisted by Morone, he said he was not going to pursue the matter and assured Ignatius that he considered the Jesuits to be "good Catholics." Ignatius, too, let the matter rest. Some years later, however, in 1547, he sent Salmerón to visit Morone in Bologna to ask pardon if in anything he had offended him. In the years that intervened between the incident in 1543 and the saint's death in 1556, Morone continued to show himself a trustworthy and devoted friend to Ignatius and seems never to have borne any resentment for the testimony Salmerón offered at the trials that, without his intending it to be so, was damaging to the cardinal.⁵⁴

Perhaps Ignatius learned something from the experience of Modena. He supported the idea of reading the books of heretics with the intention of refuting their doctrine, yet he eventually began to discourage controversy over doctrine in public, especially from the pulpit and in territories where Protestantism had a large following.⁵⁵ Even his advice to the Jesuits at the first period of Trent indicated that in preaching they were not to deal with "those points where the Protestants differ from the Catholics, but simply exhort to good morals and to the devotions of the Church."⁵⁶ He clearly believed and stated that the erring could more effectively be brought back to the truth by an example of charity and virtue and that discussion of differences was best carried on in more private settings.⁵⁷

This was a pastoral insight of no little merit, a badly needed antidote to the rage that open controversy both expressed and fed. It suggests that

Ignatius did not see dogma as the final key in the troubles of the sixteenth century, whereas he did see the "Christian doctrine" of reform of life as the solution to the ills that racked individuals, Church, and society. To his mind, which here reflected an ancient persuasion in the Church, the dogmatic aberrations of the Protestants derived ultimately, it would seem, from affective and attitudinal aberrations. Luther propounded that right thinking and preaching about justification was essentially what the world needed. For Ignatius the central issue was right living and loving, based on a spirituality in which the believer's affectivities were fostered more along the lines of the patristic and monastic, than of an academic or dogmatic, tradition. Once the affections were ordered, the return to orthodoxy was a natural result. Orthopraxis, properly and fully interiorized, was the privileged pastoral point of departure for fostering correct belief. This viewpoint perfectly coincides with the basic presupposition of the *Exercises*, whose stated purpose is "the conquest of one's self and the ordering of one's life" (*SpEx*, [21]).

PART III. ST. IGNATIUS AND THE CHURCH

If there is one exception to this vagueness on dogma in Ignatius' thinking, it lies in ecclesiology. In two important articles written a half-century ago, Pedro Leturia called attention to his *Romani tã*.⁵⁸ Various authors have tried to pinpoint the precise moment when "the pilgrim" turned into "the man of the Church."⁵⁹ Yves Congar, the most distinguished historian of ecclesiology of our century, maintains that Ignatius coined the expression "the hierarchical Church," and it would be possible to draw a number of conclusions from that fact.⁶⁰ Often in the background, sometimes in the foreground, of Ignatius' writings there also appears Ignatius' well-known regard for the papacy, expressed particularly in "the fourth vow." Moreover, we do have from his pen--or, better, from the pen of Polanco in Ignatius' name--the famous letter to the emperor of Ethiopia, 1555, which contains a little treatise on the Church that proposes the outlines of an ecclesiology that is notably papal.⁶¹ Appended to the *Exercises* are, as well, the "Rules for Thinking with the Church."

These facts have not been lost on authors who write about Ignatius, and almost every year at least one article is published on the "Rules." The last

chapter of Hugo Rahner's book is entitled "The Spirit and the Church," and Schwager's whole work is devoted to Ignatius' understanding of the ecclesiastical reality. Fessard has tried to integrate the "Rules" into the dynamic or dialectic of the *Exercises*.⁶² Then there are the works by Schneider, Gerhartz, and Madariaga. These are only a few examples among many, as even a cursory perusal of Polgár's bibliography immediately demonstrates.

By and large the literature that deals with Ignatius' views on the Church follows a method of focusing on a few texts--the *Deliberatio primorum patrum* and related documents, the "Rules for Thinking with the Church," and the letter to the emperor. Conclusions drawn from these sources are then supported by some other texts, often just phrases lifted from Ignatius' other writings, such as his description of the Church on several occasions as the Mystical Body of Christ.⁶³ These conclusions are also sometimes supported by a few examples from Ignatius' life, usually his dealings with the popes of his own day. Occasionally examples are adduced of his sensitivity to any criticism of the Holy See, no matter what the source from which they originated, especially from Jesuits themselves.⁶⁴

This method, though somewhat narrow, is quite proper, and is surely the first step in trying to understand just how Ignatius understood the Church and the way Jesuits were to function in it. Several observations on the method are, nonetheless, apposite. First of all, the word *Church* appears relatively seldom in the vast body of literature emanating from Ignatius or related to him. In the *Exercises*, for instance, it does not appear in any significant way except in the "Rules," an appendix composed after the body of the text was already set.⁶⁵

The second observation that might be made is that the literature on this question usually fails to place Ignatius in the ecclesiological context of his times. We are now much better informed about that context than we were, say, when Leturia, Tacchi-Venturi, and Schneider wrote their studies. In the years during and after Vatican Council II, furthermore, we have come, especially through *Lumen gentium*, the Council's dogmatic Constitution on the Church, to a more comprehensive teaching on the nature of the Church than prevailed when these authors wrote.

The combination of these two factors tended to make authors earlier in this century view their subject much more through the lenses of the statements of Vatican Council I on papal primacy and infallibility than in

the light of the ecclesiologies of Ignatius' times or the ecclesiological viewpoints that have taken hold in the present. We should not be surprised at this. There is always a dialectic between the situation of the historian and the situation he is investigating. It cannot be otherwise. This very fact indicates that revisions are often called for and that no historical work is, in that sense, "definitive," though even good historians sometimes fall into the illusion that such an achievement is possible.

The early years of Ignatius can, surely, be described as the "pilgrim years," and the later years those of "the man of the Church." There is an obvious sense in which this distinction is both true and useful, even granting Hugo Rahner's arguments for locating the transformation as early as Manresa. In 1540 the Society was approved and became juridically incorporated into the structure of the Church. Ignatius assumed his position of superior general and administered an organization officially chartered by the Church. He governed an ecclesiastical institution, had frequent contact with popes and cardinals, and established further ecclesiastical institutions like schools, churches, and missions that have as their ultimate purpose "the defense and propagation of the faith." Ignatius and his men were now "official," and began to work in communication with bishops and especially the Catholic princes precisely as official. These factors were bound to have an impact on Ignatius' consciousness, even aside from whatever influences his more personal experiences like the vision at La Storta might have had on him.

This distinction between "the pilgrim" and "the man of the Church" indicates a development in Ignatius, and even suggests a discontinuity. The distinction is, as I have said, entirely valid, and I would not want what I have to say to be interpreted as an attempt to discount it. Nonetheless, I wonder if it is not better to emphasize, with Rahner, the continuity in Ignatius and to use that factor as an entrance into how he perceived the Church.

I repeat what I said earlier: One of the things that are striking about Ignatius from his earliest years until his death was his perseverance in the ideal of helping others through some ministry of the word. The centrality of such a ministry is clear from the story of his early days in Spain, Paris, and Venice, and it emerges from almost every page of his correspondence as general of the Society. The content of that "ministry

of the word" remained substantially unchanged during his whole career.

What does this have to do with ecclesiology? Ministry, quite simply, is what the Church is about. As one conceives ministry, therefore, so does one conceive the Church. If the ministry of the Church consists principally in proclamation, then a "herald" model of ecclesiology is operative, as Dulles has pointed out.⁶⁶ If the ministry of the Church is conceived primarily as liturgical celebration and administration of the sacraments, then a sacramental model dominates.

Although Ignatius had not had any formal training in ecclesiology in his early years, he had from the beginning quite definite ideas about the kind of ministry he wanted to perform, even though he was then a layman. His ecclesiological awareness in a formal sense may have been nonexistent or vague, but his ministerial focus already was unquestionably sharp. That focus never seems to have blurred through the years, even later when he was superior general of the Society. I would maintain, therefore, that a model of the Church was consistently operative in Ignatius' mind through a model of ministry that was fully articulated, first of all in his style of ministry and the purposes he saw in that ministry and later in his writings as well.

The advantage of such an approach to Ignatius' view of the Church is that it sets his ecclesiology into the total context of his life and writings and sees all those actions and writings as at least implicit articulations of it. Although his explicit statements on the Church must of course be taken into account, they cannot be allowed to dominate or contradict our understanding of a much broader phenomenon. If one conceives of the Church, of course, primarily as hierarchy and institution, then this approach will fail for Ignatius, for his work was not incorporated explicitly into those structures until the fateful events of 1538-1540. But if one views the Church more broadly, it does work; it finds a solid base in his life and writings from beginning to end.

We have every reason to assume that even in his early years Ignatius did not perceive his ministry as something done outside the Church or in opposition to it. Every shred of evidence points in the opposite direction. He may not yet have been a churchman, but he certainly intended to operate within the Church and to labor for those goods that he believed the Church was founded to advance. This was the ministry of the Christian doctrine of

spiritual conversion and reform of life. This was the "truth" to which he hoped to bring himself and his fellow human beings.

The Church for Ignatius, then, emerges indeed as a "school of doctrine," but not doctrine in the sense of formal Christologies, formal soteriologies, formal eschatologies, or even formal ecclesiologies. It is doctrine much more as it was conceived in the patristic and especially the monastic tradition, intimately related to what we today call spirituality and even coterminous with it. The Church feeds the soul--or the congregation of souls--with the food of doctrine that warms the heart to love God and moves the will to embrace Him. Rather than "school of doctrine," therefore, a less ambiguous term for Ignatius' idea of the Church might be "school of the affections" or "school of affectivity," as he himself designated the culminating year of training in the Society.⁶⁷

These considerations do not contradict what I said earlier about the Pauline inspiration for Jesuit ministry. The sixteenth century experienced a new interest in Paul, most strikingly exemplified by Luther's insistence on the doctrine of justification that he found in the Epistle to the Romans. But Paul is susceptible of various interpretations and adaptations. Luther extracted from him a doctrinal maxim; Ignatius and his companions saw in him a pattern for ministry--a ministry of the *word*, a ministry *on the move*, a ministry to *all peoples*. Paul was also an exemplar of mystical identification with Christ. That reality of companionship, intimacy, and identification is what they hoped to make operative in themselves and in their fellow Christians by means of their "ministry of the word."

This characteristically Pauline emphasis on "ministry of the word" does not lead in Ignatius to a "herald" model of the Church, as it tends to do in the Lutheran tradition. Nor is the Ignatian model predominantly sacramental--there is too much energy directed to evangelization for that. The Ignatian model falls somewhere in between, as "a school of affectivity." That model is, I believe, entirely compatible with the Church understood as "community of disciples," which Avery Dulles sees as the basic vision in the Jesuit tradition.⁶⁸

If Ignatius later changed his thinking about the Church, it was not so much a modification of the model as a deeper appreciation of the vastness of the arena in which the model might operate. When the first companions' proposal to spend their ministerial energies in the Holy Land gradually

receded into the background as unattainable, and when the alternative of offering themselves to the pope for apostolic ministries gradually matured, the motivation for that alternative was also clarified. Here we must take the companions at their word. As the Declaration in Part VII, Chapter I ([605]), of the *Constitutions* states:

The intention of the fourth vow pertaining to the pope was not to designate a particular place but to have the members distributed throughout the various parts of the world. For those who first united to form the Society were from different provinces and realms and did not know into which regions they were to go, whether among the faithful or the unbelievers; and therefore, to avoid erring in the path of the Lord, they made that promise or vow in order that His Holiness might distribute them for greater glory to God. They did this in conformity with their intention to travel throughout the world and, when they could not find the desired spiritual fruit in one region, to pass on to another and another, ever intent on seeking the greater glory of God our Lord and the greater aid of souls.

Unlike the other new orders that were coming into being at the same time--the Theatines, Barnabites, and Somaschi, for example--the Jesuits were not localized by Italian nationality or perspective. They fully realized that their membership was already international in composition and that they all had had international experience. From their very arrival in Rome there was a vision of the "universal" Church. What especially appealed to them in offering themselves to the pope by a special vow was that he was the governor of the "universal" Church. He would know where to send them in that universal arena where they would do the most good--especially to those, according to Nadal, who had no one else to minister to them.⁶⁹

It seems to me that here we find the most important development in Ignatius' idea of ministry and how it should be exercised in the Church by members of the Society. It was not a change in substance or a change in ecclesiology, but a more acute perception of the vastness of the vineyard in which that ministry might be exercised. The pope was "the universal pastor." Like the Lord whose vicar he was, he had the breadth of vision that these men required for their restless energies and international membership. The pope had the resources that put him in a position to judge what was best.

The bull *Exposcit debitum* (1550) lists three purposes of the vow of obedience to the pope ([4]): "greater devotion in obedience to the Apostolic See, greater abnegation of our own wills, and surer direction from the

Holy Spirit." From a historical viewpoint, it is clear from what I have said that the third purpose provided the original motivation for the vow. Moreover, it can be argued from the Jesuit tradition of apostolic spirituality that the first two purposes in some way relate to the third and are even subsidiary to it. The "surer direction of the Holy Spirit" must, in any case, somehow correlate with that "obedience to the Holy See" specified by the vow itself to be "regarding missions."

In Part VII of the *Constitutions*, in fact, the vow of obedience to the pope is located in the context of "the distribution of members in the Lord's vineyard." That location indicates the pastoral and practical scope of the vow and supplies, by inference, a specification of the second obligation of the vow: "to do whatever they order that pertains to the progress of souls and the propagation of the faith." That generic phrase--"progress of souls and propagation of the faith"--surely indicates a *pastoral* mission, in accord with the ministerial purposes for which the Society was founded. It seems, indeed, to indicate nothing more. Ruled out by the vow, for instance, would be strictly political missions for the popes. Viewed thus, the two obligations--"to go" and "to do"--can be reduced to "to go on pastoral mission," or "to go to do ministry."

We thus come to some considerations about the ecclesiological context in which Ignatius and his companions arrived at their perceptions about the role of the pope in the Church and even in the Society. The first considerations are of a formal nature, the others material. Formally speaking, what was the state of ecclesiology in Ignatius' day? First, theology, as it was then practiced, included no "tract" in ecclesiology as we know it today. There is, for instance, no part of Thomas' *Summa* that professedly deals with the Church, and this situation prevailed in the teaching of theology into Ignatius' own times.⁷⁰ We have no reason at all to believe that the first companions ever formally "studied ecclesiology" at the University of Paris.

Secondly, a number of treatises specifically on the Church had begun to appear about the year 1300. As far as we know, these had never been incorporated into formal courses of study, especially in the traditional system of education that Ignatius had experienced at the University of Paris, where professors still lectured on the twelfth-century theologian Peter Lombard or on the *Summa* of St. Thomas. The fact is, however, that a large number of these treatises were written by professors at Paris from

the late fourteenth into the early sixteenth century; they tended to favor some form of conciliar theory, as their authors attempted to find some solution to the Great Western Schism (1376-1417) or later to reflect on its implications.

What must be emphasized is the polemical nature of almost all these "ecclesiological" treatises between 1300 and 1500. They arose in polemical situations in which the prerogatives of kings, popes, bishops, councils, and theological faculties were pitted against each other, as each of these entities battled for its "rights." Given Ignatius' distaste for controversy on issues in which Catholics were divided among themselves and his general lack of interest in academic speculation, it is a priori unlikely that he had a clear idea of what was at stake in these theologico-political controversies, though he probably inclined to one general viewpoint rather than another.⁷¹

If we go on to consider the content, or material aspect, of these treatises, we see that, despite the differences among themselves, these Catholic polemicists all tended to recognize the position of the pope as universal pastor and judge. No one denied the supreme importance of the papal position (or "Petrine ministry," to use a phrase common today) in the Church, but what divided them was their conception of how it was to function and how it related to other bodies. If we set aside the cases that the secular rulers and the theological faculties constructed for themselves, the issues in Ignatius' day boiled down to questions of the prerogatives of the popes and those of the bishops, especially of the latter gathered in council. The extreme papal position had been enuniated by Giles of Rome in 1301 with his shorthand expression "the pope, who is the Church." At the opposite extreme were the radical conciliarists of the Council of Basel (1431-1449), who saw the pope as the executor of the Council's orders. Neither of these extremes had widespread support in the early sixteenth century.

The consensus was, rather, that the pope was the universal pastor with certain prerogatives that made him the ultimate judge in areas where equitable settlement could otherwise not be achieved. He resolved disputes and thereby was the ultimate guarantor of order in the Church. "Pastor" and "judge" would be the two best words to describe his function. The pastoral component was fully delineated in the spiritual literature about the papacy at least from the time of St. Bernard's *De consideratione* in the mid-twelfth century

onwards. In that literature the pope was a *speculum*, or mirror, of virtue and pastoral care for the rest of the Christian community. Because he was set on a *specula*, or mountain, he was in a position to oversee and be an exemplar for the general well-being of the Church. These images recur again and again in the rhetorical literature of the age, even in that emanating from the papal court itself.⁷²

The judicial prerogatives of the pope were discussed at length by the canonists and spilled over on occasion into speculative theology. The pope was the final recourse, "who judged all and was judged by none"--at least not until he "deviated from the faith" (. . . *nisi a fide devius deprehendatur*).⁷³ Even in doctrinal matters he had the prerogative, at least according to authors like Aquinas, to "finally determine" (*finaliter determinare*) issues of controversy.⁷⁴

In this vast literature, the pope is rarely described as "teacher," at least as we would be inclined to understand that word today. He might be called upon to resolve a dispute and was acknowledged to have a responsibility towards the universal Church to censure bad doctrine in notorious cases. But the popes did not "teach" in the sense implied by the modern usage of the term magisterium. That kind of teaching was generally carried on by the theologians in the universities.⁷⁵

There are no papal encyclicals that deal with doctrinal matters until the nineteenth century.⁷⁶ What we find in the *Bullarium Romanorum Pontificum*, for instance, is a series of liturgical, administrative, jurisdictional, and political decisions that deal with privileges, appointments, and similar things. There are a few documents that deal with orthodoxy, such as the condemnations of the theses of the Spiritual Franciscans, of Meister Eckhart, of Ockham, of Marsilius of Padua, and of a few others. Many of these condemnations stem from the curia of a single, tumultuous pontificate, that of Pope John XXII (1316-1334). These condemnations were the results, for the most part, of the work of papal commissions of theologians, and were not positive but negative statements, that is, rejections of specific errors. By Ignatius' day the popes did not preach in public or even in the private liturgies of their court in the Sistine Chapel.⁷⁷ They were very far, then, from exercising a teaching office in any regular and positive sense.

There still prevailed, of course, the traditional belief in the inerrancy of "the Roman Church." This belief goes back at least to Irenaeus

in the late second century and originally referred directly to the Church of Rome. Beginning in the eleventh century, the idea of the "Roman Church" began to be broadened to mean the universal Church, and that was how it was accepted by canonists and theologians of Ignatius' day; thus came into being the rather curious juxtaposition of adjectives in our term "Roman Catholic Church." Although theologians and canonists differed considerably among themselves as to just how this inerrancy of "the Roman Church" functioned and was determined, few if any would have exclusively localized it in the clergy and bishop of the city of Rome. Their understanding of this phenomenon was by this time more universalized.

These considerations are apposite, even indispensable, when we try to discover what was operative in Ignatius' understanding of the role of the pope in the Church and even in the Society. There is no solid basis in the sources for attributing to him an understanding of the papacy that his contemporaries--including the popes themselves--did not have. It is quite true that in the letter to the emperor of Ethiopia an especially strong view of the pope's jurisdictional rights is expressed, but there is otherwise nothing exceptional in that document, which is rather a text on Church unity. It is also true that at the Council of Trent the Jesuits were notably papal in their viewpoint and that Lainez enunciated strong opinions on papal prerogatives during discussion of the reform of the Roman Curia in 1563--to the consternation even of the papal legates.⁷⁸ This is not the place to discuss that complicated matter, and much has already been written about it. But how theologically reflective Ignatius himself was on such issues is quite open to question. In any case, his viewpoints can be regarded only as incidental to an understanding he had of the Church that was much deeper and broader than these issues indicate.

Rather than attempt to see theological acumen in Ignatius' understanding of the papacy's jurisdictional rights, it is more appropriate to consider his appreciation for order as a value in the Church and in society in general. Order, not prophecy, was his strength; "representation," not confrontation, was his procedure in times of conflict. Although himself a mystic, his upbringing and temperament inclined him to have an exalted, even exaggerated, view of authority and of the necessity of a clear chain of command. This is strikingly clear from his instructions on obedience and from the organization he gave the Society in the *Constitutions*. He had been schooled,

moreover, in a world view that saw hierarchy as the natural order of the universe, necessary for maintaining a preordained harmony within diversity.⁷⁹ It was inevitable that he would ascribe this same structure to the Church, in accordance with ancient traditions, and prescribe it for his order.

Once again, we must penetrate beneath the structures and the traditional vocabulary to see how he thought the Society and, by inference, the Church actually function. For him, obedience to the papacy did not mean in every instance automatic submission "at the least sign of the superior's will," for on several well-known occasions he did everything in his power to bring Paul III, Julius III, and even the intransigent and at best only semifriendly Paul IV around to his way of thinking.⁸⁰ Although he was quite capable of giving specific directives in even the smallest details, this is not what is most telling in his correspondence or in the *Constitutions*. Rather than the legalistic principle of "the letter of the law," or even his own axiom of "blind obedience," the pastoral principle of adapting speech and action to time, place, and circumstance was most generally in play in Ignatius' instructions to his fellow Jesuits. As John Bossy correctly observed some years ago, "Few religious superiors can have told members of their order so firmly to forget the rules and do what they thought best."⁸¹ Ignatius insisted, moreover, that superiors in the order consult others before making any important decision, and even in matters of the spirit left immense leeway for what each person's "devotion would suggest." I will never forget how impressed one of my Protestant friends was by what he described as "the non-prescriptive" character of the *Spiritual Exercises* when he read them for the first time. The only firm prescription found therein is that the director should be careful *not* to prescribe, lest he thereby interfere with the direct action between God and the retreatant.

If this was how the Society as an ecclesiastical institution was to function, there is reason to believe it is how Ignatius thought the Church in fact functioned. If on one occasion he described the Church as "hierarchical," he on another occasion described it as "the congregation of faithful Christians."⁸² Authors have frequently called attention to the former, but never, as far as I know, to the latter. The term occurs in both Augustine and Thomas, but could have had a decidedly conciliarist ring in Ignatius' day, though he surely did not subscribe to conciliarist theory.⁸³ However, even if he located final authority for ordinary government in the

general of the Society, he gave the General Congregations powers that resembled those advocated by conciliarists for General Councils. My point is that it is methodologically unsound to press any single term--like "hierarchical Church"--too hard and to allow it to obscure other realities. If we wish to do so, however, it would be interesting to see the conclusions that might be drawn from a line by Nadal: "Holy Scripture, the virtues, right reason, and edification--in a word, the Church."⁸⁴ If Ignatius saw the Society as a defender of the just prerogatives of the papacy, he also saw the papacy as the defender of the Society. This reciprocity of interests needs to be stressed. In certain instances he defended the Society by maintaining that an attack on it was in effect an attack on the Holy See.⁸⁵ The approval of the Society and the *Exercises* by the Holy See was the best defense the order had against its early critics, and St. Ignatius utilized the approvals for precisely that end. The *Exercises* were under attack in some quarters. The Jesuits were without choir, without a distinctive habit, and they arrogated to themselves the high-sounding name of "Society of Jesus." They needed the Holy See as badly as they believed the Holy See needed them.

We must recall, moreover, that the first companions offered themselves to Paul III so that he might help *them* find the best field for their zeal.⁸⁶ St. Ignatius and his companions exercised a ministry and had a keen sense of it before they seized upon the idea of a vow to the pope to make that ministry more fruitful. They did not exercise ministry because they took the vow of obedience to the pope, but just the other way around.

Ignatius at one time considered submitting the Society for approval to the Council of Trent, but never did so.⁸⁷ The bishops of the sixteenth century resented the pastoral privileges of all the mendicants, and were distressed to find more prerogatives being granted by the Holy See to the Society.⁸⁸ This was an ancient complaint against religious, and had just erupted again at the Fifth Lateran Council (1512-1517) with a vigorous onslaught by bishops who maintained that their own ability to exercise their pastoral office, especially through preaching and the sacrament of penance, was undercut by the practice of religious exemption. The matter was discussed again at Trent, and made the Society, as a new order, especially vulnerable.

In defending the Holy See and its jurisdictional powers, especially as these powers were expressed in the papal approval of the Society, therefore, the Jesuits were also defending their own charter to exist. They

were defending, moreover, their independence from the local episcopacy that made feasible the universality of their apostolic mission. At stake, as well, were the Jesuits' mobility and adaptability within a diocese to do what they were convinced had to be done, rather than what the bishop's pastoral routine dictated.

Ignatius loved to refer to his order as "this *least* Society." There is no doubt, however, that from a human point of view every sign of favor, confidence, and esteem that the Holy See showed the Jesuits immensely gratified him.⁸⁹ His satisfaction with Francis Borgia's project, in 1550, to transfer from St. Peter's the body of his great-grandfather, Pope Alexander VI, to the Church of the Gesù, then in its planning stage, illustrates this tendency in a slightly different way.⁹⁰

Neither too little nor too much, then, should be made of the papal character of Ignatius' vision of the Church. His special regard for the Holy See is beyond question, though it was far from that nineteenth-century "devotion to the pope" that first sprang up around Pius IX and has continued to our own day.⁹¹ The relationship between the Jesuits and the pope was mutually advantageous.

What was persistent in Ignatius was his understanding of the pope as "the universal pastor," whose general powers of jurisdiction and whose direct missions to the Society could best assure that fundamental Ignatian principle of "the *greater* good of souls." This was a fully justified pastoral and even theological insight, if we may for the moment distinguish those two aspects of what was for Ignatius one reality. Just how deeply this insight was based on any specific and fully articulated ecclesiology, or how much it can be interpreted as a self-conscious effort to support one such "school" over another, is quite a different question.

PART IV. ST. IGNATIUS AND THE FOURTH VOW

What does the fourth vow mean? What was it meant to assure and even symbolize? These are questions that are heavily discussed and debated today. For many Jesuits the very fact that it is being discussed is confusing, for the purpose of the vow seems clear from the *Constitutions*, from the other documents and practice of the early Society, and even from their own experience in the order. It is guarantor of that mobility "for the greater good of

souls" for which the order was founded. It is symbol of the universal mission of the Society, which extends, like the papal *cura* itself and under its inspiration, "to the ends of the earth." It is a symbol, as well, that the ministries of the Society are not private, but public and "ecclesial." These common and common-sense perceptions should not be discounted as we review the literature on the subject.

In fact, viewed both historically and canonically, this seems undoubtedly to be the correct interpretation of the vow. From the explicit statements in the *Fontes narrativi* and in the *Constitutions* themselves, it is clear that the vow pertains to "missions" and is to be understood precisely as promoting mobility and availability "for the greater good." The two most generally recognized students of the vow--Schneider and Gerhartz--give it precisely this interpretation.

Was there, however, something more that the vow symbolized for Ignatius? Gerhartz, in his sober canonical study, does not enter into this question. But Schneider would answer in the affirmative. For him the vow symbolizes Ignatius' commitment to the visible Church as contrasted with a spiritual or invisible Church advocated by the Protestants and even by Erasmus.⁹² Aside from the fact that neither Erasmus nor many Protestants proposed such an ideal, there is something to be said for this interpretation. It accords with a tendency in Ignatius to localize and concretize spiritual realities in time and place. The method of "contemplation" in the *Exercises* illustrates this tendency, as does his fervent desire to live and work in the Holy Land, where there were visible traces of the Lord's life on earth. His devotion and his apostolic desires underwent a simple transfer of locale from the historical Jerusalem to the "Latin Jerusalem" of Rome. Schwager and Hugo Rahner also call attention to this tendency, and it is a justifiable and helpful insight into Ignatius.⁹³

Schneider also argues that for Ignatius this vow was and remained the fundamental vow of the order, even though this was not the understanding conveyed in the bull *Regimini*.⁹⁴ Schneider maintains that Ignatius was not pleased with the formulation in the bull, but was willing to go along with it. His interpretation has been challenged on several scores.⁹⁵ The most damaging criticism, it seems to me, however, is Ignatius' behavior as general of the order from 1540 until his death in 1556. Only in a few rare instances is the vow mentioned even obliquely in the correspondence, though there was

ample opportunity to do so, especially in the several long instructions on obedience.⁹⁶ Moreover, the number of instances when the popes made direct use of the Jesuits in virtue of the vow are few, though they were without doubt important in Ignatius' mind. On at least one occasion, he proposed the vow as an instance of Jesuit eagerness to serve the Holy See, but precisely in the context of an argument to defend the Society against the attacks on it by the theological faculty of Paris.⁹⁷

It is quite correct that in a sketch, 1545, preliminary to the writing of the *Constitutions*, Ignatius spoke of the vow as "nuestro principio y principal fundamento."⁹⁸ This echo of the opening pages of the *Exercises* indicates how deeply Ignatius felt about the vow. The fact is, however, that the phrase does not appear in the final version of the *Constitutions*. Whether this deletion was done lightly or after great consideration, the inference from it is the same: Ignatius chose *not* to include the phrase in the fundamental document of the Society.

Schneider would, however, go a step further. Although the vow strictly and directly regards "missions," this scope should not be interpreted narrowly. The vow indicates a "complete dedication" or "complete surrender" (*Totalübergabe*) to the visible Church.⁹⁹ Schneider does not indicate with any clarity just what this *Totalübergabe* means in practice, except a kind of general standing-in-readiness for service. He certainly does not specifically indicate any doctrinal component, yet the introduction of this carte-blanche language opens the way for an author like Madariaga to see the vow as relating directly to doctrine and to press "totalidad" beyond what Schneider himself seems to intend.¹⁰⁰

This brings us to the series of articles by Madariaga, especially the one translated into English entitled; "The Jesuits' Fourth Vow: Can It Extend to What He Teaches?" The first difficulty with the article is that the author seems, for the most part, to be arguing for the obvious: Ignatius had a profound loyalty to the doctrine of the Church and a profound respect for its customs and holy practices; he had as well a profound loyalty to the Holy See in the persons of the popes and even in their policies; he saw that the missions of the Society were related to orthodox Catholic teaching and that, in some sense, they could be defined in terms of it; he had firm convictions about the inerrancy of the Church; the missions given to Jesuits by the popes during Ignatius' lifetime were not political but religious, and often related

to doctrinal issues in a broad way, for example, when Paul III sent Laínez and Jay as his theologians to the Council of Trent.

Does anyone contest all this? *Can* anyone contest it? It seems, however, to beg the question. What Madariaga fails to show is how all these facts support his conclusion that the pope can command adherence to some specific doctrine by virtue of the fourth vow.

Several highly questionable presuppositions underlie Madariaga's method of argumentation. One of these is that Ignatius simply identifies the Church with the pope.¹⁰¹ This in effect makes Ignatius subscribe to the extreme curialist ecclesiology of Giles of Rome. Ignatius could well have been influenced by this viewpoint. Given, however, his extreme reluctance to enter into theological controversy and his reticence in subscribing to any position on which Catholics were divided among themselves, it is highly unlikely that he intended in any reflective way to give support to one ecclesiology over another or transmit such an ecclesiology as his legacy to the Society. If he had meant to do so, he had enough legislative skill to make it clearer to us than he did. Ignatius indicated Thomas Aquinas as the preferred theologian for the order, and Aquinas never identified the Church with the papacy.¹⁰²

But even aside from this general objection, Madariaga can be faulted for not adducing solid evidence in his texts to show that Ignatius identified the Church with the papacy. Ignatius believed in the irreversibility and inerrancy of certain kinds of papal decisions, and on one occasion extended this to some areas beyond what many theologians would have done, for example, to the approval of the Society.¹⁰³ But the popes' prerogative of inerrancy on certain issues is simply different from their right to initiate "missions." That distinction is rudimentary, but crucial, for the problem we are discussing. Nor does Ignatius' application of inerrancy to the approval of the Society manifest in him any particular theological finesse. In fact, the Ignatius that Madariaga here presents for our emulation is an Ignatius so indiscriminating in his judgments that it is difficult to see what is to be admired.

Madariaga has, however, put his finger on something characteristic of Ignatius. There was in fact a "totalism" in Ignatius' attitude towards the pronouncements of authority within the Church. One can state quite categorically that there is also no evidence in his writings of an explicit

sense for that "hierarchy of truths" that Vatican Council II proposes.¹⁰⁴ This totalism extended even to belief in the authenticity of certain relics and the inauthenticity of certain others, all based on the flimsiest of arguments.¹⁰⁵ There may be an admirable substratum of reverence for the actual practice of the Church in this attitude, but the surface manifestation of it is hardly something to be perpetuated among thinking persons; it would have been rejected by many of Ignatius' friends and fellow reformers in Rome like Contarini and even Marcello Cervini, later to be the "good Pope Marcellus" of Jesuit tradition.

A second presupposition of Madariaga can be detected in his method for interpreting early Jesuit documents. That method avoids some important distinctions that the early Jesuits themselves made, especially about the papacy, and forces from their statements a maximal sense. For instance, in interpreting a text of Nadal concerning the fourth vow, Madariaga asserts that Nadal means that Jesuits should "unconditionally bolster the authority of the Holy See."¹⁰⁶ That "unconditionally" is nowhere evident in the quotation from Nadal that he adduces. Polanco expressed a significantly conditioned attitude on this same subject when he stated quite clearly that Jesuits were papalists "only where they have to be and nothing more, and even then only with an eye to the glory of God and the general good."¹⁰⁷ This is an explicit text left curiously unmentioned by Madariaga.

In fact, Ignatius himself discouraged the indiscriminating style of thinking about the papacy that Madariaga employs, even though his style of speaking might sometimes leave itself open to such an interpretation. In his instruction to Jesuits going to Germany in 1549, for instance, Ignatius prescribed: "Let them defend the Apostolic See and its authority and draw men to authentic obedience to it in such a way that they not make themselves, like 'papists,' unworthy of credence by exaggerated defenses."¹⁰⁸ In a different context, Laínez and Salmerón, both noted defenders of ecclesiastical authority, felt free to interpret in a nuanced and even restrictive sense Ignatius' enthusiastic words about the Vulgate: "When the text says *para deffender en todo*, that means [to defend] in everything that with reason and honesty can be defended."¹⁰⁹

A third presupposition in these articles concerns the "papal magisterium," which Madariaga describes as "so prominent among the offices of the Holy See."¹¹⁰ What he seems to be presupposing in this context is that "papal magisterium"

was "an important office" of the Holy See in Ignatius' day and must have been in the forefront of his consciousness in his thinking about the vow. The very use of the term "papal magisterium" is misleading, for it seems to read back into the sixteenth century a reality that came into existence only in the nineteenth, as Congar has on several occasions demonstrated.¹¹¹

One cannot deny that during Ignatius' lifetime there was some form of such a magisterium, but it functioned so much differently and so much more rarely than does the papal teaching office today that it is unhistorical and, therefore, misleading to use the term. Insofar as Ignatius thought about this matter at all, he seems to have had in mind either juridical documents like the approval by the papacy of the Society or of the *Spiritual Exercises*, or doctrinal definitions in the strict sense of the term.¹¹² Some of the medieval councils, including the recent Lateran V, in fact issued their documents in the name of the reigning pope. But there were no papal encyclicals, no allocutions or similar documents against which specifically to test Ignatius' attitude.

The closest thing we have to an exercise of papal magisterium during Ignatius' lifetime that approximates what it is usually considered to be today would be the bull *Exsurge Domine* issued by Pope Leo X in 1520-1521 against Martin Luther. Ignatius never mentions it, never relates it to the Society's vow or mission; no pope ever thrust it into the hands of one of his companions as they set out to "refute the errors of the heretics." Ignatius was fully aware that Luther and his followers had been condemned. Such condemnations had been issued by the theological faculties of both Paris and Louvain, as well as by the pope. But Ignatius nowhere invokes these documents in relation to the vow or in relation to anything else.

In summary, Madariaga's methodological presuppositions render the substance of his arguments about the thinking and practice of the early Society untrustworthy. Moreover, his style of treatment and the emphasis on *totalidad* tend to remove the object of the vow from any specific delimitation, whereas the canonical practice of the Church has always striven to circumscribe carefully where the obligations of a vow begin and where they end. The alternative to this practice opens the floodgates to scrupulosity and to other problems as well. The symbolic character of a vow, as an expression of a religious ideal, should be expansive, but the proper object of a vow must, by the nature of the case, be clearly localized, as we see exemplified

in the varieties of practice of the vow of poverty in different religious institutes.

Towards the end of the article we have been discussing, Madariaga leaves the origins of the Society in order to give a concrete example of a strictly doctrinal mission actually imposed upon the Society by a pope. The example is Pope Paul VI's commission ("task," *munus*) to the Society to fight atheism in his opening allocution to the 31st General Congregation.¹¹³ Madariaga's argument from the pope's words is contextual, but there does seem to be little doubt that in the pope's mind there was a connection, however unspecified, between the vow and his commission. The Congregation also saw a connection, and on one occasion actually referred to the *munus* as a *missio*. The 32nd Congregation did the same. But these sources are circumspect in their manner of speaking, and we should be circumspect, too, in "developing" them beyond what they seem to intend.¹¹⁴ The authors of papal documents know their Latin well and are perfectly capable of saying what they mean, as well as of leaving texts ambiguous when it is prudent to do so. It seems clear, moreover, that the two Congregations did not intend to give any general and definitive interpretation of the vow when they used the term *missio*. The most secure interpretation of all these texts would seem to be that, whereas the vow has a specific scope but indicates as well a general willingness to be of service to the Holy See and thus to the Church, the Holy see now wants to make use of that willingness by imposing a special task (*munus*), and the Society gladly accepts it.

Looked at in another way, the content of that "task" hardly seems doctrinal at all except in the most general sense. It is formally similar to expressions like "the propagation of the faith," or "refuting the errors of heretics," or, in our own day, "implementing (the teaching of) Vatican Council II." Madariaga asserts that "atheism is a doctrine, an idea."¹¹⁵ If so, it is an extremely general one at best, and that helps account for the fact that the Society, at least in the United States, has had great difficulty finding ways effectively to deal with that "task."

In any case, are this and similarly general injunctions what are at stake when Madariaga insists that "matter which is doctrinal can indeed form part of the proper object of the Fourth Vow; and that therefore the pope can impose an order which is strictly or purely doctrinal in virtue of that Vow"?¹¹⁶ If that is the case, although one might still disagree with him

on principle, his conclusion seems to be nothing more than an inflated way of stating the obvious.

The problem that troubles Jesuits when they hear such language is not whether they are expected to defend and propagate the teachings of the Church. The question is whether their vow binds them to something much more specific. To use Madariaga's own term, the problem concerns "the papal magisterium" in its contemporary and quite precise meaning. Can the pope bind a Jesuit by virtue of his *vow* to some "special" defense, say, of *Veterum sapientia*, or *Populorum progressio*, or *Humanae vitae*, or *Laborem exercens*? If he could, what would his action in fact mean? Madariaga does not descend to such detail, but leaves us with the disquieting conclusion that the pope "can command the defense of any Catholic truth whatever, even if it is not infallible."¹¹⁷

The fundamental points to return to are that such commands have never been given, there is no evidence that Ignatius ever considered such a likelihood or even possibility, and there is no solid indication from any word or deed of the early Jesuits that they had that understanding of the vow. What about the phrase "do whatever they command that pertains to the progress of souls and the propagation of the faith"? In my opinion, that phrase, despite its generic terms, is best understood in a restrictive sense. It specifies the *pastoral* character of the vow, in accord with the pastoral purposes of the origins of the Society. That is the sense, as I stated earlier, that seems to me to emerge from the historical sources.

It is quite true, however, that the way the papacy functions has changed considerably since Ignatius' day. It is quite true that *today* the exercise of a magisterium, conceived in a positive and active way, is "prominent among the offices of the Holy See." But I do not understand how that in itself changes what the vow is about, since the stated purposes of the vow still function. There therefore seems to be no reason to find a different scope for it than that originally intended.

It might be argued of course that "if Ignatius were alive today" he would see matters differently. There is, however, no secure way of determining what Ignatius would do if he were alive today, and that makes the hypothesis an utter waste of time. One fact is certain: If he *were* alive today he would not be the Ignatius of the sixteenth century, but an altogether different and totally unpredictable entity, formed as he would be by the

twentieth century, not the sixteenth. How such a hypothetical being would react to the current theological and ecclesiological situation is anybody's guess, or, better, anybody's fantasy.

At this point we might indulge in a little fantasy ourselves. Just what would it mean if Pope John Paul II commanded an individual Jesuit to defend *Laborem exercens*? Would he mean him to defend it "blindly" and "unconditionally"? Would he mean him to disregard all the theological considerations that must be applied to the interpretation of any ecclesiastical document? Is that what this "special" obedience would mean? I certainly would not think so, for such a command would at least border on the immoral. It would in effect be a command to violate the criteria for "true" interpretation, which we must assume that any pope wants. But if it does not mean that, what does it mean, and how would the Jesuit's "defense" be different from anybody else's? Do we not assume that the pope subscribes to the norm that Vatican Council II offered for interpreting its own pronouncements? They are to be "interpreted according to the general rules which are known to all."¹¹⁸ Whatever that norm means, it indicates that discretion and differentiation are to be employed in the "reception" of the documents of the Council. If that is true of conciliar documents, it would a fortiori seem to be true of ecclesiastical documents of less solemn status, like encyclicals and allocutions.

Is there, then, no way that the vow and what it symbolizes have any bearing on Jesuit attitudes towards pronouncements of the Holy See? Does Ignatius give us no help in this regard? He does, in fact, give us considerable help, but help only remotely related to the vow. There are two principles that are persistent in his writings on a variety of questions. The first is hermeneutical, the second pastoral. He enunciates the hermeneutical principle in the opening pages of the *Exercises*, where he asks us as good Christians to put a favorable interpretation on another's statement rather than to condemn it. For him this would apply a fortiori to a person of authority, and especially to the pope. Here is required a disposition of the affections that will interpret benignly and to the best effect what another, and especially a superior, has to say. Such a disposition is a valid hermeneutical stance even outside a religious context. In the case of papal and other ecclesiological documents, it rules out, surely, all disdain and disregard, and enjoins the positive effort to see how the document and its

intent be best mediated to the Christian community. This principle of "benign interpretation" does not, however, cancel all other hermeneutical principles that must be applied for a correct understanding.

The second principle is pastoral. We are always to be guided by "the greater good of souls." The expression that this principle often took for Ignatius was to avoid all public criticism of authority, and even to avoid taking sides in controversy. This stance was doubtless appropriate for many of the situations he dealt with, and perhaps especially appropriate for the circumstances and general mentality of his day. One cannot absolutize this application of the principle, however, and assume that it is always, in every context, and under every circumstance "for the greater good of souls" to avoid open discussion. "Care not to scandalize the faithful" is still often the definition of pastoral prudence, but it can turn out to be an excuse to win short-term comfort but lose some long-term benefits. Besides, the faithful continue to prove themselves tougher than their clergy sometimes give them credit for, and they rightly seem more scandalized when abuses or dissent are brought to their attention by outsiders than they are when these are dealt with straightforwardly by those properly qualified within the Church.

Our culture does not have, in fact, the same esteem that many did in Ignatius' day for forms of "pastoral prudence" that deal with disagreement behind the scenes. There is no hard-and-fast rule to be given, then, as to how to fulfill the pastoral injunction of having always in mind "the greater good of souls." Ignatius has provided us with a number of cautions, at least, about the dangers of public controversy and of public criticism of leadership in the Church.

These general principles of hermeneutics and of pastoral concern are Ignatius' legacy to us. Particular application of them must, by the very contingency of the cases to which they pertain, be left to the *discreta caritas* that he assumed would animate us in all our undertakings and that is moderated and interpreted for us, when necessary, by our legitimate superiors.

CONCLUSIONS

In this study I have discussed some issues about Ignatius that seem to me pertinent to questions a number of Jesuits have about him and about the light his writings and deeds might throw on our contemporary situation. These issues are complex. I wish I had more time and space to treat them in the greater detail that they deserve, but perhaps enough has been said here to indicate where historical scholarship stands on a number of points.

The portrait of Ignatius that emerges from these pages differs in some important respects from the Ignatius others have presented. I believe that he emerges better--more believable as a human being, more single-minded and comprehensible as a "theologian," and just as admirable as a saint. He is a saint much to be admired, but admired for the good qualities he possessed, not for those he did not possess--much less for what might not be admirable at all.

Within the confines of the questions addressed in this number of *Studies*, therefore, what in summary can be said about Ignatius of Loyola? Characteristic of him was his attempt to correlate speculative, pastoral, and spiritual doctrine in a way that, while remaining respectful of the achievements of "later theologians," was closer to the patristic and monastic traditions. He placed those traditions in a new framework, however, by directing them to apostolic purposes. This harmonization has a decidedly Pauline cast to it. His vision of "doctrine" is, then, distinctive, and concerns reform of life and those ministerial means that can make such a reform operative in others.

He was devoted to orthodoxy. He was devoted, therefore, to the teachings of the Church, but in such a way that they fed devotion and could be presented as refection for the spirit. This means he had little intrinsic interest in the doctrinal issues of his day insofar as these were controverted by theologians and reformers--Protestants and Catholics alike. His sometimes indiscriminating posture towards these issues and figures should not, therefore, be taken as normative for Jesuits today.

St. Ignatius was devoted to the Church. His understanding of the Church, like his understanding of other mysteries of faith, had a depth, we rightly infer, that does not allow it to be reduced to catch-phrases. If we wish to understand him, we must not focus our attention on terms like "the hierarchical Church" or "the congregation of faithful Christians," but on

broader phenomena. "School of Christian affectivity" thereupon becomes a fair description of his ecclesiological model.

He respected the authority of the Church; he also respected persons in the Church that represented its authority. In dealing with the members of his own order, he counseled and exemplified a balance between obedience and initiative. He generally maintains the same posture towards authority in the Church at large. In this regard, however, his words and actions at times evince a lack of discrimination that we should not feel constrained to perpetuate in ourselves, just as Laínez and Salmerón did not hesitate to temper Ignatius' enthusiastic words about defending the authority of the text of the Vulgate.

St. Ignatius was devoted to the papacy at a time when the papacy was under heavy criticism and attack from a number of quarters. But even in this situation he never identified the Church with the papacy. Much less did he identify the teachings of "our holy Mother Church" with teachings proposed by the popes in their own name, for the popes did not in his day "teach" in a way that would have prompted him to make such an identification.

The papacy and the Society of Jesus were conjoined in Ignatius' mind, rather, in the scope of their directly pastoral concerns. The approval of the Society and of the *Spiritual Exercises* by the papacy facilitated the apostolic effectiveness of the Society, and especially made it capable of transcending diocesan and national boundaries. The pope, as "universal pastor," symbolized and helped implement the worldwide vision that animated the Jesuits' concept of their "missions." Papal approval of their order opened to the Jesuits the world as their vineyard, and handed them, in effect, a charter that assured their freedom to pursue their pastoral goals with minimum limitation imposed by local bishops and the Catholic princes.

In trying to understand the meaning of the "fourth vow," the sequence of events leading up to its creation is crucial. Any discussion of that vow that begins with Ignatius' esteem for the papacy instead of with the apostolic aims of the first companions has got things backwards at the outset. Such a starting point almost inevitably leads to a "totalism" regarding the papacy that makes it difficult to put definable limits on the proper object of the vow.

The historical facts are, on the contrary, that St. Ignatius and his first companions did not in the first place decide to show their regard for

the papacy and then conceive the idea of specifying this regard by a vow concerning missions. What came first was experience of ministry and a desire to exercise it in the most fruitful way possible. The first companions only then decided on a vow *to that effect*, that is, on a vow "to go wherever sent to do Christian ministry."

This is the historical genesis and context of the "fourth vow" of the Society of Jesus. This is how the vow is explicitly and implicitly presented in our early documents. This is an interpretation that more than adequately explains the wording of the vow and the sections of the *Constitutions* that deal with it, and takes into account its symbolic import as well. Thus interpreted, the vow symbolizes the apostolic dynamism of the Society, the fundamental concern of the Society that the members of the order be men "on mission." This is that great concern of which we have been so tellingly reminded by the Declaration "Jesuits Today" of the 32nd General Congregation. In this sense, the vow can indeed claim to be "nuestro principio y principal fundamento." Such an interpretation makes as much sense for contemporary Jesuits as it did when the Society was founded.

The Society should not ask its members to take the "fourth vow" unless it knows what the vow means. That is one of the disturbing problems with "extensions" and "contemporary adaptations" of the vow. I have tried to show in this issue of *Studies* that we do, indeed, know what the vow means and that the traditional interpretation is the correct interpretation. In such a delicate and canonically technical matter, we should be wary of other interpretations of the vow that transform it into something that never entered the minds of the first generation of Jesuits who created it and that leaves contemporary Jesuits in perplexity about the obligations they assume when they pronounce it.

A P P E N D I X

THE CHIEF EARLY AND OFFICIAL TEXTS PERTINENT TO THE FOURTH VOW

These documents are given below in chronological order. When the English translations were available in *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus . . . , Translated . . .* by G. E. Ganss, they were taken, with an occasional minor change, from there. The other translations are mine. I am grateful to Father Ganss for a preliminary listing of the more important texts.

1. From the Bull *Regimini militantis ecclesiae*, Paul III's Approval of the Society on September 27, 1540. Latin in *ConsMHSJ*, I, 27-28.

All who make the profession in this Society should understand at the time, and furthermore keep in mind as long as they live, that the entire Society and the individual members of it are campaigning for God under faithful obedience to His Holiness, the pope, and his successors in the Roman Pontificate. The Gospel does indeed teach us, and we know from the orthodox faith and firmly profess, that all of Christ's faithful are subject to the Roman Pontiff as their head and as vicar of Jesus Christ. But we have judged nevertheless that the following procedure will be supremely profitable for us, for the sake of the greater humility of our Society and of the perfect mortification of its members and the abnegation of our own wills. In addition to that common bond, we are to be obliged by a special vow to carry out whatever the present and future Roman Pontiffs may order that pertains to the progress of souls and the propagation of the faith; and to go without subterfuge or excuse, as far as in us lies, to whatsoever provinces they may choose to send us--whether they are pleased to send us among the Turks or any other infidels, even those who live in the region called the Indies, or among any heretics whatever, or schismatics, or any of the faithful.

2. Text of the vow of the first companions, Rome, April 22, 1541.
ConsMHSJ, I, 68.

Ego subscriptus promitto omnipotenti Deo coram eius Virgine Matre et tota celesti curia ac in presentia Societatis, et tibi, reverende Pater,

locum Dei tenenti, perpetuam paupertatem, castitatem et obedientiam, iuxta formam vivendi in bulla Societatis Dni. Ihu. et in eius Constitutionibus declaratis seu declarandis contentam. Insuper promitto specialem obedientiam summo pontifici circa missiones in bulla contentas. Rursus promitto me obediturum circa eruditionem puerorum in rudimentis fidei iuxta eandem bullam et Constitutiones. Actum Rome, die veneris, 22 die Aprilis 1541, in edibus Sancti Pauli extra muros.

Paschasius Broet
Johannes Coduri
Claudius Jaius

Jacobus Laynez
Alphonsus Salmeron

". . . I further promise a special obedience to the sovereign pontiff concerning the missions as contained in the bull."

3. From the Bull *Exposcit debitum* of Julius III, July 21, 1550.
ConsMHSJ, I, 377-378.

[4]. All who make the profession in this Society should understand at the time, and furthermore keep in mind as long as they live, that this entire Society and the individual members who make their profession in it are campaigning for God under faithful obedience to His Holiness Pope Paul III and his successors in the Roman pontificate. The Gospel does indeed teach us, and we know from the orthodox faith and firmly hold, that all of Christ's faithful are subject to the Roman pontiff as their head and as the vicar of Christ. But we have judged nevertheless that the following procedure will be supremely profitable to each of us and to any others who will pronounce the same profession in the future, for the sake of our greater devotion in obedience to the Apostolic See, of greater abnegation of our own wills, and of surer direction from the Holy Spirit. In addition to that ordinary bond of the three vows, we are to be obliged by a special vow to carry out whatever the present and future Roman pontiffs may order which pertains to the progress of souls and the propagation of the faith; and to go without subterfuge or excuse, as far as in us lies, to whatsoever provinces they may choose to send us--whether they are pleased to send us among the Turks or any other infidels, even those who live in the region called the Indies, or among any heretics whatever, or schismatics, or any of the faithful.

4. Texts from the Constitutions and Declarations, ConsMHSJ, III, 196-99.
 (These are the most pertinent texts from Part VII of the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, but the whole of the first chapter, [603-17], throws light on the vow.)

[603]. Just as Part VI treats of the duties which each member of the Society has in regard to himself, so Part VII deals with the members' duties towards their fellowmen (which is an end eminently characteristic of our Institute) when these members are dispersed to any part of Christ's vineyard, to labor in that part of it and in that work which has been entrusted to them. They may be sent to some places or others by the supreme vicar of Christ our Lord, or by the superiors of the Society, who for them are similarly in the place of His Divine Majesty; or they themselves may choose where and in what work they will labor, when they have been commissioned to travel to any place where they judge that greater service of God and the good of souls will follow; or they may carry on their labor, not by traveling but by residing steadily and continually in certain places where much fruit of glory and service to God is expected.

Since one's being sent on a mission of His Holiness will be treated first, as being most important, it should be observed that the vow which the Society made to obey him as the supreme vicar of Christ without any excuse meant that the members were to go to any place whatsoever where he judges it expedient to send them for the greater glory of God and the good of souls, whether among the faithful or the infidels. The Society did not mean any particular place, but rather that it was to be distributed into diverse regions and places throughout the world, and it desired to proceed more correctly in this matter by leaving the distribution of its members to the sovereign pontiff.

[605]. The intention of the fourth vow pertaining to the pope was not to designate a particular place but to have the members distributed throughout the various parts of the world. For those who first united to form the Society were from different provinces and realms and did not know into which regions they were to go, whether among the faithful or the unbelievers; and therefore, to avoid erring in the path of the Lord, they made that promise or vow in order that His Holiness might distribute them for greater glory to God. They did this in conformity with their intention to travel throughout the world and, when they could not find the desired spiritual fruit in one region, to pass on to another and another, ever intent on seeking the greater

glory of God our Lord and the greater aid of souls.

[612]. It is highly expedient that the mission should be entirely explained to the one who is thus sent, as well as the intention of His Holiness and the result in hope of which he is sent. This should be given to him in writing, if possible, that he may be better able to accomplish what is entrusted to him. The superior too will try to help him by what further counsels he can, so that in everything he more profitably accomplish his ministry for the service of God and the Apostolic See.

5. The Formula of Profession. *ConsMHSJ*, III, 168.

[527]. Insuper promitto specialem obedientiam Summo Pontifici circa missiones; prout in eisdem litteris apostolicis et Constitutionibus continetur.

"I further promise a special obedience to the sovereign pontiff in regard to the missions, according to the same apostolic letters and the Constitutions."

FOOTNOTESABBREVIATIONS Used in the Appendix and Footnotes

<u>AHSJ</u>	<u>Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu</u>
<u>ConsMHSJ</u>	<u>Constitutiones Societatis Iesu</u> , the 4 volumes in the series of the <u>Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu</u>
<u>EppIgn</u>	<u>S. Ignatii Epistolae et Instructiones</u> , 12 volumes in MHSJ
<u>FN</u>	<u>Fontes Narrativi</u> , 4 volumes in MHSJ
<u>MHSJ</u>	The series <u>Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu</u> , 124 volumes
<u>MonNad</u>	<u>Epistolae et Monumenta P. Hieronymi Nadal</u> , 6 volumes in MHSJ

- 1 "Nuestro Principio y principal Fundamento: Zum historischen Verständnis des Papstgehorsamsgelübdes," AHSJ, 25 (1956), 488-513; "Der hl. Ignatius von Loyola im Dienst der Kirche," Gregorianum, 39 (1958), 137-146; "Die Kirchlichkeit des heiligen Ignatius von Loyola," in Sentire Ecclesiam, ed. Jean Daniélou and Herbert Vorgrimler (Freiburg i/Br., Basel, Vienna, 1961), pp. 268-300.
- 2 "'Insuper Promitto . . .': Die feierlichen Sondergelübde katholischen Orden," Analecta Gregoriana, 153 (Rome, 1966).
- 3 Ibid., pp. 232-261.
- 4 John H. Wright, George E. Ganss, Ladislav Orsy, "On Thinking with the Church Today," Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits (hereafter abbreviated Studies), VII, no. 1 (January, 1975).
- 5 For further bibliography on this subject, see László Polgár, Bibliographie sur l'histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus, 1901-1980: I, Toute la Compagnie (Rome, 1981), #3579-3605. See also #3767-3770, on the Church.
- 6 See the previous note. The most recent studies of which I am aware, not listed by Polgár, are contained in Pour la Compagnie: Symposium de Wépion du 2 au 5 avril 1981, ed. Gérard Wilkens (n.p., n.d.): Herman Smets, "Le quatrième vœu, principe et fondement de la Compagnie," pp. 3-18; Michel Sales, "Note sur l'ecclésiologie des Constitutions de la Compagnie de Jésus," pp. 69-78.
- 7 José García de Madariaga, "The Jesuit's Fourth Vow: Can It Extend to What He Teaches?" Review for Religious, 41 (1982), 214-238, (hereafter abbreviated "Fourth Vow") translated from "¿Entra la materia doctrinal como objecto proprio del 4º Voto? (y II)," Manresa, 53 (1981), 227-255. The First Part of this article, with the same title appeared *ibid.*, 49 (1977), 215-228. Related articles by the same author in the same journal are: "La oblación del grupo Ignaciano al Papa en 1538," 48 (1976), 25-39; "Contenido de la cláusula papal del voto de Montmartre," *ibid.*, 231-245; "La oblación al Papa según las Deliberaciones de 1539," 49 (1977), 55-68; "El sentido verdadero en la Iglesia militante para en todo acertar," 50 (1978), 147-168. See also Bertrand de Margerie, "El cuarto voto de la Compañía de Jesús, según Nadal," *ibid.*, 42 (1970), 359-376, esp. 370,

- and his "Papacy, collegiality, ecumenism and the Jesuits. The significance and consequences for ecumenism of the fourth vow of the Society of Jesus," Science et esprit, 25 (1973), 409-429; Jesús M. Granero, "El papa y la Compañía," Manresa, 41 (1969), 5-16, esp. 14-16.
- 8 Madariaga, "Fourth Vow," p. 236; Spanish text, p. 253.
- 9 "The Jesuits, St. Ignatius, and the Counter Reformation: Some Recent Studies and Their Implications for Today," Studies, XIV, no. 1 (January, 1982), p. 1; for further detail, see my "Catholic Reform," in Reformation Europe, ed. Steven Ozment (St. Louis, 1982), pp. 297-319.
- 10 Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle calls attention to this characteristic in her unpublished paper "Angels Light and Dark: Loyola's Spiritual Discernment in Historical Perspective." I am grateful to Dr. Boyle for allowing me to read a preliminary version of the paper. I also refer the reader to my own "De Guibert and Jesuit Authenticity," Woodstock Letters, 95 (1966), 103-110, now reprinted in my Rome and the Renaissance (London, 1981), XIV.
- 11 Madariaga, "Fourth Vow," pp. 222-223; Pietro Tacchi-Venturi, Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia, 4 vols. in 2 (Rome, 1930-51), II.2, 190-195. See also EppIgn, I, 261-267 (June 24, 1543); *ibid.*, 286 (early 1544).
- 12 FN I, 71.
- 13 See, e.g., EppIgn, I (10 Dec. 1542), 236-239.
- 14 See Yves Congar, L'Église: De s. Augustin à l'époque moderne (Paris, 1970), pp. 339-477.
- 15 Moritz Meschler provides a disturbingly clear example of these tendencies in his article on the "Rules for Thinking with the Church," "Le regole del Cattolicesimo schietto," Civiltà Cattolica, 57 (1906, II), 385-397, 545-559.
- 16 For a fuller discussion of the matters mentioned in this and the following paragraph, see my "The Jesuits, St. Ignatius, and the Counter Reformation," Studies, XIV, no. 1 (January, 1982), esp. pp. 6-19.
- 17 (Zurich, Einsiedeln, Cologne, 1970).
- 18 See, e.g., Orientierung, 35 (1971), 239-240; Manresa, 43 (1971), 245-254, 303-320.
- 19 FN, II, 202; MonNad, V, 284.
- 20 Ignatius von Loyola als Mensch and Theologe (Freiburg i/Br., 1964); the English translation is by Michael Barry (New York, 1968).
- 21 Ignatius the Theologian, p. 1.
- 22 Avery Dulles, "Saint Ignatius and the Jesuit Theological Tradition," Studies, XIV, no. 2 (March, 1982), p. 1.
- 23 The Conversational Word of God (St. Louis, 1978).
- 24 See, e.g., EppIgn, I, 133 (23 Nov. 1538), "ministros suos in verbo vite"; VI, 375-376 (25 Feb. 1554), ". . . che Iddio N. S. si serva de sua parola, et la faccia efficace et frutuosa nel P. Salmeron et li altri ministri de quella." See also *ibid.*, X, 165 (21 Nov. 1555), and Exposcit debitum, [3].

- 25 MonNad, VI, Orationis Observationes, ed. Miguel Nicolau (Rome, 1964), p. 151 (1557): "Petrus firmitatem et directionem, Paulus nobis ministerium in Societate nostra significat, et adiuvat uterque ut Ecclesiae Princeps." On the Pauline paradigm for Ignatius, see Louis Cognet, La Spiritualité moderne, Histoire de la Spiritualité chrétienne 3/2 (Paris, 1964), pp. 21-22.
- 26 MonNad, V, pp. 820-65. Part of this exhortation has been translated into English by Clancy, Conversational Word of God, pp. 52-56.
- 27 EppIgn, I, 138 (19 Dec. 1538), ". . . yo me di todo á dar y comunicar exercicios espirituales á otros, assí fuera de Roma como dentro."
- 28 The text, found in EppIgn, XII, 666-73, is entitled both "La summa delle prediche di M. Ignatio sopra la dottrina cristiana," p. 666, and "Summa concionis S.P.N. Ignatius de sacra confessione," p. 673; the point I am making is not dependent on the title, in any case. See also ibid., I, 139 (19 Dec. 1538): "Después de avida, comenzamos quatro ó cinco á predicar en las fiestas y en los domingos en diversas iglesias: assímesmo á mostrar á los muchachos los mandamientos, los peccados mortales, etcétera, en otras iglesias."
- 29 See ibid., XII, 186 (25 July 1556).
- 30 Ibid., 677 (no date), ". . . y no predicando cosas dubias. . . , mas llanamente corrigiendo vicios y pecados, con modestia y concierto." See also Polanco on Laínez' sermons "ad morum reformationem," Pol Chron, I, 150 (1545): cf. EppIgn, VI, 663 (1 May 1554). See now Mario Scaduto, L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez, 2 vols., Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia 3-4 (Rome, 1964-74), II, 469-87, 505-37.
- 31 On the preacher, Agostino Piemontese (Mainardi), and the troubles this affair brought on the early companions, see Tacchi-Venturi, Storia, II.1, 139-161, and Marcello del Piazzo and Cándido de Dalmases, "Il processo sull'ortodossia di S. Ignazio e dei suoi compagni svoltosi a Roma nel 1538," AHSJ, 38 (1969), 431-453.
- 32 For instance, the long letter to Peter Canisius on how to restore Catholicism in Germany deals with formal measures, negative and positive, rather than with specific doctrines, EppIgn, VII, 398-404 (13 Aug. 1554).
- 33 "Saint Ignatius," p. 17. See also Paul V. Robb, "Conversion as a Human Experience," Studies, XIV, no. 3 (May, 1982).
- 34 See, e.g., EppIgn, II, 641-642 (12 Jan. 1550); III, 402 (April 1551); VI, 131 (2 Jan. 1554); VIII, 78 (22 Nov. 1554). See the strong statement by Nadal, Scholia in Constitutiones S.I., ed. Manuel Ruiz Jurado (Granada, 1976), pp. 180-181.
- 35 Ibid., p. 111: "Qui a scholastico diversum est. In scholis enim veritas, ea etiam quae ad praxim spectat, speculative inquiritur et tractatur, contra vero post studia scholastica non practicae solum veritates, sed speculativae etiam ad praxim conferuntur, spiritu afficiuntur, unguntur gratia nostrae vocationis, informantur pietate, devotione imbuuntur, forti ac suavi industria spiritualiter exercentur, movere debent pios ac vere christianos affectus, sensus etiam spirituales ac virtutes ingenerare breviter divina virtute ad proximorum salutem, ac perfectionem fieri debent efficaces in Christo Jesu." The translation is by George E. Ganss, The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus (St. Louis, 1970), p. 201, fn. 2.

See also Nadal, *ibid.*, pp. 386-387, on the use of ars oratoria, which is to be accommodated to "piety," especially those parts of the art "quae in commoendis affectibus versatur, qui affectus ex spiritualibus sensibus sacrarum literarum ducerentur, meditatione, ac contemplatione rerum caelestium illustrarentur, nae [sic] is praeclaram operam, et magnopere utilem Societati, et christianae reipublicae navaret." Nadal elsewhere refers this same idea to Ignatius as its source, MonNad, VI, Orationis Observationes, p. 33. See also MonNad, V, 826; EppIgn, IX, 404-405 (3 Aug. 1555); and "Regulae contionatorum," in Regulae Societatis Jesu (Rome, 1935), pp. 51-56.

- 36 See, e.g., Rahner, Ignatius the Theologian, p. 1, and De Guibert, The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice, trans. William J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 21-181.
- 37 Scholia in Constitutiones S. I., pp. 122-123: ". . . ita pronuntiari, quod Theologiae facultas ac studium debeat semper cum spiritu, et omnibus virtutibus coniungi, hoc est simul tractanda sit Theologia et scholastice, et mystice, inde enim extabit excellens huius facultatis fructus et dignitas, et praesidium." See also MonNad, V, 447-464.
- 38 MonNad, V, 282-284: "Y ved aquí la necesidad de los studios de la Compañía, para predicar y entender en los ministerios que la Iglesia tiene ordenados para ayuda del próximo. . . . He aquí al Padre theólogo. Sus deseos fueron siempre buscar como más enplearse en servicio de Dios; y así vió que a solas non podía hazer tanto fructo, y por eso buscó compañeros." The Italian text (1576) differs from the earlier Spanish version (1561) in some details, *ibid.*, pp. 283-285. The most comprehensive study of Nadal is still Miguel Nicolau, Jerónimo Nadal, S.I. (1507-1580): Sus obras y doctrinas espirituales (Madrid, 1949). See also Manuel Ruiz Jurado, "Cronología de la vida del P. Jeronimo Nadal, S.I. (1507-1580)," AHSJ, 48 (1979), 248-276.
- 39 "Supputatio errorum in censuris Beddae," in Opera omnia, IX (Leiden, 1706), col. 517: "Neque enim ideo nigrum esset album, si ita pronuntiaret Romanus Pontifex, quod illum scio nequaquam facturum."
- 40 See Boyle, "Angels Light and Dark"; and see also Schwager, Kirchenverständnis, p. 129; Cicero, Academica, 2.31.100.
- 41 See, e.g., his works against Luther, "De libero arbitrio diatriba sive collatio," *ibid.*, esp. cols. 1218-1220; "Hyperaspistae diatribes," X, esp. cols. 1267-1268. See also my "Erasmus and Luther: Continuity and Discontinuity as Key to Their Conflict," The Sixteenth Century Journal, 5, no. 2 (1974), 47-65.
- 42 The incident is recounted in Jacques Quétif and Jacques Echard, ed., Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum, 2 vols. (Paris, 1719-21), II, 167.
- 43 Paul IV placed only fifteen sermons and the "Dialogo della verità profetica" on the Index, and these only "donec corrigantur." See Mario Scaduto, "Laínez e l'Indice del 1559: Lullo, Sabunde, Savonarola, Erasmo," AHSJ, 24 (1955), 3-32.
- 44 "Judicium," in EppIgn, XII, 635-636. See also, e.g., *ibid.*, II, 40-41 (March 1548); III, 26 (26 April 1550); V, 94-95 (3 June 1553); XI, 104 (7 March 1556).

- 45 Polanco, Chronicon, III, 24: "Hoc anno P. Ignatius libros Savonarolae, quod domi invenit, comburi jussit, cum ejus spiritus, Sedi Apostolicae rebellis, ei nullo modo probandus videretur, quamvis multa bona diceret." See Scaduto, Lainez, II, 22-29.
- 46 EppIgn, VI, 80 (23 Dec. 1553): "Circa il Savonarola, la causa de proibir suoi libri non è perché non siano buoni alcuni, como Il triumpho della croce et altri, ma perché l'autore e esposto a controversia."
- 47 Ibid., X, 110 (9 Nov. 1555): "Le annotationi del Melantoni in Roma li habbiamo brosiati; puro dove non se parlasse di cose della religione, cancellando il nome, non sarria inconveniente legere gli scoli, perché non penso siano proibite, ma lo autore è tale, che anche il citarlo nelle lectioni non è spediante." See also ibid., 460-461 (4 Jan. 1556). For specific directives about humanistic books written by heretics, see ibid., 209-210 (24 Nov. 1555).
- 48 For instances of Ignatius' caution, see, e.g., ibid. IV, 108 (17 Jan. 1552), on Erasmus and Vives; ibid., 359 (6 Aug. 1552), on Erasmus; ibid., 484 (22 Oct. 1552), on heretics and Erasmus; ibid., 650 (25 Feb. 1553), on Vives; V, 94-95 (3 June 1553), on Savonarola and Erasmus; ibid., 421-422 (27 Aug. 1553), ". . . d'Erasmus, nè Vives, nè Terentio, nè autore alcuno dishonesto"; VI, 267 (1 Feb. 1554), on Vives and Terence; ibid., 485 (17 March 1554), on Erasmus; VII, 612 (1 Oct. 1554), on Erasmus and Vives; ibid., 706 (27 Oct. 1554), on Terence, Erasmus, and Vives; VIII, 35 (10 Nov. 1554), on Vives; IX, 721-722 (17 Oct. 1555) on Erasmus' De construendis [sic] epistolis and De copia; X, 468 (5 Jan. 1556), on Erasmus; ibid., 518 (16 Jan. 1556), on Erasmus. The earliest (1555) and most reliable account of Ignatius' first reaction to Erasmus' writings, 1526-1527, is in the Memoriale of Luis Gonçalves da Câmara, FN, I, 669; see also ibid., 585. On the controversy among contemporary historians about the relationship between Ignatius and Erasmus, see, e.g., John Olin, "Erasmus and St. Ignatius Loyola," now reprinted with an updated bibliography in his Six Essays on Erasmus (New York, 1979), pp. 75-92; Terence O'Reilly, "Erasmus, Ignatius Loyola, and Orthodoxy," The Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. 30 (1979), 115-127, and now Boyle, "Angels Light and Dark." On the Adagia, see Scaduto, Lainez, II, 27, and his "Lainez e l'Indice." For the general context, see Bruce Mansfield, Phoenix of His Age: Interpretations of Erasmus c. 1550-1750 (Toronto, 1979), and Marcella and Paul Grendler, "The Survival of Erasmus in Italy," Erasmus in English, 8 (1976), 2-22.
- 49 See Jesús M. Granero, San Ignacio de Loyola: Panoramas de su vida (Madrid, 1967), p. 147.
- 50 EppIgn, I, 156 (March-April 1540). See also ibid., 168 (18 Dec. 1541).
- 51 See esp. ibid., IV, 172 (27 Feb. 1552), "L'inventione di questo disegno è del cardenale Morone."
- 52 See Joseph Crehan, "Saint Ignatius and Cardonal Pole," AHSJ, 25 (1956), 72-98. This article, reliable in substance, must now be supplemented by the much fuller information we have about Pole's relationship to the spirituali. See, e.g., Dermot Fenlon, Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation (Cambridge, England, 1972); Massimo Firpo, "Sulla legazione di pace di Reginald Pole (1553-56),"

- Rivista Storica Italiana, 93 (1981), 821-837; and Paolo Simoncelli, Il caso Reginald Pole: Eresia e santità nelle polemiche religiose del Cinquecento (Rome, 1977). Simoncelli observes, p. 187: "Questo problema dell'atteggiamento cauto, non rigorista della Compagnia nei confronti di Pole e Morone è destinato a rimanere attualmente senza una soluzione soddisfacente."
- 53 For a review of recent literature on these and related figures, see Elisabeth G. Gleason, "On the Nature of Sixteenth-Century Italian Evangelism: Scholarship, 1953-78," The Sixteenth Century Journal, 9/3 (1978), 3-25. To the studies reviewed in this article should now be added Paolo Simoncelli, Evangelismo italiano del Cinquecento (Rome, 1979).
- 54 The events are related in detail by Tacchi-Venturi, Storia, II.2., 221-235, who published some of the pertinent texts, I.2, 154-176. On Morone's decisive interventions at Trent, see Hubert Jedin, Crisis and Closure of the Council of Trent, trans. N. D. Smith (London, 1967), esp. pp. 101-139, and Robert Trisco, "Reforming the Roman Curia: Emperor Ferdinand I and the Council of Trent," in Reform and Authority in the Medieval and Reformation Church, ed. Guy Fitch Lytle (Washington, 1981), 143-333.
- 55 See EppIgn, X, 281 (7 Dec. 1555), to Canisius. See also Nadal, Scholia in Constitutiones S.I., pp. 350-351, on not naming individuals from the pulpit.
- 56 EppIgn, I, 388 (early 1546): "2. Predicando, no tocaría ningunas partes donde difieren los protestantes de los chatólicos, mas simplemente [exhortando] á las buenas costumbres y devotiones de la iglesia,"
- 57 See ibid., VI, 256 (29 Jan. 1554); X, 690-692 (12 Feb. 1556); XI, 363 (11 May 1556); ibid., 372 (11 May 1556); ibid., 541 (9 June 1556); XII, 241 (24 Sept. 1549).
- 58 "Jerusalén y Roma en los designios de San Ignacio de Loyola" and "A las fuentes de la 'Romanidad' de la Compañía de Jesús (1534-41)," in Estudios Ignacianos, rev. ed. by Ignacio Iparraguirre, 2 vols. (Rome, 1957), I, 181-200, 239-256.
- 59 Hugo Rahner locates this transformation at Manresa, Ignatius von Loyola und das geschichtliche Werden seiner Frömmigkeit, 2nd ed. (Graz, 1949), pp. 52-60; English translation, The Spirituality of St. Ignatius Loyola, trans. F. J. Smith (Chicago, 1953), pp. 46-55. Schneider agrees with Rahner, "Kirchlichkeit," p. 276, n. 30, against Jesús M. Granero, who sees a more gradual development culminating in Rome, "San Ignacio de Loyola al servicio de la Iglesia," La Ciencia Tomista, 83 (1956), 529-572, esp. 534-537, 554.
- 60 Congar, L'Église, p. 369.
- 61 EppIgn, VIII, 460-467, translated by William J. Young, The Letters of St. Ignatius Loyola (Chicago, 1959), pp. 367-372.
- 62 Gaston Fessard, La dialectique des Exercices Spirituels de saint Ignace de Loyola, 2 vols. (Paris, 1956-1966), esp. II, 127-253. For a clearly dissenting opinion, see Schwager, Kirchenverständnis, pp. 61-65, 128-130.
- 63 See, e.g., EppIgn, III, 234-235 (19 Nov. 1550); V, 221 (25 July 1553); VIII, 464 (23 Feb. 1555).

- 64 See, e.g., FN, I², 583. But Polanco's open skepticism (twice in Ignatius' name) about whether Paul IV or the Council of Trent would effect a reform of the Roman Curia is noteworthy: EppIgn, X, 665 (8 Feb. 1556); XI, 245 (14 April 1556), and in his letter to Canisius from Trent (25 May 1563), in Otto Braunsberger, ed., Beati Petri Canisii Societatis Jesu Epistulae et Acta, 8 vols. (Freiburg i/Br., 1896-1923), IV, 221.
- 65 There is a general consensus that the "Rules" have an anti-Lutheran and anti-Erasmian inspiration, but no agreement on specific sources for them. See the discussion, with bibliography, in Schwager, Kirchenverständnis, pp. 127-130.
- 66 See his Models of the Church (New York, 1974).
- 67 Cons, [516], "schola affectus."
- 68 See his "Imaging the Church for the 1980's," Thought, 56 (1981), 121-138, esp. 137-138, revised (with omission of specific reference to the Society) in his A Church to Believe In (New York, 1982), pp. 1-18.
- 69 See, e.g., EppIgn, I, 132, letter to Diogo de Gouvêa from Favre (23 Nov. 1538): "Nos, quotquot sumus ad invicem in hac Societate colligati, devovimus nosmetipsos summo pontifici, quatenus ipse est dominus universae messis Christi; in qua quidem oblacione si significavimus nos esse paratos ad cuncta quae ipse de nobis judicavit in Christo; siquidem igitur ipse illuc nos miserit, quo tu vocas, ibimus gaudentes. Causa autem quaere [sic] hoc pacto nos subiecimus ejus judicio ac voluntati fuit, quod sciamus penes ipsum majorem [esse] cognitionem eorum, quae expediant universo Christianismo." See also ConsMHSJ, II, 562, and Cons, [603-17], esp. [605]; MonNad, V, 153-154, and esp. 195-196: "Ultimam ac perfectissimam Societatis habitationem dicimus peregrinationem professorum; qua peregrinatione eas oves quae pereunt disquirantur solícite Christo lucrifieri. Et haec est quidem selecta vocationis nostrae proprietas, ut eorum curam a Deo acceperimus et ab orthodoxa Ecclesia, quos nullus curat, tametsi aliquis sit omnino qui curare deberet. Quod si alius nullus, certe summus Christi Vicarius, Romanus Pontifex. Huic igitur in obsequium dati sumus, ut per nos illorum gerat curam quibus vel ordinarii praelati vel sacerdotes non prosunt, vel omnino qui nullum habent praelatum. Huc spectat votum quod fit Summo Pontifici, quod proprie ad missiones attinet. Hoc est opus simul et summae difficultatis, summi laboris et periculi, simul summae utilitatis ac necessitatis; hinc tota Societas imitationem quandam habere videtur status apostolici, in nostra humilitate in Christo." See also his Scholia in Constitutiones S. I., pp. 440, 442-443. See André Ravier, Ignace de Loyola fonde la Compagnie de Jésus (Paris, 1973), pp. 27-29.
- 70 See Congar, L'Église, esp. pp. 217-218, and Francis Oakley, The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages (Ithaca and London, 1979), pp. 157-174; specifically on Aquinas, see Dulles, A Church to Believe In, pp. 149-169.
- 71 See Cons, [823].
- 72 See my Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome (Durham, North Carolina, 1979), pp. 195-237.
- 73 See Brian Tierney, Foundations of the Conciliar Theory (Cambridge, England, 1955), pp. 57 ff.

- 74 Summa theologiae, II-II, 1.10.
- 75 See the two important articles by Congar, "Pour une histoire sémantique du terme 'magisterium,'" Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, 60 (1976), 85-98, and "Bref historique des formes du 'magistère' et de ses relations avec les docteurs," *ibid.*, 99-112. Both of these articles have been translated into English in Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, eds., The Magisterium and Morality, Readings in Moral Theology 3 (New York, 1982), pp. 297-331. See also Guy Fitch Lytle, "Universities as Religious Authorities in the Later Middle Ages and Reformation," in Reform and Authority, pp. 69-97, and especially Dulles, A Church to Believe In, pp. 103-132, with bibliography indicated.
- 76 See Congar, L'Église, pp. 424-425: "Grégoire XVI et Pie IX ont inauguré un nouvel exercice du magistère ordinaire des papes, celui des encycliques. Il s'agit d'un enseignement que dépasse le témoignage ou le contrôle de la foi, qui développe les raisons et les conséquences de la doctrine et, ainsi, pénètre sur le terrain de la théologie pour éclairer les problèmes de l'Église et de la société."
- 77 See my Praise and Blame, pp. 12-13.
- 78 See Trisco, "Reforming the Roman Curia," pp. 291-294, 320, and Scaduto, Laínez, II, 137-267.
- 79 See the well-known passage from the "letter on obedience" to members of the Society of Jesus in Portugal, EppIgn, IV, 680-681 (26 March 1553): "It is by this means that Divine Providence gently disposes all things, bringing to their appointed ends the lowest by the middlemost, and the middlemost by the highest. Even in the angels there is the subordination of one hierarchy to another, and in the heavens and all the bodies that are moved, the lowest by the highest, and the highest in their turn, unto the Supreme Mover of all"; translation by Young, Letters, p. 295. See Schwager, Kirchenverständnis, p. 166.
- 80 These are often discussed; see Schwager, *ibid.*, pp. 133-146, for a systematic treatment. His generalization is accurate, p. 152: "Die hierarchische Kirche konnte für ihn [Ignatius] unmittelbare und positive Inspiration oder nur letzte and negative Grenze oder vieles dazwischen sein."
- 81 "Postscript" to H. Outram Evennett, The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation (Cambridge, England, 1968), p. 130. See also Ravier, Ignace de Loyola, pp. 405-412. There was even a certain flexibility about insisting upon observance of the "precetti della Chiesa"; see EppIgn, XI, 542 (9 June 1556).
- 82 The phrase occurs in the "Summa delle prediche," EppIgn, XII, 671 (undated): "Essendo la Chiesa una congregazione delli fideli cristiani, et illuminata et governata da Dio N. S.," Schneider briefly mentions that Ignatius was influenced by the idea of the Church as Gemeinschaft or Genossenschaft, but he does not adduce this text to support the point, "Kirchlichkeit," p. 299. Avery Dulles develops the implications of such a model, especially for Jesuits, in his "Imaging the Church"; see also his "Saint Ignatius," p. 10. See also Joseph Lecler, "Die Kirchenfrömmigkeit des heiligen Petrus Canisius," in Sentire Ecclesiam, pp. 301-314.

- 83 See Congar, L'Eglise, pp. 305-338, and Scott M. Hendrix, Ecclesia in Via (Leiden, 1974), esp. pp. 15-74.
- 84 MonNad, VI, Orationis Observationes, p. 108: ". . . debet esse conformis Scripturis sanctis, virtutibus, rectae rationi, aedificationi; breviter, Ecclesiae."
- 85 See, e.g., EppIgn, V, 469-70 (13 Sept. 1553), on Jesuit privileges from the pope; VI, 717 (15 May 1554), on those who criticize the Exercises, ". . . y más sospechosa es tal audacia contra la sede apostólica"; VIII, 253 (5 Jan. 1555); IX, 450-451 (11 Aug. 1555); *ibid.*, 531 (1 Sept. 1555); XII, 280 (May? 1556); *ibid.*, 623-624 (Jan. 1556).
- 86 Gerhartz, "Insuper Promitto," p. 213, similarly evaluates the offering of themselves that the first companions made to Paul III: ". . . suchten sie vom Stellvertreter Christi Weisung und Hilfe. Und nicht umgekehrt!"
- 87 See, e.g., *ibid.*, III, 736 (29 Nov. 1551); IV, 39 (15 Dec. 1551). See also Scaduto, Lainez, I, 259-267.
- 88 See, e.g., EppIgn, VIII, 326 (26 Jan. 1555).
- 89 See, e.g., *ibid.*, 316-317 (24 Jan. 1555); *ibid.*, 454, (20 Feb. 1555).
- 90 See *ibid.*, III, 255 (14 Dec. 1550), and *ibid.*, 261-262 (14 Dec. 1550).
- 91 See Congar, L'Église, pp. 426-428.
- 92 Schneider, "Kirchlichkeit," p. 284.
- 93 Kirchenverständnis, pp. 16-19; Ignatius the Theologian, pp. 219-220.
- 94 See "Nuestro Principio" and "Ignatius im Dienst der Kirche."
- 95 See Granero, "Loyola al servicio," to which Schneider's "Ignatius im Dienst der Kirche" is a reply.
- 96 The vow is mentioned, e.g., EppIgn, III, 332 (23 Feb. 1551), "peculiari voto"; IV, 86 (12 Jan. 1552), ". . . per votum nostrae professionis"; IX, 350 (20 July 1555), ". . . il papa . . . virtute obedientiae." See also *ibid.*, IV, 83 (12 Jan. 1552), ". . . ut missioni summi pontificis obedirent"; *ibid.*, 89 (12? Jan. 1552), ". . . ad sanctam sedis apostolicis missionem obeundam . . ."; VIII, 270 (12 Jan. 1555), ". . . da sē estesso mosso a comandato"; *ibid.*, 490 (26 Feb. 1555), ". . . la obedientia desta santa sede apostólica obliga"; *ibid.*, 711 (29 Oct. 1555), ". . . pide á su santidad que me lo mande debaxo de obedientia, . . ."
- 97 *ibid.*, XII, 623-624 (Jan. 1556).
- 98 ConsMHSJ, I, 162; on the document itself, see *ibid.*, pp. cxx-cxxv. See also Pierre Favre's Memoriale, FN, I², 42, ". . . quasi totius Societatis fundamentum."
- 99 "Nuestro Principio," pp. 510-512.
- 100 See, e.g., "Oblación al papa, 1539," *passim*.
- 101 "Fourth Vow," pp. 223-224, and "Sentido verdadero," pp. 162, 166-167. Other authors have made the same identification for Ignatius; see, e.g., Meschler, "Le regole," p. 397: "Tutto si reduce al Papa." See also Schwager, Kirchenverständnis, p. 133. The textual basis for this identification is a line, lifted out of context, from the famous letter on obedience, EppIgn,

- IV, 680 (26 March 1553), ". . . y en la hierarchia ecclesiastica, que se reduce á un universal vicario de X.^o nuestro señor." The best interpretation of this statement is from another of Ignatius' letters on obedience, to Andrés de Oviedo, *ibid.*, II, 56 (27 March 1548), ". . . lo mesmo la ecclesiástica hierarchia y subordinación de perlados debaxo de un pontífice." Young correctly translates the line in question (1553) into English, therefore, *Letters*, p. 295: ". . . and in the hierarchy of the Church, the members of which render their obedience to the one universal vicar of Christ our Lord."
- 102 See Dulles, *A Church to Believe In*, pp. 149-169.
- 103 See, e.g., *EppIgn*, XII, 280 (May? 1556); *ibid.*, 623-624 (Jan. 1556).
- 104 See "Unitatis redintegratio," #11, p. 462, *Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Austin P. Flannery (Grand Rapids, 1975).
- 105 See, e.g., *EppIgn*, II, 359-360 (19 March 1549), and esp. *FN*, I², 711. See also Schwager, *Kirchenverständnis*, pp. 134-135; Granero, *Loyola; Panoramas*, p. 204.
- 106 Madariaga, "Fourth Vow," p. 231; Spanish text, "¿Entra? (II)," p. 247, "incondicionalmente."
- 107 *MonNad*, II, 263 (5 Feb. 1563): ". . . los de la Compañia son papistas, lo son en lo que deven serlo, y no en lo demás, y sólo con intento á la divina gloria y bien común."
- 108 *EppIgn*, XII, 244 (24 Sept. 1549): "Sic sedem apostolicam et eius auctoritatem defendant, et homines ad eius veram obedientiam trahant, ut ne per incautas defensiones, tanquam papiste, minus credantur. Sicut contra, zelo hereses persecui tali debent, ut erga personas ipsas hereticorum amor, desiderium salutis ipsorum et compassio potius ostendatur."
- 109 *ConsMHSJ*, I, 394: ". . . quando dize (para deffender en todo) que se añada (en todo lo que justamente y con razón se puede), . . ."
- 110 Madariaga, "Fourth Vow," p. 231.
- 111 See esp. his "Histoire semantique," and "Bref historique."
- 112 See the letter to the missionaries to Ethiopia, *EppIgn*, VIII, 683 (20 Feb. 1555): ". . . en las cosas que tocan á la fe y costumbres no puede errar esta sede quando va deffiniendo iudicialmente, . . ."
- 113 Madariaga, "Fourth Vow," pp. 232-236.
- 114 See the Spanish text of Madariaga's article, in *Manresa*, 53 (1981), p. 251, n. 178, for an interpretation (by A. M. Aldama) of the allocution that differs from Madariaga's but which is only referred to in the English translation (n. 102).
- 115 Madariaga, "Fourth Vow," p. 233.
- 116 *Ibid.*, p. 236.
- 117 *Ibid.*, p. 238; Spanish text, p. 255.
- 118 See the "Explanatory Note" of the General Secretary of the Council, 16 Novem. 1964, *Documents of Vatican II*, pp. 423-424.

THE INSTITUTE OF JESUIT SOURCES

ORDER BLANK

Fusz Memorial, St. Louis University
3700 West Pine Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Phone (314) 652-5737

TOTALS at
LIST PRICES

(CIRCLE THE BINDING desired)

★	_____	Arrupe, <i>Challenge to Religious Life Today: Letters & Addresses — I</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$7.00	Sewn paper, \$6.00
★	_____	Arrupe, <i>Justice With Faith Today: Letters & Addresses — II</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$8.00	Sewn paper, \$7.00
★	_____	Arrupe, <i>Other Apostolates Today: Letters & Addresses — III</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$9.00	Sewn paper, \$8.00
	_____	Bangert, <i>A History of the Society of Jesus</i>	_____
			Glued paper, \$9.00
	_____	Bangert, <i>Bibliographical Essay on History of S.J.</i>	_____
			Sewn paper, \$2.50
			Glued paper, \$1.50
☆	_____	Clancy, <i>The Conversational Word of God</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$5.00	Sewn paper, \$2.50
	_____	Clancy, <i>Introduction to Jesuit Life . . . Through 435 Years</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$12.00	Glued paper, \$5.50
	_____	<i>Conferences on the Chief Decrees of General Congregation 32</i>	_____
			Sewn paper, \$4.50
			Glued paper, \$3.50
★	_____	Correia-Afonso, <i>Letters from the Mughal Court (1580-1583)</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$9.00	
	_____	DeGuibert, <i>The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine & Practice</i>	_____
			Glued paper, \$8.00
★	_____	DeMello, <i>Sadhana: A Way To God</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$6.00	Sewn paper, \$5.00
			Glued paper, \$4.00
	_____	<i>Documents of General Congregation 31 & 32</i>	_____
			Sewn paper, \$6.00
	_____	Egan, <i>Spiritual Exercises & Ignatian Mystical Horizon</i>	_____
			Sewn paper, \$7.00
			Glued paper, \$6.00
☆	_____	Fleming, <i>Spir. Exercises: Literal Trans. and Contemp. Reading</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$12.00	Sewn paper, \$8.00
	_____	Fleming, <i>Contemporary Reading of the Spiritual Exercises</i>	_____
			Sewn paper, \$4.00
			Glued paper, \$3.00
	_____	Futrell, <i>Making an Apostolic Community of Love</i>	_____
			Sewn paper, \$5.00
			Glued paper, \$4.00
	_____	Ganss, <i>Jesuit Educational Tradition & St. Louis University</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$3.25	
	_____	Gruenberg, <i>Labor Peacemaker: Life & Works of Leo C. Brown, S.J.</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$8.50	Sewn paper, \$7.00
			Glued paper, \$6.00
	_____	Ignatius, <i>Constitutions SJ: Intro, Trans., Commentary by Ganss</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$14.50	Glued paper, \$5.00
	_____	Iparraguirre, <i>Bibliographical Orientations on Cons. SJ</i>	_____
			Glued paper, \$1.60
	_____	<i>Jesuit Religious Life Today</i>	_____
			Sewn paper, \$4.00
			Glued paper, \$3.00
☆	_____	Pousset, <i>Life in Faith & Freedom — Fessard's Dialectic</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$9.00	Sewn paper, \$8.00
			Glued paper, \$7.00
☆	_____	Schütte, <i>Valignano's Mission Principles for Japan, Vol. I, Part I</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$14.00	Sewn paper, \$12.00
☆	_____	Toner, <i>Commentary on Ignatius' Rules for the Discernment of Spirits</i>	_____
		Cloth, \$14.00	Sewn paper, \$11.00
	_____	Wulf (ed), <i>Ignatius: His Personality & Spiritual Heritage</i>	_____
			Glued paper, \$7.00

TOTAL at LIST prices

DISCOUNTS:

On \$30.00 up at list prices: 10%

Subtract discount, if any

On \$60.00 up at list prices: 20%

• POSTAGE and handling, if prepaid

\$ 1.25

Amount to be paid

\$ _____

*This may be OMITTED on PREPAID orders of \$30.00 or over at LIST prices

★ For sale by us ONLY in North America.

☆ For sale by us ONLY in the First World (Americas, Europe, Australia, N. Zealand).

Single issues, 75 CENTS--Double issues, \$1.50

- Vol. I, no. 1 (Sept., 1969). J.R. Sheets, S.J. A Profile of the Contemporary Jesuit: His Challenges and Opportunities.
- Vol. I, no. 2 (Nov., 1969). G.E. Ganss, S.J. The Authentic Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: Facts of History and Terminology.
- Vol. II, no. 1 (Feb., 1970). W.J. Burke, S.J. Institution and Person.
- Vol. II, no. 2 (April, 1970). J.C. Futrell, S.J. Ignatian Discernment.
- Vol. II, no. 3 (Sept., 1970). B.J.F. Lonergan, S.J. The Response of the Jesuit, as Priest and Apostle.
- Vol. III, no. 1 (Feb., 1971). J.H. Wright, S.J. Grace of Our Founder and the Grace of Our Vocation.
- Vol. III, no. 2 (April, 1971). V.J. O'Flaherty, S.J. Reflections on Jesuit Commitment.
- Vol. III, no. 3 (June, 1971). T.E. Clarke, S.J. Jesuit Commitment, Fraternal Covenant? J.C. Haughey, S.J. New Perspective on Religious Commitment.
- Vol. III, no. 4 (Sept., 1971). J.J. Toner, S.J. A Method for Communal Discernment of God's Will.
- Vol. III, no. 5 (Nov., 1971). J.R. Sheets, S.J. Toward a Theology of the Religious Life, A Sketch.
- Vol. IV, no. 1 (Jan., 1972). D.B. Knight, S.J. St. Ignatius' Ideal of Poverty.
- Vol. IV, no. 2 (March, 1972). Two Discussions: (1) Spiritual Direction. (2) Leadership and Authority.
- Vol. IV, no. 3 (June, 1972). L. Orsy, S.J. Questions about Purpose and Scope of the General Congregation.
- Vol. IV, no. 4 (Oct., 1972). On Continuity and Change. A Symposium by Frs. Ganss, Wright, O'Malley, O'Donovan, and Dulles.
- Vol. IV, no. 5 (Nov., 1972). J.C. Futrell, S.J. Communal Discernment: Reflections on Experience.
- Vol. V, nos. 1 & 2 (Jan. & March, 1973). V.J. O'Flaherty, S.J. Renewal: Call and Response. \$1.50
- Vol. V, no. 3 (April, 1973). Place of Art in Jesuit Life. V.R. Pedro Arrupe, S.J. and C.J. McNaspy, S.J.
- Vol. V, no. 4 (June, 1973). J.C. Haughey, S.J. Pentecostal Thing and Jesuits.
- Vol. V, no. 5 (Oct., 1973). L. Orsy, S.J. Toward a Theological Evaluation of Communal Discernment.
- Vol. VI, nos. 1 & 2 (Jan. & March, 1974). J.W. Padberg, S.J. General Congregations of the Society of Jesus: A Brief Survey of their History. \$1.50
- Vol. VI, no. 3 (April, 1974). D.B. Knight, S.J. Joy and Judgment in Religious Obedience.
- Vol. VI, no. 4 (June, 1974). J.J. Toner, S.J. Deliberation That Started the Jesuits. A Commentary on *Deliberatio primorum Patrum*.
- Vol. VI, no. 5 (Oct., 1974). R.L. Schmitt, S.J. The Christ-Experience and Relationship Fostered in the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius.
- Vol. VII, no. 1 (Jan., 1975). J.H. Wright, S.J., G.E. Ganss, S.J., L. Orsy, S.J. On Thinking with the Church Today.
- Vol. VII, no. 2 (March, 1975). (1) G. Ganss, S.J. The Sodalties of Our Lady and Christian Life Communities. (2) Specimen copy of *Communication 2* (by Miss José Gsell) and 3 (by Sr. Françoise Vandermeersch, MHS).
- Vol. VII, no. 3 (June, 1975). W.J. Connolly, S.J. Contemporary Spiritual Direction: Scope and Principles.
- Vol. VII, no. 4 (Sept., 1975). T.E. Clarke, S.J. Ignatian Spirituality and Societal Consciousness. L. Orsy, S.J. Faith and Justice: Some Reflections.
- Vol. VII, no. 5 (Nov., 1975). M.J. Buckley, S.J. Confirmation of Promise: A Letter to George Ganss. J.W. Padberg, S.J. Continuity and Change in General Congregation XXXII.
- Vol. VIII, no. 1 (Jan., 1976). Charles E. O'Neill, S.J. *Acatamiento*: Ignatian Reverence in History and in Contemporary Culture.
- Vol. VIII, no. 2 & 3 (March & May, 1976). On Becoming Poor: A Symposium on Evangelical Poverty. Papers by H. de la Costa & E.F. Sheridan. Discussions by M.J. Buckley, W.J. Connolly, D.L. Fleming, G.E. Ganss, R.F. Harvanek, D.F.X. Meenan, C.E. O'Neill, L. Orsy. \$1.50
- Vol. VIII, no. 4 (Oct., 1976). R.L. Faricy, S.J. Jesuit Community: Community of Prayer.
- Vol. VIII, no. 5 (Dec., 1976). Michael J. Buckley, S.J. Jesuit Priesthood: Its Meaning and Commitments.
- Vol. IX, nos. 1 & 2 (Jan. & March, 1977). Changes in U.S. Jesuit Membership, 1958-1975: A Symposium. J.E. Becker, S.J. Discussions: L. Orsy, R.F. Harvanek, J.J. Gill, D.L. Fleming, W.J. Connolly, W.A. Barry. \$1.50

(continued on next page)

(continued)

- Vol. IX, no. 3 (May, 1977). R.F. Harvanek, S.J. The Reluctance to Admit Sin.
- Vol. IX, no. 4 (Sept., 1977). W.J. Connolly, S.J. & P. Land, S.J. Jesuit Spiritualities and the Struggle for Social Justice.
- Vol. IX, no. 5 (Nov., 1977). J.J. Gill, S.J. A Jesuit's Account of Conscience, For Personal and Organizational Effectiveness.
- Vol. X, no. 1 (Jan., 1978). A.C. Kammer, S.J. "Burn-Out"--Contemporary Dilemma for the Jesuit Social Activist.
- Vol. X, nos. 2 & 3 (March & May, 1978). Affectivity and Sexuality: Their Relationship to the Spiritual and Apostolic Life of Jesuits. Comments on Three Experiences, by W.A. Barry, S.J., Madeline Birmingham, R.C., W.J. Connolly, S.J., Robert J. Fahey, Virginia Sullivan Finn, and J.J. Gill, S.J. \$1.50
- Vol. X, no. 4 (Sept., 1978). Robert F. Harvanek, S.J. The Status of Obedience in the Society of Jesus. Philip S. Land, S.J. Reactions to the Connolly-Land Letters on Faith and Justice. A Digest.
- Vol. X, no. 5 (Nov., 1978). John W. Padberg, S.J. Personal Experience and the *Spiritual Exercises*. The example of St. Ignatius.
- Vol. XI, no. 1 (Jan., 1979). Thomas H. Clancy, S.J. Feeling Bad about Feeling Good.
- Vol. XI, no. 2 (March, 1979). Dominic Maruca, S.J. Our Personal Witness as a Power toward Evangelizing Our Culture.
- Vol. XI, no. 3 (May 1979). J. Leo Klein, S.J. American Jesuits and the Liturgy.
- Vol. XI, no. 4 (Sept., 1979). Michael J. Buckley, S.J. Mission in Companionship: of Jesuit Community and Communion.
- Vol. XI, no. 5 (Nov., 1979). Joseph F. Conwell, S.J. The Kamikaze Factor: Choosing Jesuit Ministries.
- Vol. XII, no. 1 (Jan., 1980). Thomas H. Clancy, S.J., editor. Veteran Witnesses: Their Experience of Jesuit Life.
- Vol. XII, no. 2 (March, 1980). Living Together in Mission: A Symposium on Small Apostolic Communities, by Peter J. Henriot, S.J. (coordinator), Joseph A. Appleyard, S.J., and J. Leo Klein, S.J.
- Vol. XII, no. 3 (May, 1980). Joseph F. Conwell, S.J. Living and Dying in the Society of Jesus; or, Endeavoring to Imitate Angelic Purity.
- Vol. XII, nos. 4 & 5 (Sept. & Nov., 1980). J. Peter Schineller, S.J. The Newer Approaches to Christology and Their Use in the Spiritual Exercises. \$1.50
- Vol. XIII, no. 1 (Jan., 1981). Simon Peter, S.J. Alcoholism and Jesuit Life: An Individual and Community Illness.
- Vol. XIII, no. 2 (March, 1981). Paul Begheyn, S.J. A Bibliography on St. Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises. A Working-Tool for American Students.
- Vol. XIII, no. 3 (May, 1981). George E. Ganss, S.J. Toward Understanding the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation, Especially as Described in the Papal and Jesuit Documents.
- Vol. XIII, no. 4 (Sept., 1981). James W. Reites, S.J. St. Ignatius of Loyola and the Jews.
- Vol. XIII, no. 5 (Nov., 1981). David J. O'Brien. The Jesuits and Catholic Higher Education.
- Vol. XIV, no. 1 (Jan., 1982). John W. O'Malley, S.J. The Jesuits, St. Ignatius, and the Counter Reformation: Some Recent Studies and Their Implications.
- Vol. XIV, no. 2 (March, 1982). Avery Dulles, S.J. Saint Ignatius and the Jesuit Theological Tradition.
- Vol. XIV, no. 3 (May, 1982). Paul V. Robb, S.J. Conversion as a Human Experience.
- Vol. XIV, no. 4 (Sept., 1982). Howard J. Gray, S.J. An Experience in Ignatian Government: Letters to a New Rector.
- Vol. XIV, no. 5 (Nov., 1982). Francisco Ivern, S.J. The Future of Faith and Justice: A Critical Review of Decree Four.
- Vol. XV, no. 1 (Jan., 1983). John W. O'Malley, S.J. The Fourth Vow in Its Ignatian Context: A Historical Study.



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

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND PRICES, beginning July 1, 1982

I: To Persons OTHER THAN JESUIT MEMBERS of the American Assistancy

These *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* are published by this Seminar. Naturally, they are focused on Jesuit problems and interests. But others who find these essays helpful are cordially welcome to read them.

THE PRICES

Constantly rising costs, especially for postage outside the U.S., force us with regret to raise our subscription prices. After July 1, 1982, they will be:

Per SINGLE COPY, 75 cents. (Double issues, \$1.50)

SUBSCRIPTIONS:	DOMESTIC	OUTSIDE THE U.S.A., surface mail
	\$4.50 for 1 year, \$9.00 for 2	\$8 for 1 year; \$16 for 2 years

FOREIGN AIR MAIL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Checks using foreign money (e.g., francs) must add \$1 for bank fees and exchange.	\$10 for 1 year in Central America; \$20 for 2 years
	\$14 in Europe, South America, Mediterranean Africa; \$28 for 2 years
	\$16 in Asia, Africa, Pacific regions; \$32 for 2 years

ALL REQUESTS FOR SUBSCRIPTIONS, RENEWALS, AND CHANGES OF ADDRESS

should be mailed to: *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*
from THE AMERICAN ASSISTANCY SEMINAR

(Payment should accompany all requests for subscriptions or renewals)

Circulation Department
Post Office Box 6148
Duluth, Minnesota 55806

REQUESTS for SINGLE COPIES or PAST ISSUES should be mailed to:

(Please add 75 cents for shipping)

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

II. To JESUIT MEMBERS of the American Assistancy

Copies of these *Studies* are mailed to you by means of labels prepared by National Jesuit News, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia, PA 19131.

REQUESTS for CHANGES OF ADDRESS should be sent there. Your FORMER address and your new one are both necessary.

An exception: U.S. Jesuits LIVING OUTSIDE THE U.S. should send such requests for change of address here to the Assistancy Seminar, in St. Louis.

ALL PAST ISSUES are available. See the opposite page for A LIST OF THE TITLES.

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, Missouri
Permit No 2541

