



STUDIES

IN
THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

The *First First* Companions

*The Continuing Impact of the Men
Who Left Ignatius*

BARTON T. GEGER, S.J.

THE SEMINAR ON JESUIT SPIRITUALITY

The Seminar is composed of a number of Jesuits appointed from their provinces in the United States.

It concerns itself with topics pertaining to the spiritual doctrine and practice of Jesuits, especially United States Jesuits, and communicates the results to the members of the provinces through its publication, *STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS*. This is done in the spirit of Vatican II's recommendation that religious institutes recapture the original inspiration of their founders and adapt it to the circumstances of modern times. The Seminar welcomes reactions or comments in regard to the material that it publishes.

The Seminar focuses its direct attention on the life and work of the Jesuits of the United States. The issues treated may be common also to Jesuits of other regions, to other priests, religious, and laity, to both men and women. Hence, the journal, while meant especially for American Jesuits, is not exclusively for them. Others who may find it helpful are cordially welcome to make use of it.

CURRENT MEMBERS OF THE SEMINAR

Shay Auerbach, S.J., is pastor of Sacred Heart Parish, Richmond, Va. (2011)

Michael Barber, S.J., is dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. (2010)

Richard A. Blake, S.J., is chair of the Seminar and editor of *STUDIES*; he teaches film studies at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. (2002)

Mark Bosco, S.J., teaches English and theology at Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (2009)

Terrence Dempsey, S.J., teaches art history and directs the Museum of Contemporary Religious Art at St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. (2009)

Paul Janowiak, S.J., teaches theology at the Jesuit School of Theology and Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, Cal. (2010)

Francis X. McAloon, S.J., teaches theology at the Jesuit School of Theology and the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, Cal. (2009)

Robert E. Scully, S.J., teaches history and law at LeMoyne College, Syracuse, N.Y. (2011)

Thomas D. Stegman, S.J., teaches New Testament at the School of Theology and Ministry at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass. (2010)

Gilbert Sunghera, S.J., teaches architecture at the University of Detroit-Mercy, Detroit, Mich. (2011)

The opinions expressed in *STUDIES* are those of the individual authors. Parentheses designate year of entry as a Seminar member.

Copyright © 2012 and published by the Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality

**THE *FIRST* FIRST
COMPANIONS**

*The Continuing Impact of the Men
Who Left Ignatius*

BARTON T. GEGER, S.J.

STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

44/2 • SUMMER 2012

the first word . . .

Anyone who deals with young people knows how quickly the collective memory evaporates. Through the years I've learned to presume nothing about their knowledge of the historical contexts of the films in our syllabus. *Casablanca*, for example, may be confusing without some knowledge of Vichy France and its relationship to the Nazis in Occupied France, and I have to make time for a brief lesson on the history of World War II. In school Americans learn about D-Day and Iwo Jima, but not much about El Alamein or Tobruk. This lacuna should come as no surprise to anyone who does a bit of mental arithmetic on their ages and the dates of the war. The events took place too long ago for them to remember and are too insignificant for them to have covered in their high-school survey of world history.

But this may come as a bit of a shock. If a morning class falls on September 11, I start with a moment of silence to commemorate those who lost their lives on that dreadful day. In the last couple of years, I've felt the need to provide some rationale for this unusual practice. Freshmen were eight or nine years old when it happened, and although constant reference to the date in connection with all manner of policy decisions has certainly made 9/11 a familiar phrase, much of the horror has simply faded from the public consciousness of the young. They may have some notion of the connection between the event and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but little appreciation of the visceral effect it had—and continues to have—on those of us who lived through it. Had I been in New York at the time, I could have seen the plumes of smoke over the World Trade Center from the baseball diamonds I used to play on. I still get a queasy feeling when I see images of the twin towers in older films or television programs.

Keeping history alive is a constant challenge, and, paradoxically, the more recent the history the more challenging. As new generations arise, key events in the lives of the older ones slip into irrelevance all too easily. In the Church, the Vatican II age has morphed into to the age of John Paul II. In the Society, a few of us Janssensites still remain on the scene, while the Arrupe generation has become the elders of the tribe and the Kolvenbach people have assumed the leadership positions. *Four Stories of the Kolvenbach Generation* (STUDIES 42/1, Spring 2010) came as a bit of a shock to me, and surely to

other readers as well. I didn't appreciate the fact that Jesuits now knocking on the door of middle age had no first-hand experience of the generalate of Pedro Arrupe. The Society that became rapidly transformed under his leadership is the only Society they have ever known. Stories of "the long black line" tramping through endless corridors in isolated country seminaries, litanies, and monthly permissions strike them as embellished folklore. Just as well. The angry divisiveness that marked some areas of Jesuit life in those days is well put behind us and forgotten. We are where we are. No need to dredge up the past. The present and the future provide challenges enough to test our psychic energies.

What follows may violate that principle, but there is a reasonable explanation, or excuse. In this issue of *STUDIES*, Bart Geger provides a meticulously documented narrative about the first companions of St. Ignatius, their uneasy relationship in starting a new kind of religious order, and the effect their departures had on both the Founder and the Society. It's a fascinating story in its own right, but it stirred recollections of that frightening period in my own life when the Church and the Society had begun to feel the impact of the Council. The number of departures from religious life and priesthood reached a scale incomprehensible to many of us now. Yet is important to try to comprehend what the exodus meant to us then and whether it has left any lingering effect on us, individually or corporately. Although first-person narratives have their limitations—the word "narcissistic" may occur to some readers—they do offer an effective way to re-create the sense of a period of time, even if from one person's possibly unreliable perspective. The center of the narrative covers only the few months before my ordination in 1969, but of course it extends beyond that time into the turbulent "'Sixties."

Departures from the Society were part of Jesuit life from the candidacy. As novices, we used the term "checking," an in-house abbreviation of "checking out," as from a Holiday Inn. At St. Andrew on Hudson, they were a secretive affair. The man disappeared during noon examen, changed from his habit to entry clothes and was driven to the train station while the community was at lunch. During afternoon *laborandum*, Brother Sub removed his chair, kneeler, and desk. No notes were posted; nothing was said; he ceased to exist, as though he never had. It seems the sight of a departing classmate might have been considered a threat to the vocations of those so new to religious life. A few left during philosophy, as well, and as I recall a few more decided not to return to studies after their regency. We missed some friends, naturally, but there were so many of us that the period of mourning was short, and no one ever conceived that one or two fewer Jesuits would have an impact on the Society in any way. Business as usual. Replaceable parts.

Woodstock in 1966 was a wonderful experience. While the outside world was beginning the convulsions of its national nervous breakdown—drugs, rock 'n' roll, the pill, the draft resistance, "don't trust anyone over thir-

ty”—seminary life held steady, more or less. During my first year, cassocks and daily order vanished, we had a rathskeller in the basement where both faculty and scholastics could join together in the evening to solve the world’s problems over a pitcher of beer and a bowl of pretzels, the curriculum was updated to make it compatible with other divinity and graduate schools, electives were introduced, and we were free to design our own summer projects and vacations. We certainly felt in step with the changes and openness endorsed by the Council. There was significant change, but the center held. A few more scholastics left us. I recall a few as being dismayed by the collapse of the old structures. “I’m not leaving the Society; the Society left me,” they said, but it didn’t sound very convincing. As Gerry McKeivitt pointed out in his study of aging in the Society (*The Gifts of Aging*, STUDIES 43/3, Autumn 2011), this attitude of negative reaction to the new forms of religious life seemed more common in men somewhat older than we. Some left, he notes, but a few remained to nurture their bitterness. My contemporaries, for the most part, had not yet become hardened in the old ways and were quite happy with English liturgies, seminar rooms instead of lecture halls, and sport shirts.

In the subsequent two years, as I try to piece the story together, it seemed the unrest became more palpable, and departures more frequent. While it was scarcely unusual for a scholastic to leave, we had the impression that Holy Orders solved the vocation question once and for all. I think I knew of only one priest who left. That situation changed rapidly and dramatically. As we prepared for our own ordinations, one of our professors told us that if we thought celibacy was going to be a problem, we should go ahead, since the regulation would change within three years. Within a year he left to marry. Other faculty members chose other commitments, as did scholastics in greater numbers. Choice rooms, once the prerogative of fourth-year fathers, became readily available, even for first-year students. Gallows humor became commonplace: deck chairs on the *Titanic*, last one out turn out the lights, and so on.

Now this is the center of the narrative. Early in the summer of 1968, I traveled to St. Louis for a conference on theology and the arts. Two events stick out in my mind. One, a miserable intestinal virus hit, and I felt death a close companion. One of the kindly natives took me over to Fusz where the brother infirmarian for the scholastics gave me some potion to quiet the upheaval. He advised me to drink room-temperature Coca Cola until I felt up to solid food. During the recovery I was pretty much confined to quarters in the old Coronado Hotel, but on one foray for sustenance, I noticed a crowd gathered around a television set. Someone told me, “Kennedy has been shot.” That was the second trauma. Thoughts of November 1963 came rushing back. Not again! It couldn’t be true. It was simply depressing.

After these twin assaults on my spirits, I arrived in Chicago to continue gathering credits toward my degree. Summer school was big business during this period, and many priests and religious formed a transient community

around the Newman Center. Some of us were in similar programs and knew one another from class. The circle grew through friends of friends. We met for lunch. It was a supportive social network. Soon after I landed, I called a good Jesuit friend then living in another part of the city. Getting together for brat and beer at Berghoff's would be a good start to the summer. After some discreet questions to establish my identity, the man who answered the phone, told me he had left. I called a sister with the idea of catching up over a cup of coffee before classes started. She asked me to come over to her convent that very afternoon. The reason: she was leaving the next day. A Jesuit doing studies during regency told me he was having second thoughts about going to theology. And so it went.

As the summer term began, I moved into an apartment near campus with a Jesuit from the Maryland Province. Within a short time, he received word that his provincial had left the Society, apparently with the intention of marriage. Over the next few days, the phone rang incessantly. Standard rumor theory: people are always eager to share bad news. During the same summer, *Humanæ Vitæ* came out. The ban on artificial contraception took many in the Church by surprise, and the reaction was furious. Some moral theologians were defiant; some bishops were draconian in their response. Many sought a middle ground, but the middle seemed ever more difficult to locate. As the summer wound down, the Democrats met in Chicago. Robert Kennedy, the obvious response to Lyndon Johnson's war policy, was gone. With no spokesman, anti-war demonstrators took to the streets, and as the convention turned to Johnson's vice-president, Hubert Humphrey, the demonstrators clashed with police, in what has been termed a "police riot." It seemed not only the Society and the Church were entering a state of meltdown, but the entire country was falling apart.

The climax of that insane summer came as we closed out the apartment and prepared to travel back to Woodstock, by way of villa at Blue Ridge Summit, Penna. It was to be my last year of theology before ordination. An older Jesuit who had been extremely gracious and supportive in my earlier summers in the area invited me to his room for a drink and some serious conversation. I sat on the bed and he on his desk chair as we sipped gin (no ice) from plastic cups. His advice was direct and heartfelt. He explained that I was young enough and smart enough to make it on my own. He was stuck. He was too old. He had no place to go. The Society was falling apart. It had no future, and I would be well advised to get out while I could still make another life for myself. His words sound shocking now, but they so fit the mood of the times that I probably took them in stride. It's what a lot of people were saying.

The stream of departures continued for the next few years. In my short time on provincial staff, I did some of the paperwork for dismissal for two close friends. The decline in vocations, which seemed a momentary speed bump, turned out to be a long lasting trend. Without question, that period of

upheaval and departures left a lasting mark on the American Society. The decrease in numbers has had a undeniable impact on our ministries, from greater reliance and trust in our collaborators, to cooperation and unification of provinces, to judicious decisions about priorities in mission. We've grown leaner and humbler. We can't do everything, and most of the things we do, we can't do without help. During those years we lost some of our best and most talented and well-trained men. Their talents could not be replaced, and their departures were indeed detriments to the ministries we expected them to serve. With our diminished numbers we are no longer an organization of readily replaceable parts. At the same time, we have become more reliant on God's designs than on human resources. We've gained freedom to move in different directions, and we demand more from one another. What would the Society look like today if we had the same numbers that we had in the early 1960s? Would we have become muscle-bound with our corporate commitments? I wonder.

The startling number of departures certainly led to a different concept of nurturing a productive life in the Society. It seems tragic that we had so few institutionalized resources to help young Jesuits then. Spiritual direction was at best sporadic, when it existed at all. The annual manifestation was brief and perfunctory in my experience. The individually directed retreat had not yet become the norm. Alternatives were clearly impractical because of the large number of men involved. One crusty but wise New York Jesuit told me that in our day, the Society let the numbers solve our problems. If you couldn't fit in, you got out. This was not an exaggeration, as I know from personal experience. One rector told me I could "seek my tranquility elsewhere" if I was not happy with a policy he had set. Since he was not a particularly eloquent man, I suspect that this phrasing had been used with other Jesuits in other circumstances.

At the end of my summer of discontent, I went about my business of finishing theology at Woodstock, seeking ordination and moving on. There was no one to talk to, and in fact the idea of talking through doubts and fears never occurred to me. My problems were my own and so were my solutions. I went it alone. That was what we did. I hope Jesuits of later vintage read this with a mixture of astonishment and disbelief. We've made such vast improvements in our formation and pastoral care for one another over the years that this story might have been translated from the language of another planet. We live in another Society today, a much healthier and much more humane Society, and I think it's fair to say that in God's unfathomable designs, much of change can be traced to our experience of this wave of departures. As Bart Geger points out in his study, Ignatius too profited from the painful lessons learned from those leaving the Society.

Richard A. Blake, S.J.

Editor

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE IÑIGUISTAS	10
The First Group (Spain, 1524-1528)	10
The Second Group (Paris, 1528-1535)	12
The Third Group (Paris and Venice, 1536-1537)	14
III. EVIDENCE AND RELEVANCE OF THE IMPACT.....	21
The Spiritual Exercises and “Autobiography”	21
The “Formula of the Institute”	23
First Vows in the Society	28
Annotation 15	33
IV. CONCLUSION.....	37

Barton T. Geger, S.J., entered the Missouri Province in 1990. He received a M.Th. in systematic theology from Heythrop College in London, an S.T.L. from Weston Jesuit School of Theology (now the School of Theology and Ministry at Boston College), and an S.T.D. from the Universidad Pontificia Comillas in Madrid. He is currently director of Ignatian Programs for Faculty and Administration and rector of the Jesuit Community at Regis University, Denver, Colorado.

The *First First* Companions

The Continuing Impact of the Men Who Left Ignatius

St. Ignatius made several attempts to gather companions before he identified those who would actually form the Society of Jesus. Some of the activities of these earliest followers, known as Iñiguistas, imperiled the foundation of the new order. Although their names are all but unknown today, they seem to have left a mark on Ignatius as he formulated the foundational documents.

I. Introduction

Some Jesuits might be surprised to learn that, before the official foundation of the Society of Jesus in 1540, St. Ignatius had tried twice to form an apostolic body of men, and failed both times. The first defeat occurred in 1528, when he left three companions in Spain to prepare a place for them at the University of Paris. In his absence their enthusiasm for his way of life appears to have faded, so that the group eventually disbanded.¹ The pilgrim tried again in Paris from

¹ "Autobiography," no. 80. All translations of the "Autobiography" and *Spiritual Exercises* are taken from *Saint Ignatius of Loyola: Personal Writings*, ed. Joseph A. Munitiz and Philip Endean (London: Penguin Books, 1996). Hereafter this source will be abbre-

1529 to 1530, but at least three men, if not more, fell away due to resistance from relatives and university authorities.²

True to the old proverb, the third try proved the charm. Ignatius finally managed to recruit some students who remained with him: Favre and Xavier, Laínez and Bobadilla, Salmerón and Rodrigues.³ Jesuits fondly remember these six, along with Jay, Broët, and Codure, who joined later, as Ignatius's "First Companions" who helped found the Society.⁴ Not widely known, however, is it that still others joined this historic group. They too failed to persevere, with consequences that proved nearly disastrous for the fledgling Society.

There is good reason to imagine that these departures affected Ignatius deeply. He had formed strong emotional ties with many of the men, as is only to be expected, considering the nature of their lives together. They had prayed together, worked in the same ministries, lived the same rigorous lifestyle, and labored under the same watchful eye of the Inquisition. Had Church authorities judged Ignatius and his friends guilty of heresy by associating them with the Illuminati—a possibility that was hardly out of the question—all of them could have been burned at the stake.⁵ Thus it is not surprising that Ignatius did

viated to Munitiz, *Ignatius of Loyola*, and the so-called "Autobiography" will be abbreviated to "Auto."

² "Auto," nos. 77–78; *Sancti Ignatii de Loyola Societatis Jesu fundatoris epistolæ et instructiones* (hereafter *Ignatii Epistolæ*), 12 vols., vol. 22 of the series *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu* [hereafter *MHSI*] (Madrid, 1903–11; reprinted in Rome, 1964–68), 1:191. Unless noted otherwise, all translations of Ignatius's letters in this paper are from *Ignatius of Loyola: Letters and Instructions*, trans. Martin E. Palmer, ed. John W. Padberg and John L. McCarthy (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2006). This source will be abbreviated to Ignatius, *Letters*.

³ "Auto," no. 82.

⁴ For the sake of clarity, "Companions" always denotes the ten founders of the Society.

⁵ The Illuminati, or "Alumbrados" in Spanish, were Catholics who claimed to be enlightened directly by the Holy Spirit and who therefore transcended the need for the moral norms and sacramental life of the institutional Church. For an account of the suspicions that Ignatius and his friends were under, especially Ignatius's confessor Manuel Miona, see John E. Longhurst, *Luther's Ghost in Spain* (Lawrence, Kan.: Coro-

not give up on his friends easily. He remained in contact with many of them, and one of his motives for returning to Spain in 1535, some seven years after the dissolution of the first group, was to persuade his old friends to rejoin his new, third group, namely, the First Companions.⁶

We should remember too that insofar as Ignatius was under constant scrutiny by the Inquisition, the conduct of the “Iñiguistas” (as the townspeople called his friends) testified to his credibility. The odd behavior of two women who were simply devotees of the pilgrim was sufficient to have him imprisoned for more than two weeks,⁷ and in Paris, the imprudent zeal of Ignatius’s second group prompted the Inquisition to launch a manhunt for him, but he was in Rouen at the time.⁸ We can only imagine Ignatius’s distress, then, when almost all of the Iñiguistas left him, and even worse, when some went on to create serious scandal.

In centuries past, histories of the Society were written with a strong eye to edification, and perhaps it was feared that drawing too much attention to these men, whose stories were often salacious, would scandalize Jesuits.

To appreciate the anxiety that Ignatius would have experienced as a result of the departures, two points are critical. First, during the period between his conversion and the foundation of the Society (1521–40), he was far more famous throughout southern Europe than is commonly supposed, due largely to his noble status and to the publicity made possible by being a student at several renowned universities.⁹

nado Press, 1964), 103–15, 339, 355; and “Saint Ignatius at Alcalá, 1526–1527,” *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 26 (1957): 252–56.

⁶ *Fontes Narrativi de S. Ignatio de Loyola et de Societatis Iesu initiis*, 4 vols., vol. 66 of MHSI (Rome: Institutum historicum Societatis Iesu, 1943–45), 1:185, 187–88, 307, 480; 2:568–69 (hereafter *FontNarr* and *IHSI*).

⁷ “Auto,” nos. 60–61.

⁸ *Ibid.* no. 81.

⁹ In the ancient and medieval Church, conversions of nobles and the wealthy exercised a special fascination on the faithful, as exemplified by Sts. Perpetua, Anthony, and Francis. Though only of the minor nobility, Ignatius’s own conversion would have been widely perceived by his contemporaries as following in this hagiographical tradi-

According to Polanco, when the French carried Ignatius in a stretcher to Pamplona, he was already well known by many in the city.¹⁰ Ignatius himself asserted that, to avoid being recognized, he had to leave Montserrat in the middle of the night, and again, to pass through Manresa instead of Barcelona.¹¹ As a student in Barcelona, he already was permitted to reform convents, a remarkable feat for an unordained man without a theology degree. In Alcalá “there was a great deal of talk in the whole of [Spain]” about Ignatius and his friends.¹² The pilgrim’s easy access to civil and ecclesial officials also makes it clear that he enjoyed a certain prominence.¹³ Consequently, one former Iñiguista could write to another that news of their defections would spread “first in Italy, then in Spain, or somewhere else in the world.”¹⁴

The second point is that, as Nadal and Polanco both affirmed, Ignatius had been passionate about forming an apostolic group since his

tion. See “Auto,” no. 18, and *Constitutions* no. 161, which treats of accepting nobles and the wealthy into the Society.

All translations of the *Constitutions* are taken from *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, trans. and ed. George E. Ganss (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970). For the latest and now-official edition of the *Constitutions*, see *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and Their Complementary Norms* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996). The paragraph numbers will be the same in both editions, either of which will be abbreviated to *Cons.*

¹⁰ Antonio Alburquerque, ed., *Diego Laínez: First Biographer of Saint Ignatius Loyola*, trans. John F. Montag (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2010), 99.

¹¹ “Auto,” no. 18.

¹² *Ibid.*, no. 58.

¹³ *Ibid.*, nos. 53, 63. “It is noteworthy that Ignatius is in a position to make this kind of contact over the heads of officials such as Figueroa” (Munitiz, *Ignatius of Loyola*, 370n.98). On Ignatius’s early prominence, see also Philip Endean, “Who Do You Say Ignatius Is? Jesuit Fundamentalism and Beyond,” *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 19, no. 5 (1987): 27–28.

¹⁴ *Epistolae Mixtæ ex variis Europæ loci ab anno 1537 ad 1556 scriptæ* (hereafter *Epp-Mixt*), 5 vols., vol. 12 of MHSI (Madrid, 1898–1901), 1:13 (translation mine). When over a hundred Jesuits left the Society during a crisis caused by Rodrigues’s leadership in Portugal, certain of them were talked about as far away as Italy. See Manuel Ruiz Jurado, “Admission and Dismissal in the Society of Jesus,” in *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus: Incorporation of a Spirit* (Rome: Centrum Ignatianum Spiritualitatis, 1993), 127.

earliest days in Barcelona.¹⁵ This does not mean that he was already thinking of a canonical order. On the contrary, widespread among the faithful at this time was hope of a grass-roots reform movement in the Church, one untainted by associations with canonical religious life, which suffered from a reputation for laxity and decline. Various mystics foretold that the group would possess twelve members at its core, a symbolic recreation of the Apostolic College, and thereby restore the integrity and simplicity of the primitive Church.¹⁶ (The Illuminati occasionally tried to make that hope a reality, and some were burned at the stake as a result.)¹⁷ And, in fact, Ignatius appears to have had something like this in mind when he told people in Alcalá that his group was leading “the life or way of the apostles.”¹⁸

They decided that if any Jesuit superior took so much as one escudo from a sacristy for himself, he should be considered guilty of theft and expelled from the Society. Any Jesuit guilty of assault or sexual misconduct should be expelled also.

Why is this important? If Ignatius was convinced that forming a group was God’s will for him—a reasonable assumption in light of the efforts and risks he took in that regard—we can only imagine his consternation at the repeated defections of his friends. Was he doing something wrong? Had he sinned? Was there a problem with the *Exercises*? Was God testing him? In this light, the Jesuit historian Antonio Astrain

¹⁵ *FontNarr* 1:135; 4:229.

¹⁶ On sixteenth-century preoccupation with the primitive Church, see Joseph F. Conwell, *Walking in the Spirit: A Reflection on Jerónimo Nadal’s Phrase “Contemplative Likewise in Action”* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2003), 73–99. “Auto,” no. 5, probably should be read in this context.

¹⁷ See Angela Selke de Sánchez, “Vida y muerte de Juan López de Celain, alumbrado vizcaino,” *Bulletin Hispanique* 62 (1960): 136–62.

¹⁸ *Fontes documentales de S. Ignatio de Loyola* (hereafter *FontDoc*), vol. 115 of MHSI (Rome, 1977), 322. See also “Auto,” no. 75, and *Ignatii Epistolæ*, 12:333–34, or Ignatius, *Letters*, 196.

was not being indulgent when he likened Ignatius's anguish to that of Abraham when asked to sacrifice Isaac.¹⁹

Although the Iñiguistas were often acknowledged by Jesuit writers, only recently do they seem to be attracting more than cursory interest.²⁰ In centuries past, histories of the Society were written with a

They gave all their possessions to the poor, including their books, and moved to the poorhouse of St. Jacques, where Ignatius had lived for a time.

strong eye to edification, and perhaps it was feared that drawing too much attention to these men, whose stories were often salacious, would scandalize Jesuits. There was also a widespread conviction that the future Society with all of its distinguishing char-

acteristics had been revealed to Ignatius at the Cardoner (an idea widely rejected by scholars today).²¹ Perhaps as a result, historians considered the Iñiguistas essentially irrelevant to the Society's story, a few irritating delays before the pilgrim's inevitable triumph.

Today, Jesuit scholars like John O'Malley and Philip Endean prefer to illustrate how many of the Society's characteristics were inspired

¹⁹ Antonio Astrain, *Historia de la Compañía en la Asistencia de España*, 7 vols. (Madrid: Razón y Fe, 1905-25), 1:67.

²⁰ See Javier Osuna, *Friends in the Lord*, trans. Nicholas King, *The Way*, ser. 3 (London, 1974), 30-47; José García de Castro, "Los primeros de Paris: Amistad, Carisma y Pauta," *Manresa* 78 (2006): 253-75; Jaime Emilio González Magaña, "'We Are of the Society of Jesus': Our Identity and Mission," *Review of Ignatian Spirituality* 125 (2010): 9-29.

²¹ Until the early-twentieth century, writers often affirmed that the Society was divinely revealed to Ignatius at Manresa, despite indications by Ignatius and his contemporaries to the contrary (e.g., "Auto," no. 71, *FontNarr* 2:137-38, *Scripta de Sancto Ignacio de Loyola*, 2 vols., vol. 20 of MHSI [Madrid, 1904-1918], 1:105). For many, the desire was to legitimate the Society in the eyes of other religious orders that accused the Society of being derivative or misbegotten. More recent scholarship, unanimated by such polemics, recognizes the origin of the Society as a gradual process. See Manuel Quera, *Los Ejercicios Espirituales y el origen de la Compañía de Jesús* (Barcelona: Imprenta Revista Ibérica, 1941), and Joseph de Guibert, *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. William Young (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1964), 39-44.

by the lived experience of the Jesuits over time, for example, their successes, mistakes, and practical responses to exigencies.²² A case in point is the Society's storied commitment to education, which had not been on the minds of the Companions when the Society was founded in 1540. Ignatius's command decision in 1546 to allow lay students to attend a Jesuit school bore such fruit that the Society soon was building schools all over Europe, notwithstanding that such institutions were antithetical to the original vision of a peripatetic ministry.

In a similar vein, I suggest that Ignatius's experience with the Iñiguistas was highly influential on the later Society. The pilgrim made mistakes with these men that nearly cost him the Society and his own life. The Iñiguistas also undid many of the fruits of his ministry through scandal and treachery. If we give these remarkable facts their due, we will not be surprised to find numerous innovations in the *Constitutions* and *Exercises* that concern the proper discernment of a religious vocation, the quality of men accepted into the Society, and the importance of perseverance. Not coincidentally, these novelties were hugely controversial from the very beginning, and they remained targets for the Society's detractors for well over four centuries. Some of the principal ones are:

- The extraordinary attention to perseverance in the *Constitutions*, which exceeds by far what we find in the classic rules of earlier religious communities, with the arguable (and not unrelated) exception of Cassian's *Institutes*.
- The leitmotif of "preserving and increasing" the Society of Jesus in the *Constitutions*.²³
- Simple vows that bind individual Jesuits *on their part* to remain in the Society; whereas the Society *for its part* is not obliged to keep them, and can dismiss them for its own reasons, even if they want to stay.²⁴

²² See John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Harvard University Press, 1994); Endean, "Who Do You Say?" See also Philip Sheldrake, *Spirituality & History*, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1995), 83–87.

²³ *Cons.* no. 136 *et passim*, esp. Part 10 (nos. 812–82).

²⁴ *Ibid.*, nos. 119, 120, 536.

- The long formation of scholastics, including a two-year novitiate.
- Emphasis on the character and natural gifts required to be a Jesuit, as opposed to considering that the Society has a duty to accept any well-intentioned applicant with desires for personal sanctification (as was generally the case with other orders at that time).²⁵
- Ignatius's distinction between a core group of professed fathers, who constitute the Society in the strict sense, and the broader Society that includes spiritual and temporal coadjutors, scholastics, and novices.²⁶
- A rule in the *Constitutions* that forbids Jesuits from leaving the Society for other religious orders, or accepting men from other orders, unless the latter possessed exceptional talents.²⁷
- Annotation 15 of the *Exercises*, where Ignatius instructs directors not to urge religious life upon exercitants.

I cannot elaborate upon these sufficiently within the present essay. For now, my goal is simply to call attention to these men and to the intriguing possibilities they raise for any number of questions about Jesuit history and spirituality.

For example, in March of 1541 the First Companions gathered to deliberate the details of their new order. They decided that if any Jesuit superior took so much as one *escudo* from a sacristy for himself, he should be considered guilty of theft and expelled from the Society.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, nos. 144, 147, 151, 152. The "General Examen" is startling for its rigor; see esp. nos. 101–2. The original draft ended with an excursus in which Ignatius acknowledged the primacy of grace while insisting on the legitimacy of selecting men for their natural gifts. The Society's apostolic thrust required unprecedented qualifications. The excursus was deleted from later revisions of the "Examen," possibly because it would have been perceived as Pelagian, an accusation that nevertheless dogged the Society for centuries. For a translation of the excursus, see de Guibert, *The Jesuits*, 147–48.

²⁶ *Cons.* nos. 12, 511.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, nos. 27, 30, 99, 171, 172. The well-known "Carthusian exception" is not mentioned in the *Constitutions*, but rather in several papal bulls that predate the final draft of that document.

Any Jesuit guilty of assault or sexual misconduct should be expelled also.²⁸ Now, considering that the Companions were idealistic men and filled with enthusiasm for their new order, we might wonder why they turned so quickly to unpleasant topics. On this point, Fr. Aloysius Hsü made this observation:

[I]t is hard to suppose that these prescriptions and sanctions were not modeled on those already in existence among the established religious Orders. Because it is unthinkable, first of all, that this group of six could lay down a rule as the first mentioned above for their coming Superior General, who was of course Ignatius; nor, on the other hand, could the cases mentioned in the second prescription have any relevance to the first nine companions of Loyola.²⁹

Fr. Hsü was correct that the above rules are inexplicable in terms of the First Companions. Unfortunately the same cannot be said for the *Iñiguistas*, some of whom were guilty of theft, assault, sexual misconduct, and the attempted murder of Ignatius.

In the *Spiritual Exercises*, Ignatius refers to “immutable elections” that cannot be discerned anew, as well as to the danger of accepting offices and benefices for one’s personal advantage instead of for the glory of God.³⁰ Joseph Conwell suggested that, on these points, Ignatius might have been influenced by the experiences of Favre and Xavier, since “ [n]one of these seems to have been particularly relevant to Ignatius at Manresa in his own interior struggle.”³¹ But, of course, immutable elections were wholly relevant to all the men who turned back on their elections to follow Ignatius, and at least two of them went on to receive ecclesial dignities, as we shall see.

²⁸ *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, 3 vols., vols. 63, 64, and 65 of MHSI (Rome: IHSI, 1934–38), 1:40.

²⁹ Aloysius Hsü, *Dominican Presence in the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1971), 7.

³⁰ Ignatius of Loyola, *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, trans. and ed. George E. Ganss (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources 1992), nos. 169–89. Hereafter this source will be abbreviated to *SpEx*.

³¹ Joseph F. Conwell, *Impelling Spirit; Revisiting a Founding Experience (1539): Ignatius Loyola and His Companions* (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1997), 72.

Admittedly, there is no “smoking gun” in the historical sources of which I am aware that explicitly names the Iñiguistas as the inspiration behind any part of the Jesuit way of proceeding, although, as I shall show, it is strongly insinuated in the “Formula of the Institute.” Yet I do believe the circumstantial evidence is compelling (like the above decrees of 1541), and all the more if we are cognizant of the drama provoked by the Iñiguistas. In Part II, therefore, I delineate some of what we know of these men; and in Part III, I offer a few examples of their relevance for our understanding of Jesuit history and spirituality.

II. The Iñiguistas

The First Group (Spain): 1524–1528

In 1524 and 1525, while Ignatius was studying Latin in Barcelona, three men chose to imitate his way of life: Calisto de Sa and Lope de Cáceres of Segovia and Juan de Arteaga of Estépa. We may reasonably assume that Ignatius gave them the Exercises, at least in the rudimentary form in which they existed at that time. At Ignatius’s prompting, Calisto first made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

The four friends moved to the University of Alcalá in March of 1526. Ignatius lodged and worked in the hospital of Antezana. There he won over a seventeen year old Frenchman, Juan de Reinalde, or “Juánico,” who had been wounded in a brawl.

This group was no accidental conjunction of like-minded personalities. Ignatius was refusing others who wished to join them, men such as Miguel Rodis, Bartolomé de Torres, and Juan Pascual.³² His selectivity is evidence both of his intentionality and of the existence of certain priorities in his own mind. All wore matching outfits similar to canonical religious and walked barefoot. The people called them *Iñiguistas*, meaning “followers of Iñigo,” and *los ensacados*, meaning “sack-wearers.”

Ignatius and Calisto enjoyed a special bond. Ignatius trusted him to share in his ministry of spiritual direction to women, no small confi-

³² Stewart Rose, *St. Ignatius Loyola and the Early Jesuits* (London: Burns & Oates, 1891), 107; *Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús*, Charles E. O’Neill and Joaquín M^a Dominquez, eds., 4 vols. (Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2001), 4:3819.

dence at a time when the least indiscretion could result in an ecclesial investigation. When Calisto fell gravely ill in Segovia, Ignatius walked barefoot all the way from Alcalá to obtain the merits for his recovery. When Ignatius was arrested shortly after his return, Calisto hurried to Alcalá, although he had not yet fully recovered, and asked to share the same cell.

Shortly after Ignatius's band arrived in Salamanca, he was invited to dinner by the Dominicans. Knowing he would be questioned about his theology, he invited Calisto to join him. As a result, both men were imprisoned together again. The group relocated yet again to the University of Paris in 1527, after the Inquisition had placed restrictions on their ministry in Spain.

The plan was that Ignatius would go ahead of them to prepare the way. Meanwhile, the others were to complete their studies in Salamanca. The Iñiguistas never made it to Paris. Indeed, even before Ignatius departed, Juanico had left the group to become a Franciscan. His motive is

Laínez and Polanco reported that two became Franciscans, and that one persevered in that vocation, while the other did not. The others were a motley bunch who made the misadventures of the earlier Iñiguistas pale by comparison.

unknown, but it seems likely the youth was frightened by the controversy surrounding his friends, and decided to join a canonically approved order. We know nothing else of his life. Cáceres returned to his hometown of Segovia. There, according to Ignatius, he lived "in such a way as suggested that he forgot his first intention."³³ In 1538, Arteaga became bishop of Chiapa, Mexico.³⁴ He remained well disposed to Ig-

³³ "Auto," no. 80. The expression "first intention" (*primer propósito*) was extremely loaded in the religious jargon of sixteenth-century Catholicism, as it denoted a serious religious commitment apart from a formal vow. It originated in the New Testament, where the sacred author rebukes widows for remarrying after they had dedicated their lives to the service of the Church (1 Tim. 5:2). See Conwell, *Impelling Spirit*, 339–66.

³⁴ For sources on Arteaga, see *Diccionario Bio-Bibliográfico de la Compañía de Jesús en Mexico*, ed. P. Francisco Zambrano, Instituto de Investigaciones Historicas de la Universidad Iberoamericana, 12 vols. (Editorial Jus, S.A. Mexico, 1961), 1:113–16.

natus, and before he left for the New World in the spring of 1541, he petitioned the new General for several Jesuits to staff his diocese. Ignatius declined. That September, Arteaga died when he accidentally drank a bottle of clear antiseptic instead of water. The bishop who replaced him was the saintly Bartolomé de Las Casas.

Calisto deeply embarrassed Ignatius by failing to appear in the Portuguese court to accept a royal scholarship that Ignatius had obtained by vouching on his behalf to the Doña Leonora de Mascarenhas. She had even offered Calisto a mule and money for his travels. Instead, he went to Mexico City with a *beata* named Catalina Hernández to establish a school for native girls.³⁵ His relationship with her provoked scandal, and he was expelled from the city.

Over the next few years Calisto made more trips to the “Indies” (the Americas), as was popular among Spaniards at that time, and became wealthy. He then settled in Salamanca, where his lavish lifestyle scandalized the locals who still remembered the poverty and preaching of the Iñiguistas.³⁶ Ignatius’s outrage may be safely presumed.

The Second Group (Paris): 1528–1535

In the spring of 1529, while still in correspondence with the Iñiguistas in Spain, Ignatius gave the Exercises to at least three students. Juan de Castro, age 44, from a noble family in Burgos, was a distinguished doctoral student and a member of the Sorbonne. Pedro Peralta, from the diocese of Toledo, was studying for his master’s degree; likewise he was renowned for his academics. Amador de Elduayén of the diocese of Pamplona was from a noble family, but not as intellectually illustrious as the others.

The effect of the Exercises on the three men was startling. They gave all their possessions to the poor, including their books, and moved to the poorhouse of St. Jacques, where Ignatius had lived for a time. Then they went begging through the streets. The sight of the university’s “golden boys” behaving this way proved too much for friends and colleagues, who went armed to the poorhouse to drag them back to the

³⁵ Munitiz and Endean, *St. Ignatius of Loyola*, 373 n.120. *Beatas* were Spanish laywomen renowned for their holiness and charitable works. Many were mystics, and were consulted by royalty and ecclesial authorities.

³⁶ “Auto,” no. 80.

university. Between them it was decided that the three men would finish their studies, after which they could do as they pleased.

The furor probably was just winding down in July of 1529 when Ignatius set off to visit a friend in Rouen who had fallen ill on his way to Spain. Ignatius gave him three letters to forward to Cáceres, Calisto, and Arteaga, an indication that he still entertained hopes of recalling them to Paris. A few days later, standing in the street, the pilgrim received word that his critics were taking advantage of his absence to press their grievances to the Inquisition, and that, once again, the university was in an uproar over his friends. Ignatius immediately set off for Paris, without even going to his room to collect his belongings, and when he arrived days later, he proceeded directly to the Inquisitor's office to defend himself.³⁷

The new investigations seem to have been the final straw for the survival of the second group. Castro obtained his doctorate in October of 1532, and in June of 1535 he entered the Carthusian charterhouse of *Val de Christo* near Valencia. There he died in 1556.³⁸ In 1532, Peralta began a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, but relatives had him apprehended while passing through Italy. In 1534 he became the canon of the Cathedral of Toledo, where he remained at least until 1554. Of Amador we know nothing more.

We find no explicit acknowledgment in the "Autobiography" that the Parisian men considered themselves a formal group as had the *Iñiguistas* in Spain, or that Ignatius had intended to recruit them for such. It is implied, however, where we read that Ignatius still wished to form a group when he left for Paris, and again that he put those desires on hold after Castro, Peralta, and Amador failed to persevere.³⁹ And years later, Polanco explicitly referred to them as Ignatius's second at-

³⁷ *FontNarr* 4:221.

³⁸ Ignatius visited Castro in the charterhouse on his return from Azpeitia to Venice in 1535. According to Carthusians who were there at the time, Ignatius informed Castro of the formation of the third group and its dedication to the apostolate, whereupon Castro volunteered to rejoin Ignatius. The pilgrim declined, telling Castro that he should honor his commitment to the Carthusians. See Daniel Bartoli, *History of the Life and Institute of St. Ignatius de Loyola*, trans. Marquesa de Calderon de la Barca, 2 vols. (New York: P.J. Kenedy, 1855), 1:245–46.

³⁹ "Auto," nos. 71, 82.

tempt: "They determined to leave the world and follow the way of life of Iñigo, although this second group, like the first, did not hold together well, all three later turning back from the path they had begun, albeit continuing to live virtuously."⁴⁰

The Third Group: Paris and Venice: 1536–1537

After the second failure, Ignatius waited two years before recruiting the first six of the Companions. But his efforts were not limited to those six. Polanco wrote of three men at the university who left Ignatius because he was not yet thinking of forming a canonical order.⁴¹ And Laínez estimated that Ignatius had "14 or 12 companions" when he returned to Spain for a home visit in 1535.⁴²

Who were these men, and what happened to them? Laínez and Polanco reported that two became Franciscans, and that one persevered in that vocation, while the other did not.⁴³ The others were a motley bunch who made the misadventures of the earlier Iñiguistas pale by comparison.

Jean Bochet, a Frenchman, made the Exercises under Favre in 1535. He then latched onto Favre as a companion. Bochet entered the Society in 1541, but left shortly afterward. He became a highwayman in Catalonia, which means that he was guilty of theft, assault, and presumably murder. He was captured and hanged.⁴⁴

Guillermo Postel, another Frenchman, was importuned by the Companions to join their group. One of the most brilliant and famous minds of his time, he mastered a dozen languages and wrote books on mathematics, philosophy, theology, and linguistics. Yet he was highly eccentric, and his work was riddled with outlandish theories. He en-

⁴⁰ *FontNarr* 1:179 (translation mine). See also *ibid.*, 2:309, 560. Bartoli quoted the Parisian Iñiguistas as saying to others at the university, "If you yourselves would listen to him, perhaps you also would wish to join him" (Bartoli, *History of the Life*, 1:147).

⁴¹ *FontNarr* 1:183.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 100.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 100, 183.

⁴⁴ Georg Schurhammer, *Francis Xavier, His Life, His Times*, trans. M. Joseph Costelloe, 4 vols. (Rome: IHSI, 1973), 1:253 n.59. See also *The Letters and Instructions of Francis Xavier*, trans. M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J. (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1992).

tered the Society in 1544, but Ignatius dismissed him two years later for making prophecies that scandalized the faithful. According to Ribadeneira, he was imprisoned in Rome by the Inquisition, and broke his arm while trying to squeeze through the window of his cell. He was imprisoned again, this time more harshly, and though he was eventually released, his writings were declared heretical.⁴⁵

Diego de Cáceres was particularly close to the Companions.⁴⁶ Favre called him “our very special friend and brother in Christ.”⁴⁷ When the Companions left Paris for Venice in 1537, Cáceres remained behind to finish his studies. He nonetheless made a special trip to be with them for their deliberations of 1539, and his name appears on several documents which they drafted at that time.⁴⁸

In 1542, shortly after his ordination, Cáceres left the Society and became a spy for the French crown. He was twice captured and imprisoned, so that the French suspected him of being a counterspy. They tortured Cáceres and left him permanently lame.⁴⁹ His sad fate and previous association with Ignatius appear to have been widely known throughout France, as we shall see shortly.

That the First Companions considered Cáceres a member of their inner circle was acknowledged by Nadal himself, who lamented in his lectures to Jesuits that, had it not been for Diego Hoces who died ear-

⁴⁵ For sources on Postel, see *Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús*, 4:3203.

⁴⁶ It is long debated whether Lope de Cáceres and Diego de Cáceres were the same person. Polanco answered negatively, Ribadeneira in the affirmative. See Juan A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolæ et rerum Societatis Iesu historica* (hereafter *Chron.*), 6 vols., vol. 1 of MHSI (Madrid, 1898–1901), 1:33; *FontNarr* 1:170–171; 2:544, 567; *EppMixt* 1:72n.1). I consider them distinct. Among other reasons, Polanco’s perspective seems more reliable insofar as he began collecting historical data on the Society in 1546 while working with Ignatius in Rome, that is, when reports about Diego would have been coming to Ignatius’s ears. At the same time, Ribadeneira was a teenaged scholastic in Padua.

⁴⁷ *FontNarr* 1:133.

⁴⁸ *Constitutiones Societatis Iesu: Monumenta Constitutionum prævia* (hereafter *Cons. I*), 3 vols., vol. 63 of MHSI (Rome: IHSI, 1943), 1:8, 13.

⁴⁹ *EppMixt* 1:72n.1.



ly, and Cáceres who “apostasized,” the Companions would have numbered twelve, like the Apostles.⁵⁰

Miguel Landívar was a teenager at the University of Paris who paid his tuition by working as a manservant for Xavier. He lost his job after his master chose to follow Ignatius in apostolic poverty. Landívar became so incensed that he entered Ignatius’s dormitory in the middle of the night with the intention of stabbing him. As he was climbing

Landívar asserted that the Companions were fugitives from the Inquisition in Spain and Paris, and that he himself had been witness to those events. These lies, coming from a known associate of Ignatius, were all the proof that many needed that Ignatius was not who he claimed to be.

the stairs, he heard a disembodied voice: “You wretch! What do you intend to do?” Landívar dropped the knife, fell at Ignatius’s feet, and begged forgiveness.⁵¹

When the Companions left Paris for Venice, Landívar followed after them to ask admission into their group. There he was accepted, in 1537, together with Fr. Antonio Arias. Both were

foolish choices. Landívar was emotionally volatile, easily manipulated, and of limited academic ability.⁵² Arias appears to have been something of a conniver, and had a weakness for money. According to Favre, he became mentally unhinged several years after leaving the Companions, when some of his own money was stolen.⁵³

Why Ignatius placed such trust in these two characters is a fascinating question without an obvious answer. But trust them he un-

⁵⁰ *FontNarr* 2:180. In the ancient and medieval Church, the term “apostasy” was applied to leaving religious life for the lay state and to leaving one religious community for another without permission. See Ignatius’s letter to Cardinal Charles of Lorraine (*Ignatii Epistolæ*, 11:449, or *Ignatius, Letters*, 673).

⁵¹ *FontNarr* 2:332; 4:767. Ignatius recounted the story to Ribadeneira in 1553.

⁵² See *EppMixt* 1:11–14; *FontNarr* 1:202; *B. Petri Fabri primi sacerdotis e Societate Jesu Epistolæ, memoriale, et processus* (hereafter *Faber*), vol. 48 of MHSI (Madrid, 1914; reprinted 1972), 157.

⁵³ *Faber*, 7–8. See also *Epistolæ P. Alphonsi Salmeronis* (hereafter *Salmeron*), 2 vols., vol. 30 of MHSI (Madrid, 1906–7), 1:67, 403.

doubtedly did. When he sent the Companions to Rome to request ordinations and permission for a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, he was so concerned that they make a favorable impression on the papal curia that he remained behind, lest his presence harm their chances with churchmen who disliked him. Yet Landívar and Arias were allowed to go. On April 3, 1537, the group successfully charmed Pope Paul III, who was eating a meal at the time. He gave them the permissions they desired and 60 *escudos* for the pilgrimage. Cardinals and professors standing around the table gave them 150 *escudos* more.

Then, on or about April 27, while the Companions were still in Rome and their paperwork was being processed, Landívar and Arias suddenly disappeared. The reason is unclear, but it seems they were attracted to the charismatic preaching of Augustine Mainardi, a Franciscan friar with Lutheran leanings, as were other Spaniards in Rome at that time. There is also evidence to suggest that Arias had stolen some of the Companions' funds before leaving.⁵⁴ Whatever the truth, the fact remained that the curia had to be informed of the departures.⁵⁵ The Companions were surely mortified.

The Companions returned to Venice to be ordained and to await passage to the Holy Land. At some point during that interval, Landívar reappeared on their doorstep and pleaded to be readmitted. Ignatius allowed him to stay in the house. The evidence is unclear whether Ignatius intended to accept him back into the group, but the fact that Landívar disappeared again a few days later seems to indicate the negative.

⁵⁴ According to Landívar (by no means a trustworthy source), he had been chiding Arias for their defections, when Arias responded, "What do I care what [people] say about me? How would they know if I gave the money to the poor or if [the Companions] dismissed me in Rome?" (*EppMixt* 1:13; translation mine).

⁵⁵ There is no question that the curia knew of the departures. Landívar's name appears on a curial document dated April 27, 1537, approving ordinations for the Companions (*FontDoc*, 526); and another document dated April 29 mentions "twelve associates" of Favre, which would have included Landívar, Arias, Hoces, and Ignatius (*ibid.*, 528). As these documents took several days to process, Landívar and Arias were included in them despite the fact that they had already left. For on the same date of April 29, the papal treasurer recorded funds given to only eleven companions (*Schurhammer, Francis Xavier*, 1:339n.226).

In September of 1537, shortly before Ignatius, Favre, and Laínez left for Rome, Ignatius received a letter from Landívar. It began with an apology for leaving, and an admission of Landívar's inconstancy. Landívar continued:

The day that I left you, I had supper with Master Arias. He received me with a happy and jovial expression, or so it seemed to me. Before, during and after dinner he grilled me about each one of you with skill and great efficiency, namely, about how you were, and what you were saying about him.

I responded as well as I could regarding the first point. As for the second, I told him that I was marveling that such a man as he, so prudent and learned, and so in-the-know about interior and exterior secrets, could harbor suspicions that [the Companions] would say anything bad or improper about anyone, or would tell others anything about their business that was not entirely true; and especially since their way is clearly holy and dedicated to the apostolic life, without any of the fictions of the Illuminati or false servants of God, who are really from the Devil. You know well that [the Companions] work to help others, and to walk with those who wander off the beaten path. And for doing good they receive evil in return.⁵⁶

The remainder of Landívar's letter suggests that he still entertained hopes of one day being a Companion. To that end, he placed most of the blame for his first defection on Arias, whom he accused of luring him from the group. To bolster his case, Landívar informed Ignatius that Arias had taken residence in the home of a pious widow, where he scandalized her by stealing an expensive book "of secrets" (meaning a book on the occult) and then inviting men into his room for sex.⁵⁷ Landívar told Arias that he might report him to the Pope, in retaliation for what Arias had done to him.

⁵⁶ *EppMixt* 1:11–12 (translation mine). "Interior and exterior secrets" probably alludes to the occult.

⁵⁷ The MHSI editors excised that part of the letter which referred to Arias's purported sexual activity (*EppMixt* 1:14n.1). Its content is described by Schurhammer, *Francis Xavier*, 1:363–65.

Landívar probably hoped that Ignatius would be pleased by that threat. But the possibility that Arias's behavior might come to the ears of Paul III (the same pope who saw Arias standing side by side with the Companions) must have horrified Ignatius. Homosexual activity and the occult were both popularly associated with the Illuminati, the same people from whom Ignatius was trying so desperately to distance himself.⁵⁸

Incredibly, the story does not end there. Shortly after Ignatius, Favre, and Laínez settled in Rome, Landívar appeared on their doorstep once again and asked admittance to the group. Ignatius took him into the house, but refused his request. In retaliation, Landívar found Brother Augustine, and together they accused the Companions of Lutheranism and "immoral behavior" (typically a euphemism for sexual misconduct). Landívar asserted that the Companions were fugitives from the Inquisition in Spain and Paris, and that he himself had been witness to those events. These lies, coming from a known associate of Ignatius, were all the proof that many needed that Ignatius was not who he claimed to be. Brother Augustine, only too happy to turn the tables on Laínez and Favre (who a month before had reported him for heresy), cited Landívar's defection as proof of the Companions' corruption.

Diego Hoces joined in Venice in 1536, and had he not died a little less than two years later, he would have been a founding father of the Society.

The uproar in Rome lasted eight months. Many said that Ignatius and his friends finally would burn at the stake.⁵⁹ Not surprisingly, two priests who were known associates of Ignatius, Lorenzo García

⁵⁸ Seven years after papal approbation of the Society, the Inquisitor of Rome was still accusing Jesuits of being Illuminati, sodomites, heretics, and abusers of the confessional. See Pietro Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia*, 5 vols. (Rome: La Cività Cattolica, 1950), I.2:278–81.

⁵⁹ *FontNarr* 3:110, as translated by Joseph F. Conwell, *A Brief and Exact Account: The Recollections of Simão Rodrigues on the Origin and Progress of the Society of Jesus* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2004), 77. See Ignatius's letter to a Franciscan who vowed to see all Jesuits burn at the stake (*Ignatii Epistolæ*, 1:408–9; or Ignatius, *Letters*, 142), and *FontNarr* 1:180.

and Mateo Pasqual, fled the city, despite Ignatius's having met with García secretly in a grotto to reassure him. Ignatius later wrote to Isabel Roser that "[w]e experienced the severest opposition or persecution that we have ever experienced in this life. . . . [The accusers] were making us suspect and hateful to the people, causing great scandal."⁶⁰

Finally, at a Roman trial, Ignatius cleared his name by showing the governor the aforementioned letter in which Landívar had praised the Companions' orthodoxy. In punishment, Landívar was expelled from the city. If Ignatius had not been able to produce that letter, papal approbation of the Society almost certainly would have been thwarted.

García had known the Companions in Paris. Together with Diego de Cáceres, he obtained a certificate of orthodoxy from the Parisian Inquisitor on their behalf after they had left for Venice.⁶¹ In 1538 he was living with Ignatius in Rome, and was granted privileges along with the Companions to preach publicly and absolve from censures. After the Roman crisis erupted and García fled, the authorities managed to track him down in a small town just north of the city. They interrogated him about various claims that Landívar was making. Was it true that García overheard Ignatius boasting that he (Ignatius) would receive greater glory in heaven than St. Paul? García answered that he had lied to Landívar while in a bad mood, and that he had no accusation to make against the pilgrim.

Three years later, Favre was passing through Perpignan in southern France when he encountered García. Favre wrote to Ignatius as follows:

[H]ighly excited and with tears pouring from his eyes, [García] threw himself on his knees before me. He begged my pardon and would rise only when I insisted on it. I was not able to get away from him until he had tagged after me for four leagues, all the while telling me of the sufferings he had endured since he quit Rome and of his inmost desire to be a member of our Company again. He insistently asked me to write for him and in his name to beg your pardon and present his plea that you receive him

⁶⁰ *Ignatii Epistolæ* 1:137–38, or Ignatius, *Letters*, 35.

⁶¹ *FontDoc*, 524–25.

even as one of your hirelings. I believe that without question he will soon be on his way to Rome.⁶²

As if to prove the saying that there is no honor among thieves, García told Favre that Landívar was blaming his defection partly on García, while García was blaming his own defection on Pasqual.

To be sure, not all of the Iñiguistas failed to persevere or created scandal. Diego Hoces joined in Venice in 1536, and had he not died a little less than two years later, he would have been a founding father of the Society. The Companions' affection for him was such that he is still called "the first to die in the Society," even though the Society was not yet canonically approved. Manuel Miona, confessor to Ignatius in Spain and Paris, entered the Society in 1544. Diego de Eguia had known the Companions at the university, as did his brother Esteban de Eguia, a widower. Both became Jesuits. Antonio Araoz, a relative of Ignatius by marriage, joined the group in Venice, and in 1547 he became the first provincial of Spain.

III. Evidence and Relevance of the Impact

The drama provoked by the Iñiguistas was considerable, to say the least. On that basis alone one could be forgiven for asserting, without further evidence, that they were deeply influential on the Companions and their ideas for the Society. Yet clues to that effect do exist.

Spiritual Exercises and "Autobiography"

Ignatius wrote in the *Exercises* that "one should say nothing to defame another or to spread gossip, because if I make known a mortal sin which is not public knowledge, I sin mortally, and if the sin is venial, I sin venially, while if it is a defect, I show my own defect."⁶³ Exceptions were possible only

⁶² *Faber*, 156–57; *Ignatii Epistolæ*, 1:187 n.4, or as translated by William V. Bangert in his *To the Other Towns: A Life of Blessed Peter Favre*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1959), 150.

⁶³ *SpEx* no. 41.

[w]hen the sin is public, as in the case of a public prostitute, and where a sentence has already been passed in court, or a public error poisons the minds of those with whom one deals . . . [or w]hen a hidden sin is revealed to someone so that such a person can help the sinner to rise from sin; however, there should be some expectation or probable likelihood that help can be given.⁶⁴

Early Jesuits attested that Ignatius was meticulous about following his own advice.⁶⁵ This was especially evident during his tenure as superior general, when he often was obliged to consult his aides about the misconduct of Jesuits.

So what can it mean, then, that Ignatius explicitly named his former companions and their misdeeds in the “Autobiography,” while knowing perfectly well that his words were being recorded for posterity?

In other words, even if Ignatius and the Companions had erred by accepting unqualified men in Spain, Paris, and Venice, the founding fathers of the new Society as such had not.

If we take Ignatius at his word, we must conclude that knowledge of these men, their defections, and their scandals was already widespread. Of course, we already know this is true from other sources. But we find another hint of it in the “Autobiography.” There, Landívar is introduced

to readers abruptly and by first name only: “Miguel began to cause trouble and to speak ill of the pilgrim.”⁶⁶ Clearly it was presumed that readers already knew the story.

We can conclude something else too. Ignatius was deeply concerned that the Iñiguistas’ failures to persevere would “poison the minds” of Jesuits unless he somehow addressed the matter. He understood that Nadal and others had asked him to dictate his memoirs for the edification of Jesuits. In this light, Ignatius would not have wanted the Iñiguistas to be viewed as a legitimate precedent for leaving the particular way of life that he espoused (that is, emphasis on the aposto-

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ *Scripta de Sancto Ignacio* 1:197, 274, 320, 331–32; *FontNarr* 2:389.

⁶⁶ “Auto,” no. 98.

late, not long hours of prayer) and that many still regarded with suspicion, including many new Jesuits!

Consequently, there is more to the “Autobiography” than meets the eye, where we read that Arteaga became a bishop in Mexico.⁶⁷ Ignatius certainly did not consider episcopal ordination sinful in itself, but the fact remains that, in the sixteenth century, it was commonly associated with a means to riches, honor, and privilege. Many bishops, preoccupied with benefices and other financial gains, never stepped foot in their own dioceses, much less ministered to the faithful. Probably for that reason, a number of reputable nominees refused the bishopric in Mexico before Arteaga finally accepted it.⁶⁸ To be clear, there is no evidence that Arteaga was not a worthy shepherd. Nonetheless, in this historical context, he would have been widely perceived as having failed the ideals of the Two Standards. Ignatius would have been well aware of that when he related Arteaga’s story.

The “Formula of the Institute”

In 1539, the Companions submitted a draft of the “Formula” for papal approval. Though all contributed to its content, Ignatius probably was its immediate author.⁶⁹ Near the end he wrote:

By experience we have learned that the path has many and great difficulties connected with it. Consequently we have judged it opportune to admonish those not to fall, under the appearance of good, into these two things we have avoided.

One is [not to impose mortifications].

The other is that no one be received into the Society unless he has first been tested for a long time and very diligently; and only when he appears prudent in Christ and conspicuous either in learning or in holiness of life may he be admitted into the militia of Jesus Christ.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 80.

⁶⁸ Marcel Bataillon, “L’Iniguiste et la Beata: Premier voyage de Calisto à Mexico,” *Revista de historia de América* 31 (1951): 62.

⁶⁹ Conwell, *Impelling Spirit*, 21–26.

⁷⁰ *Cons. I*, no. 20; or Antonio M. de Aldama, *The Formula of the Institute: Notes for a Commentary*, trans. Ignacio Echániz (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1990),

Ignatius's words "by experience" allow for several interpretations. Perhaps the most innocuous is that the Companions logically concluded that it would not be wise to accept immature or unskilled men in light of the difficulties that they themselves had experienced in their rigorous lifestyle. Thus interpreted, there is no implication

In Ignatius's day, religious life (canonical or informal) was considered a safer and surer path to salvation than life "in the world." Hence, monasteries and mendicant orders generally felt obliged to accept anyone who applied, regardless of skills or personality.

that the Companions ever erred by accepting unqualified men in the past. Indeed, Ignatius appears to confirm that interpretation where he wrote that "we have avoided" that mistake.

But of course, the Companions had *not* avoided that mistake, not by a long shot. Does this mean that Ignatius was being disingenuous? Not

exactly. We must remember that knowledge of the Iñiguistas was so widespread that any whitewashing of history in the "Formula" would have been easily recognized.

An alternative interpretation of the "Formula" is possible if we grant that the First Companions understood themselves to possess a new corporate history that began with the Pope's verbal approval of the Society in 1539. In other words, even if Ignatius and the Companions had erred by accepting unqualified men in Spain, Paris, and Venice, the founding fathers of the new Society *as such* had not.

This distinction might seem like a stretch. It is not. Early Jesuits sometimes distanced the Society from the Iñiguistas by splitting some very fine hairs. In 1555, for example, Polanco wrote to Broët about "Cáceres" (presumably Diego, the French spy):

The thought came to us that the theologians' decree [against the Society at the University of Paris] seems to imply that some member of our Society had incurred the stigma of criminality or infamy. While we are unable to think of anyone who might reasonably have afforded a basis for such a claim, it did occur to us

that Cáceres may once have said he belonged to our Society; but Your Reverence knows that he never did.⁷¹

Polanco's denial of Cáceres's membership in the Society was true only in the strict sense that Cáceres was not professed when he left in 1541. He participated in the Companions' deliberations of 1539, and he lived and studied with Jesuits in Paris after the Society was founded in 1540. And again, Nadal asserted that Cáceres would have been a founder of the Society had he not remained in Paris to finish his studies.⁷²

The elderly Rodrigues, after outliving all the other Companions, implied in his memoirs that they had never accepted Landívar into their group. This decision, he claimed, was based on Landívar's poor academic skills.⁷³ Polanco affirmed likewise.⁷⁴ But how these two Jesuits understood "acceptance into the group" is curious at best, since Landívar had stood with the Companions at the papal audience of 1537. Had he not left them, he would have been ordained with them and received the same papal privileges as they.

Even Ignatius put Landívar and Arias at arm's length. In 1537, shortly after the Roman crisis ended, he wrote to Juan Verdolay, a Spanish priest whom he was trying to recruit for his group:⁷⁵

In mid-January nine friends of mine in the Lord arrived [in Venice] from Paris—all masters of arts and well versed in theology, four of them Spaniards, two Frenchmen, two from Savoy, and one from Portugal. . . . [Two months later] they went to Rome, along with some others who followed them with the same resolves, to spend Holy Week there.⁷⁶

⁷¹ *Ignatii Epistolæ*, 8:542, or Ignatius, *Letters*, 555.

⁷² *FontNarr* 2:180. On another comment by Polanco (*ibid.*, 1:171), Marcel Bataillon remarked, "Without a doubt, the first group of Iñiguistas is not so completely distinct as Polanco insinuates from the group that will found the Society in 1539" (Bataillon, "L'Iñiguiste," 59; translation mine).

⁷³ Conwell, *Brief and Exact*, 79.

⁷⁴ *FontNarr* 2:590.

⁷⁵ Magaña, "We Are of the Society of Jesus," 17–18. Verdolay joined the Society in 1556 but left eight years later for the Carthusians (*EppMixt* 5:555–56).

⁷⁶ *Ignatii Epistolæ* 12:321, or Ignatius, *Letters*, 29.

The “others” were Landívar and Arias. Ignatius did not mention that they later left him; perhaps Verdolay already knew. By distinguishing his “friends in the Lord” from “the others,” Ignatius appears to want to imply that he had a core group untouched by inconstancy. Of course, one could argue that in Venice perhaps Ignatius really was distinguishing between “core” and “tentative” companions. But even if that were true, the distinction could not have been worth much if Ignatius still allowed Landívar and Arias to present themselves before the Pope with so much on the line.

By way of comparison, what Ignatius wrote to a friend about Landívar shortly *before* the Roman crisis broke out seems to imply that Landívar had been accepted as one of the Companions: “Master Miguel is here [in Venice] leading an entirely new life. Regarding him and everything else you will enjoy hearing about I am writing at length to Favre, from whom you can get a complete report.”⁷⁷

Ignatius’s words are more significant than they appear. “This life” and “this way of life” were common metaphors in the sixteenth century to denote canonical religious life or a private commitment to the evangelical counsels.⁷⁸ The Companions used them often to denote their form of apostolic life, as is evident in the “Autobiography” and their letters. As a result, the assertion that Landívar was leading “an entirely new life” did not mean simply that he was living virtuously, but that he had committed himself to the form of life of the Companions.

If we read the “Formula” in light of the Iñiguistas, it provides fascinating insights into the lessons Ignatius learned. That unqualified men had been accepted “under the appearance of good” (*recti specie*) could have meant several things. In Ignatius’s day, religious life (canonical or informal) was considered a safer and surer path to salvation than life “in the world.” Hence, monasteries and mendicant orders generally felt obliged to accept anyone who applied, regardless of skills or personality. And thus, according to Ribadeneira, Ignatius initially had accepted Landívar out of concern for the latter’s salvation and consolation.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ *EppMixt* 1:111, or Ignatius, *Letters*, 25.

⁷⁸ See Conwell, *Impelling Spirit*, 291–98.

⁷⁹ *FontNarr* 4:767.

Another reading of *recti specie* is that Ignatius had been fixated on forming the largest group possible for the sake of the “more universal good,” a Thomistic principle that he explained at length in the *Constitutions*.⁸⁰ That is, in the beginning, Ignatius might have been more preoccupied with quantity over quality. But if that were the case, he certainly learned from his mistake. Polanco later wrote: “Although in the beginning Ignatius did not make it difficult to admit persons to the Society, later he began to clench his hand, and to say that, if there were one thing that made him want to live longer . . . it would be to make it more difficult to receive men into Society.”⁸¹

A third possibility, albeit more speculative, is that Ignatius had persuaded himself to accept these men from a pious desire to re-create the Apostolic College. As noted earlier, many believed that the long-awaited reform movement would possess twelve members at its core.⁸² In this light, it is notable that the addition of Landívar and Arias in Venice brought their number to twelve (not counting Hoces, who had not joined yet). Perhaps Ignatius thought he saw a providential sign: weak but redeemable men who still could become effective apostles, like the original Twelve.

*Perhaps Ignatius thought he saw
a providential sign: weak but
redeemable men who still could
become effective apostles, like the
original Twelve.*

Whatever Ignatius meant by *recti specie*, his affirmation that, based on the Companions’ experience, future Jesuits should not accept unqualified men under the appearance of good, certainly appears to be an allusion to the Iñiguistas. That he would allude to them

⁸⁰ *Cons.*, nos. 618–32.

⁸¹ *FontNarr* 3:611 (translation mine).

⁸² I am unaware of any historical sources that posit re-creating the Twelve Apostles as a goal of Ignatius, nor have I found it held by any modern writer. Nevertheless, Ignatius’s contemporaries often alluded to his missed chance to re-create the Twelve, making it plausible that he had spoken to them of it, or at least that it had been on his mind. Ribadeneira, for instance, wrote that the Companions arrived in Venice “with another two companions” [namely, Landívar and Arias], “so that together they numbered twelve” (*Epistolæ S. Francisci Xaverii aliaque eius scripta*, 2 vols., vol. 67 of MHSI [Rome: 1944–45], 2:820). See *FontNarr* 1:466; 2:178, 180; *Ignatii Epistolæ*, 2:52; 8:461; 12:332–33.

in such a fundamental text as the “Formula of the Institute” speaks volumes about the influence that they had on him. It also speaks to the Iñiguistas’ influence on two of the Society’s distinguishing characteristics, as also mentioned in the “Formula”: its admissions criteria and the long formation of its men.

First Vows in the Society

In 1535 Ignatius returned to Spain for a number of reasons: to restore his health in his “native air,” to make amends to his townspeople for the bad example he had set as a youth, to assure the parents of his Companions that their sons were safe, and to try to persuade some of his former companions to rejoin his new group. The trip, made on foot, meant Ignatius would be separated from the Companions for almost a year.

Looking back on that day when Ignatius said goodbye to his friends in Paris, the elderly Rodrigues described what had been going through their minds.

The companions mourned the fact that their Father was gone, as was right, but because of his absence their burning desire to persevere did not grow cold. For their hope and strength was placed in God. For just as each one by himself, freely, before he had heard of the vocation and determination of any other, began to aspire to this one pattern of living, so each one firmly decided within himself that even if the others defected, he would put his hand to the plow and not look back.⁸³

Granted that Rodrigues might have been romanticizing a bit, if we accept the essence of his account, it means that perseverance was front and center in the collective consciousness of the Companions. Why? Fr. Joseph Conwell suggested (not in the above context) that the men harbored private fears that they could not persevere in such a selfless, rigorous lifestyle until their deaths.⁸⁴ This does seem likely. Nevertheless, I venture that, at the moment of their farewell, what probably weighed even more heavily on them were the failures of Ignatius’s ear-

⁸³ *FontNarr* 3:28, or as translated in Conwell, *Brief and Exact*, 23. Note the expression “pattern of living” to refer to the vocation of the Companions.

⁸⁴ Conwell, *ibid.*, 28.

lier groups. The first disbanded while Ignatius was away in Paris, and the second began to unravel while he was in Rouen. How could the Companions be sure that their own union would not dissolve during Ignatius's long absence in Spain?

Ribadeneira insinuated this very thing in his life of Ignatius. Describing the Companions' farewell in Paris, he wrote, "They would remain united and joined in such a way that they made a body, with the result that neither bodily absence, nor physical distance between them, nor interval of time, could serve to dampen the love so strong and dear that they now had for each other in God."⁸⁵

That the Companions were preoccupied with perseverance, and that this derived from their experience of the *Iñiguistas*, was implied in a short life of Ignatius written by Laínez in 1547 (while Ignatius was still alive), and still more strongly in Polanco's biography written a few months later.⁸⁶ Both affirmed that Ignatius, before leaving Paris, took measures to ensure that the group would be preserved. The first was the vows at Montmartre. The second was to leave someone in charge, namely Favre, something that Ignatius apparently had not done for the first two groups. A third measure was to arrange for frequent group meetings and reception of the sacraments.

In both accounts by Laínez and Polanco, the paragraph that lists the three "aids to perseverance" follows another paragraph in which are acknowledged all the men who had already abandoned Ignatius in Paris. By arranging their narratives in this manner, Laínez and Polanco implied that the vows at Montmartre were motivated largely by the memory of the *Iñiguistas*.

That the vows at Montmartre were as much a response to the negative memory of the *Iñiguistas* as a positive expression of devotion might strike us today as a little disappointing. Nonetheless, it would not be the last time that numerous departures from the Society prompted certain practical responses that, were one ignorant of their true origins, would still seem entirely fitting in their own right. One example is the so-called "Arrupe Month" of prayer and reflection for men about to be ordained, which was suggested by Fr. Arrupe in a letter to the whole Society in December of 1979.

⁸⁵ *FontNarr* 4:281 (translation mine).

⁸⁶ For a translation of both Lives, see Alburquerque, *Diego Laínez*.

Another example is Ignatius's institution of simple vows. When the Society was founded in 1540, simple vows did not exist. Scholastics made solemn vows only, at the end of theology studies. In the meantime, they were obligated to remain in the Society only insofar as they had made a personal resolution to do so. (Some made private vows to reinforce their resolutions.) Only six years later, however, Ignatius became alarmed at the number of men leaving during studies. In response, he required that they make a promise to "enter the Society" (that is, to profess solemn vows) after their studies were complete. In other words, as odd as it sounds, they had to promise to make a promise.⁸⁷ This was the origin of the simple, perpetual vows that are practiced to this day.

In 1547, Ignatius wrote a letter to a student at Louvain who desired to enter the Society and who had formed a student community to that end:

My second suggestion is that while you speak of vows of poverty and chastity, you speak of a "resolve" [*propositum*], not a vow, to enter the Society. Now, while I have no wish to induce anyone to undertake our way of life unless called thereto by God, I want you to know that we are normally unwilling to exercise government over persons committed to our care unless they have confirmed by vow their intention of entering the Society; your government will be very weak over such persons who are free to withdraw from it at will.⁸⁸

Simple vows immediately provoked ire and confusion among Jesuits and other religious. The first reason was that, insofar as Ignatius had instituted them as a practical response to a particular problem, they lacked a theological basis in a way that solemn vows did not.⁸⁹ In

⁸⁷ Hence the wording "I promise that I shall enter that same Society" in the formula for first vows (Cons., no. 540).

⁸⁸ *Ignatii Epistolæ*, 1:661–62, or as translated in Ignatius, *Letters*, 228.

⁸⁹ See Antonio M. de Aldama, *An Introductory Commentary on the Constitutions*, trans. Aloysius J. Owen (Rome: CIS, 1989), 201–13. Ignatius did not write the formula for simple vows. According to Polanco, a novice wrote it, Ignatius liked it, and others began to use it (*Ignatii Epistolæ*, 2:471). Consequently, attempts to elaborate a theology of simple vows based on that formula should be taken with a grain of salt.

the traditional theology of religious life, those who made solemn vows at the end of a one-year novitiate were understood to consecrate themselves entirely to God. The irrevocability of that gift, that is to say, the complete and utter surrender, was essential to that consecration, and it defined a person as a “religious.”

But Jesuit simple vows created a dilemma. Were scholastics consecrated to God or not? If they were, the Society had no right to expel them for not being expedient to the Society’s mission. The Society was presuming to interfere in the private surrender that the scholastics had made to God and, furthermore, the Society was placing their souls in greater peril by sending them back into “the world.” But if scholastics

In Dominus ac Redemptor, the bull that suppressed the Society in 1773, Pope Clement XIV cited simple vows as a reason for the unceasing rancor that the Society brought to the Church.

were *not* consecrated, then they were not true religious. They did not deserve to enjoy the papal privileges granted to the Society, nor to receive the graces promised in the Constitutions to those who belonged to the Society.

Simple vows were also accused of being unjust. Scholastics swore to remain in the Society until death, but the Society for its part made no promise to keep them, and could dismiss them at any time. Consequently, it was argued, scholastics could not live tranquilly with a Sword of Damocles over their heads. This particular objection was raised so quickly that Ignatius was obliged to defend himself in a later revision of the *Constitutions*:

Their being bound on their side is good, since their stability is sought; and, as appears in the apostolic bull, it is not unjust for the Society to have the liberty to dismiss them when their remaining in it is not expedient. For in that case they remain free; and an individual can more easily fail to do his duty than the Society or its general, who alone will be able to dismiss; and he ought not to do it without highly sufficient reasons, as will be seen in Part II of the *Constitutions*.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ *Cons.*, no. 120.

Note that Ignatius is clear about the motive for the simple vows: the stability of the men. He is also clear about the proper reason for their dismissal: that which is “expedient” for the work of the Society.

The debate caused by simple vows lasted well into the twentieth century. Pope Gregory XIII declared that scholastics were true religious in *Quanto fructuosius* (1583) and *Ascendente Domino* (1584). He did not offer a theological explanation for that assertion, but simply noted the utility of simple vows for a successful apostolic order. This did not mollify the critics. In *Dominus ac Redemptor*, the bull that suppressed the Society in 1773, Pope Clement XIV cited simple vows as a reason for the unceasing rancor that the Society brought to the Church. In 1886, Pope Leo XIII issued the brief *Dolemus inter alias* in which he defended the Society’s practice. And in 1918 Pope Benedict XV reportedly said the following to one Jesuit Father Nalbone:

How beautiful are your simple vows! How pleasing and satisfying they are to me! They deserve to be kept in the Church and I will not permit the Society to be deprived of so fine an ornament, so noble a privilege. I want it to be preserved. Assure the general that we shall leave this privilege intact.⁹¹

Why is all this important? It taxes the imagination to suppose that simple vows were something that Ignatius conceived *a priori* as the most logical way of proceeding for an apostolic religious order, when those vows were lacking a theological basis, when they left new Jesuits confused about the nature of their commitment, when they were widely perceived as being unjust, and when they stirred unremitting hostility toward the Society. Far more likely is it that simple vows were Ignatius’s practical response to the numerous men who left him, who publicly embarrassed him, who had him investigated by the Inquisition, and who nearly cost him the Society.

Annotation 15: “Dealing Directly with the Creature”

Ever since Polanco’s *Chronicon*, the standard explanation of Jesuit historians for the defection of the Iñiguistas in Spain is that they lost their enthusiasm while Ignatius was in Paris. Be that as it may, we should not let our devotion to Ignatius lead us to the facile conclu-

⁹¹ Cited in Aldama, *Introductory Commentary*, 212.

sion that his friends were men of lesser mettle.⁹² To be fair, we might ask whether the fault was entirely theirs. Is it possible that Ignatius was such a powerful personality, so driven in his mission, that without his realizing it, he had never really listened to them? Did he essentially push them from Barcelona to Alcalá to Salamanca despite their hesitations? Had their decision to go to Paris really been *his* decision? Or when Ignatius directed them in the Exercises, had he coerced them into electing his way of life? If any of these speculations are even partly true, we could forgive the Iñiguistas for later losing enthusiasm.

Given what we know of the young pilgrim's passion and inexperience, it seems plausible that he could have fallen into the temptation of foisting his ideals on others or presuming that his experiences of God applied to everyone else.

When he was being investigated in Alcalá, he admitted to the Inquisitor that he had been telling people what consolations and desolations to expect, and *when*, based on his experience at Manresa.⁹³ It is also suggestive that each of the Companions resolved to make a pilgrimage to Jeru-

Modern writers not infrequently contend that Ignatius believed that each person received a unique, particular call, which, as such, cannot be anticipated on the basis of public revelation and universal norms.

salem after making the Exercises (except Xavier, who made the resolution before the Exercises), a plan that just so happened to be Ignatius's personal obsession ever since he had been expelled from the Holy Land by the Franciscans.

These considerations have repercussions for how we interpret annotation 15 of the *Exercises*, where Ignatius warns spiritual directors not to impose their own ideals on exercitants, but rather, "to leave the Creator to work directly with the creature, and the creature with the Creator and Lord." Today, spiritual writers tend to place tremendous weight on this text. They interpret it as Ignatius's affirmation of a criti-

⁹² Fr. Bartoli opined that the Iñiguistas "were not strong enough to follow in the footsteps of a giant" (Bartoli, *History of the Life*, 1:146).

⁹³ *FontDoc* 340. See also Paul Dudon, *St. Ignatius of Loyola*, trans. William J. Young (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing, 1949), 113–15.

cal theological principle, namely, that God communicates directly to individuals in their interiorities, as opposed to an idea commonly held in the sixteenth century that, for most Christians, knowledge of God was limited to the public revelation of Scripture and Tradition.

This principle, in turn, is said to embody that watershed moment in the history of Christian spirituality when attention shifted from a medieval emphasis on *universals* (meaning ideas and rational norms that apply to everyone) to the Renaissance recovery of the *particular* (meaning the uniqueness of each person and his or her circumstances).⁹⁴ For example, in the ancient and medieval Church, celibacy was widely understood as an open invitation to all the faithful, so that each Christian must discern his or her state of life from the standpoint that the ideal response was already known. In contrast, modern writers not infrequently contend that Ignatius believed that each person received a unique, particular call, which, as such, cannot be anticipated on the basis of public revelation and universal norms.⁹⁵

Rather, I believe we can take heart in the realization that the golden age of the first Jesuits was really no more golden than ours.

particular (meaning the uniqueness of each person and his or her circumstances).⁹⁴ For example, in the ancient and medieval Church, celibacy was widely understood as an open invitation to all the faithful, so that each Christian must discern his or her state of life from the standpoint that the ideal response was already known. In contrast, modern writers not infrequently contend that Ignatius believed that each person received a unique, particular call, which, as such, cannot be anticipated on the basis of public revelation and universal norms.⁹⁵

But labels have consequences. The more we stress annotation 15 as a theological principle, the more readily we can conclude that a director voicing an opinion to an exercitant *by its nature* violates the spirit of the *Exercises*. That is, if the goal is immediate communication between God and the creature, then placing a director into that dynamic *ipso facto* interrupts that immediacy (to say nothing of directors who actively encourage or discourage exercitants). Such appears to be the presupposition at work when we hear that the fundamental duty of direc-

But labels have consequences. The more we stress annotation 15 as a theological principle, the more readily we can conclude that a director voicing an opinion to an exercitant *by its nature* violates the spirit of the *Exercises*. That is, if the goal is immediate communication between God and the creature, then placing a director into that dynamic *ipso facto* interrupts that immediacy (to say nothing of directors who actively encourage or discourage exercitants). Such appears to be the presupposition at work when we hear that the fundamental duty of direc-

⁹⁴ E.g., Karl Rahner, "The Logic of Concrete Individual Knowledge in Ignatius Loyola," in *The Dynamic Element in the Church*, translated by W. J. O'Hara (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), 84–170; Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Christian State of Life*, trans. Mary Frances McCarthy (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1983), 391. John O'Malley maintains in *The First Jesuits* that the spirituality and ministries of the new Society were generally reflective of this shift, although the Jesuits themselves were often unconscious of it. On annotation 15, see *ibid.*, pp. 373–74.

⁹⁵ E.g., Von Balthasar, *ibid.*, 396; Conwell, *Impelling Spirit*, 312.

tors is to “get out of the way,” and even in one case, that directors are a “walking contradiction.”⁹⁶

Ignatius’s experience with the Iñiguistas provides us with an alternative approach to annotation 15. What if he meant it not so much as a theological principle as a practical warning? In other words, perhaps Ignatius simply wanted exercitants to be satisfied that the elections they made were truly *theirs*, and not their directors’.

In 1554 Dr. Bartholomé de Torres (an early friend of the Society) defended annotation 15 in just this manner.

[F]or the one giving the Exercises, it is indeed licit to persuade and counsel the one who makes the Exercises to enter religious life. Fr. Ignatius does not deny this. He does not say that one who gives the Exercises acts wrongly in counselling one to enter religious life, but rather he says that one should not push him [*impellere*] into religious life. He wants to say that one should not force or compel aggressively [*forçar e induzir con alguna violentia*], but rather leave him in freedom.⁹⁷

The following year, Ignatius made the same point to Fr. Juan Victoria. In the latter’s words, Ignatius explained that

[a director should not urge an exercitant] to choose one or another state, unless the exercitant already feels himself inclined to a particular state and has told him this, then he may, after careful reflection (and supposing, as I have said, that he has permission) tell the exercitant what he thinks in the presence of the Lord, if he judges that saying it at that point might confirm the exercitant in his good resolve or help him to turn away from something that is less good and to place himself back in God’s hands to be guided by him. But, as I have said, he must constantly be on guard not to talk about anything which might suggest that he is trying to push

⁹⁶ Frank Wallace, “Spiritual Direction,” in *The Christian Ministry of Spiritual Direction*, The Best of the Review, no. 3, edited by David Fleming (St. Louis: Review for Religious, 1988), 88–89.

⁹⁷ *Exercitia Spiritualia Sancti Ignatii de Loyola et eorum Directoria*, 2 vols., vol. 19 of MHSI (Rome: IHSI, 1919), 1:657 (translation mine). See also Dr. Vergara’s explanation of annotation 15 (*ibid.*, 672–73).



him toward the Society. This would be against the rule of the *Exercises* [annotation 15] and against the purity of the spirit of the Society, which does not want anyone to be moved to enter the Society otherwise than by free choice and at God's will and prompting. . . . Moreover, with the exercitant having been moved at such a time by the advice or efforts of a mortal human, the door will always be open for the devil to tempt him by suggesting that had it not been for the influence of so-and-so's advice, he would never have taken such a step, and that the idea came from a human being, and humans are nearly always wrong. And so the devil will always have this temptation at hand.⁹⁸

Note that what Ignatius affirmed is quite contrary to what many today would consider good spiritual direction. Directors may deliberately encourage exercitants in a decision to which they are leaning, and what is more startling, they may dissuade them from choosing that which is simply *less good* than the alternative!⁹⁹

Ignatius was also clear about the motive behind his counsel: to ensure that no one entered the Society without being convinced that it was his decision. Ignatius was speaking from experience. While he was general, many Jesuits had already left the Society, and had justified themselves, rightly or not, on the grounds that their directors had been too aggressive in pushing a Jesuit vocation.¹⁰⁰ Ignatius's hard-won wisdom found its way into the "General Examen," where he counseled Jesuits who were entrusted with interviewing candidates.

If [the candidate] says that he was not moved by any member of the Society, the examiner should proceed. If the candidate says that he was so moved (and it is granted that one could licitly and meritoriously move him thus), it would seem to be more

⁹⁸ Ibid., 2:95. See also Martin E. Palmer, trans., "Directory Dictated to Father Juan Alonso de Vitoria," in *Giving the Spiritual Exercises: The Early Jesuit Manuscript Directories and the Official Directory of 1599* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1996), 18.

⁹⁹ See *SpEx* no. 333.

¹⁰⁰ *Ignatii Epistolæ* 13:677; *Salmeron* 1:18; *EppMixt* 2:257; *Chron.*, 1:433, 3:48. See Ignacio Iparraguirre, *Práctica de los Ejercicios de San Ignacio de Loyola en Vida de su Autor* (Bilbao: Mensajero, 1946), 101–2, 192–201.

conducive to his spiritual progress to give him a period of some time, in order that, by reflecting on the matter, he may commend himself completely to his Creator and Lord as if no member of the Society had moved him, so that he may be able to proceed with greater spiritual energies for the greater service and glory of the Divine Majesty.¹⁰¹

Obviously we cannot give Ignatius's doctrine a nuanced treatment here. My sole intention at the moment is to illustrate how the practical experience of the Companions regarding the Iñiguistas can have implications for our understanding of Ignatian discernment. David Fleming once likened spiritual direction to a "three-way conversation" between God, the exercitant, and the director.¹⁰² I propose that this "communitarian" description, in which directors are more prominent in theory if not in practice, is more true to what Ignatius had in mind than an alternative model widely held today, whereby directors are admitted with apologies into a private conversation between God and his creatures.

Conclusion

When Polanco recounted the death of Pierre Favre in his life of Ignatius, he made the seemingly casual remark that Favre was the first to persevere in the Society.¹⁰³ Looking back, we know that remark was anything but casual. Both Polanco and the Jesuits for whom he was writing were all too aware of the trauma caused by the men who left Ignatius. And the memory lingered. In 1565 Superior General Francisco Borja received a letter from a bishop who related that he frequently had seen Arteaga and Calisto conversing in Mexico City.¹⁰⁴ That these men were still being discussed thirty-five years after leaving Ignatius gives us a sense of the impression they left behind.

¹⁰¹ *Cons.*, no. 51.

¹⁰² David L. Fleming, *Like the Lightning, The Dynamics of the Ignatian Exercises* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2004), 12.

¹⁰³ *FontNarr* 1:182.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 171 n.10.



The Iñiguistas certainly bring to the light the seamier side of the Society's early history. My intent was not to be sensational for its own sake. Rather, I believe we can take heart in the realization that the golden age of the first Jesuits was really no more golden than ours. The First Companions had to contend with scandal, pettiness, and departures just as much as we do. Truth be told, even one of our founding fathers, Simão Rodrigues, once tried to flee the Companions in the middle of the night to become a hermit!¹⁰⁵ At the time, he was unconvinced by Ignatius's arguments that the apostolic life could serve his own sanctity as much as the contemplative life. Rodrigues received a scolding from the pilgrim upon his return.

Strange as it might sound, I am consoled by such stories. They remove some of the romantic gloss surrounding these men, but just *some*, for most of it is legitimate. But only then will we see the fallacy of suspecting (as perhaps many Jesuits do from time to time) that we fall short of the wisdom and fidelity of the First Companions, and that the departures and scandals we experience are somehow indicative of the same. And then, what is more important, we will find it easier to accept that the holiness of the First Companions is ours as well.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 3:45–47, 4:263. See also Conwell, *Brief and Exact*, 34–36; Dudon, *Ignatius Loyola*, 239–40 (Dudon confuses Rodrigues with Le Jay).

Past Issues of STUDIES IN THE SPIRITUALITY OF JESUITS

Available for Sale

(For prices, see inside back cover.)

- 1/1 Sheets, *Profile of the Contemporary Jesuit* (Sept. 1969)
- 1/2 Ganss, *Authentic Spiritual Exercises: History and Terminology* (Nov. 1969)
- 2/1 Burke, *Institution and Person* (Feb. 1970)
- 2/2 Futrell, *Ignatian Discernment* (Apr. 1970)
- 2/3 Lonergan, *Response of the Jesuit as Priest and Apostle* (Sept. 1970)
- 3/1 Wright, *Grace of Our Founder and the Grace of Our Vocation* (Feb. 1971)
- 3/2 O'Flaherty, *Some Reflections on Jesuit Commitment* (Apr. 1971)
- 3/4 Toner, *A Method for Communal Discernment of God's Will* (Sept. 1971)
- 3/5 Sheets, *Toward a Theology of the Religious Life* (Nov. 1971)
- 4/2 *Two Discussions: I. Spiritual Direction, II. Leadership and Authority* (Mar. 1972)
- 4/3 Orsy, *Some Questions about the Purpose and Scope of the General Congregation* (June 1972)
- 4/4 Ganss, Wright, O'Malley, O'Donovan, Dulles, *On Continuity and Change: A Symposium* (Oct. 1972)
- 5/1–2 O'Flaherty, *Renewal: Call and Response* (Jan.–Mar. 1973)
- 5/3 Arrupe, McNaspy, *The Place of Art in Jesuit Life* (Apr. 1973)
- 5/4 Haughey, *The Pentecostal Thing and Jesuits* (June 1973)
- 5/5 Orsy, *Toward a Theological Evaluation of Communal Discernment* (Oct. 1973)
- 6/3 Knight, *Joy and Judgment in Religious Obedience* (Apr. 1974)
- 7/1 Wright, Ganss, Orsy, *On Thinking with the Church Today* (Jan. 1975)
- 7/2 Ganss, *Christian Life Communities from the Sodalities* (Mar. 1975)
- 7/3 Connolly, *Contemporary Spiritual Direction: Scope and Principles* (June 1975)
- 7/5 Buckley, *The Confirmation of a Promise; Padberg, Continuity and Change in General Congregation XXXII* (Nov. 1975)
- 8/1 O'Neill, *Acatamiento: Ignatian Reverence* (Jan. 1976)
- 8/2–3 De la Costa, Sheridan, and others, *On Becoming Poor: A Symposium on Evangelical Poverty* (Mar.–May 1976)
- 8/4 Faricy, *Jesuit Community: Community of Prayer* (Oct. 1976)
- 9/1–2 Becker, *Changes in U.S. Jesuit Membership, 1958-75; Others, Reactions and Explanations* (Jan.–Mar. 1977)
- 9/4 Connolly, Land, *Jesuit Spiritualities and the Struggle for Social Justice* (Sept. 1977).
- 9/5 Gill, *A Jesuit's Account of Conscience* (Nov. 1977)
- 10/1 Kammer, *"Burn-Out" — Dilemma for the Jesuit Social Activist* (Jan. 1978)
- 10/4 Harvanek, *Status of Obedience in the Society of Jesus; Others, Reactions to Connolly-Land* (Sept. 1978)
- 11/1 Clancy, *Feeling Bad about Feeling Good* (Jan. 1979)
- 11/2 Maruca, *Our Personal Witness as Power to Evangelize Culture* (Mar. 1979)
- 11/3 Klein, *American Jesuits and the Liturgy* (May 1979)
- 11/5 Conwell, *The Kamikaze Factor: Choosing Jesuit Ministries* (Nov. 1979)
- 12/2 Henriot, Appleyard, Klein, *Living Together in Mission: A Symposium on Small Apostolic Communities* (Mar. 1980)
- 12/3 Conwell, *Living and Dying in the Society of Jesus* (May 1980)

- 13/1 Peter, *Alcoholism in Jesuit Life* (Jan. 1981)
- 13/3 Ganss, *Towards Understanding the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation* (May 1981)
- 13/4 Reites, *St. Ignatius of Loyola and the Jews* (Sept. 1981)
- 14/1 O'Malley, *The Jesuits, St. Ignatius, and the Counter Reformation* (Jan. 1982)
- 14/2 Dulles, *St. Ignatius and Jesuit Theological Tradition* (Mar. 1982)
- 14/4 Gray, *An Experience in Ignatian Government* (Sept. 1982)
- 14/5 Ivern, *The Future of Faith and Justice: Review of Decree Four* (Nov. 1982)
- 15/1 O'Malley, *The Fourth Vow in Its Ignatian Context* (Jan. 1983)
- 15/2 Sullivan and Faricy, *On Making the Spiritual Exercises for Renewal of Jesuit Charisms* (Mar. 1983)
- 15/3–4 Padberg, *The Society True to Itself: A Brief History of the 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus* (May–Sept. 1983)
- 15/5–16/1 Tetlow, *Jesuits' Mission in Higher Education* (Nov. 1983–Jan. 1984)
- 16/2 O'Malley, *To Travel to Any Part of the World: Jerónimo Nadal and the Jesuit Vocation* (Mar. 1984)
- 16/3 O'Hanlon, *Integration of Christian Practices: A Western Christian Looks East* (May 1984)
- 16/4 Carlson, "A Faith Lived Out of Doors": *Ongoing Formation* (Sept. 1984)
- 17/1 Spohn, *St. Paul on Apostolic Celibacy and the Body of Christ* (Jan. 1985)
- 17/2 Daley, "In Ten Thousand Places": *Christian Universality and the Jesuit Mission* (Mar. 1985)
- 17/3 Tetlow, *Dialogue on the Sexual Maturing of Celibates* (May 1985)
- 17/4 Spohn, Coleman, Clarke, Henriot, *Jesuits and Peacemaking* (Sept. 1985)
- 17/5 Kinerk, *When Jesuits Pray: A Perspective on the Prayer of Apostolic Persons* (Nov. 1985)
- 18/1 Gelpi, *The Converting Jesuit* (Jan. 1986).
- 18/2 Beirne, *Compass and Catalyst: The Ministry of Administration* (Mar. 1986)
- 18/3 McCormick, *Bishops as Teachers and Jesuits as Listeners* (May 1986)
- 18/5 Tetlow, *The Transformation of Jesuit Poverty* (Nov. 1986).
- 19/1 Staudenmaier, *United States Technology and Adult Commitment* (Jan. 1987)
- 19/2 Appleyard, *Languages We Use: Talking about Religious Experience* (Mar. 1987)
- 19/5 Endean, *Who Do You Say Ignatius Is? Jesuit Fundamentalism and Beyond* (Nov. 1987)
- 20/1 Brackley, *Downward Mobility: Social Implications of St. Ignatius's Two Standards* (Jan. 1988)
- 20/2 Padberg, *How We Live Where We Live* (Mar. 1988)
- 20/3 Hayes, Padberg, Staudenmaier, *Symbols, Devotions, and Jesuits* (May 1988)
- 20/4 McGovern, *Jesuit Education and Jesuit Spirituality* (Sept. 1988)
- 20/5 Barry, *Jesuit Formation Today: An Invitation to Dialogue and Involvement* (Nov. 1988)
- 21/1 Wilson, *Where Do We Belong? United States Jesuits and Their Memberships* (Jan. 1989)
- 21/2 Demoustier, Calvez, et al., *The Disturbing Subject: The Option for the Poor* (Mar. 1989)
- 21/3 Soukup, *Jesuit Response to the Communication Revolution* (May 1989)
- 22/1 Carroll, *The Spiritual Exercises in Everyday Life* (Jan. 1990)
- 22/2 Bracken, *Jesuit Spirituality from a Process Perspective* (March 1990)
- 22/3 Shepherd, *Fire for a Weekend: An Experience of the Exercises* (May 1990)
- 22/4 O'Sullivan, *Trust Your Feelings, but Use Your Head* (Sept. 1990)
- 22/5 Coleman, *A Company of Critics: Jesuits and the Intellectual Life* (Nov. 1990)

- 23/1 Houdek, *The Road Too Often Traveled* (Jan. 1991)
- 23/3 Beghey and Bogart, *A Bibliography on St. Ignatius's Spiritual Exercises* (May 1991)
- 23/4 Shelton, *Reflections on the Mental Health of Jesuits* (Sept. 1991)
- 23/5 Toolan, "Nature Is a Heraclitean Fire" (Nov. 1991)
- 24/1 Houdek, *Jesuit Prayer and Jesuit Ministry: Context and Possibilities* (Jan. 1992)
- 24/2 Smolich, *Testing the Water: Jesuits Accompanying the Poor* (March 1992)
- 24/3 Hassel, *Jesus Christ Changing Yesterday, Today, and Forever* (May 1992)
- 24/4 Shelton, *Toward Healthy Jesuit Community Living* (Sept. 1992)
- 24/5 Cook, *Jesus' Parables and the Faith That Does Justice* (Nov. 1992)
- 25/3 Padberg, *Ignatius, the Popes, and Realistic Reverence* (May 1993)
- 25/4 Stahel, *Toward General Congregation 34* (Sept. 1993)
- 25/5 Baldovin, *Christian Liturgy: An Annotated Bibliography* (Nov. 1993)
- 26/2 Murphy, *The Many Ways of Justice* (March 1994)
- 26/3 Staudenmaier, *To Fall in Love with the World* (May 1994)
- 26/5 Landy, *Myths That Shape Us* (Nov. 1994)
- 27/1 Daley, "To Be More like Christ" (Jan. 1995)
- 27/2 Schmidt, *Portraits and Landscapes* (March 1995)
- 27/3 Stockhausen, *I'd Love to, but I Don't Have the Time* (May 1995)
- 27/4 Anderson, *Jesuits in Jail, Ignatius to the Present* (Sept. 1995)
- 27/5 Shelton, *Friendship in Jesuit Life* (Nov. 1995)
- 28/1 Beghey, *Bibliography on the History of the Jesuits* (Jan. 1996)
- 28/3 Clooney, *In Ten Thousand Places, in Every Blade of Grass* (May 1996)
- 28/4 Starkloff, "As Different As Night and Day" (Sept. 1996)
- 28/5 Beckett, *Listening to Our History* (Nov. 1996)
- 29/1 Hamm, *Preaching Biblical Justice* (Jan. 1997)
- 29/2 Padberg, *The Three Forgotten Founders* (March 1997)
- 29/3 Byrne, *Jesuits and Parish Ministry* (May 1997)
- 29/4 Keenan, *Are Informationes Ethical?* (Sept. 1997)
- 29/5 Ferlita, *The Road to Bethlehem—Is It Level or Winding?* (Nov. 1997)
- 30/1 Shore, *The "Vita Christi" of Ludolph of Saxony and Its Influence on the "Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius of Loyola"* (Jan. 1998)
- 30/2 Starkloff, "I'm No Theologian, but . . . (or So . . .)?" (March 1998)
- 30/3 Torrens, *The Word That Clamors* (May 1998)
- 30/4 Petrik, "Being Sent" (Sept. 1998)
- 30/5 Jackson, "One and the Same Vocation" (Nov. 1998)
- 31/1 Clifford, *Scripture and the Exercises* (Jan. 1999)
- 31/2 Toohig, *Physics Research, a Search for God* (March 1999)
- 31/3 Fagin, *Fidelity in the Church—Then and Now* (May 1999)
- 31/4 Schineller, *Pilgrim Journey of Ignatius* (Sept. 1999)
- 31/5 Fullam, *Juana, S.J.: Status of Women in the Society* (Nov. 1999)
- 32/1 Langan, *The Good of Obedience in a Culture of Autonomy* (Jan. 2000)
- 32/2 Blake, *Listen with Your Eyes* (March 2000)
- 32/3 Shelton, *When a Jesuit Counsels Others* (May 2000)
- 32/4 Barry, *Past, Present, and Future* (Sept. 2000)
- 32/5 Starkloff, *Pilgrimage Re-envisioned* (Nov. 2000)
- 33/1 Kolvenbach et al., *Faith, Justice, and American Jesuit Higher Education* (Jan. 2001)
- 33/2 Keenan, *Unexpected Consequences: Persons's Christian Directory* (March 2001)
- 33/3 Arrupe, *Trinitarian Inspiration of the Ignatian Charism* (May 2001)
- 33/4 Veale, *Saint Ignatius Asks, "Are You Sure You Know Who I Am?"* (Sept. 2001)

- 33/5 Barry and Keenan, *How Multicultural Are We?* (Nov. 2001)
- 34/1 Blake, "City of the Living God" (Jan. 2002)
- 34/2 Clooney, *A Charism for Dialog* (March 2002)
- 34/3 Rehg, *Christian Mindfulness* (May 2002)
- 34/4 Brackley, *Expanding the Shrunken Soul* (Sept. 2002)
- 34/5 Bireley, *The Jesuits and Politics in Time of War* (Nov. 2002)
- 35/1 Barry, *Jesuit Spirituality for the Whole of Life* (Jan. 2003)
- 35/2 Madden/Janssens, *The Training of Ours in the Sacred Liturgy* (March 2003)
- 35/4 Modras, *A Jesuit in the Crucible* (Sept. 2003)
- 35/5 Lucas, *Virtual Vessels, Mystical Signs* (Nov. 2003)
- 36/1 Rausch, *Christian Life Communities for Jesuit University Students?* (Spring 2004)
- 36/2 Bernauer, *The Holocaust and the Search for Forgiveness* (Summer 2004)
- 36/3 Nantais, "Whatever!" Is Not Ignatian Indifference (Fall 2004)
- 36/4 Lukács, *The Incarnational Dynamic of the Constitutions* (Winter 2004)
- 37/1 Smolarski, *Jesuits on the Moon* (Spring 2005)
- 37/2 McDonough, *Clenched Fist or Open Hands?* (Summer 2005)
- 37/3 Torrens, *Tuskegee Years* (Fall 2005)
- 37/4 O'Brien, *Consolation in Action* (Winter 2005)
- 38/1 Schineller, *In Their Own Words* (Spring 2006)
- 38/2 Jackson, "Something that happened to me at Manresa" (Summer 2006)
- 38/3 Reiser, *Locating the Grace of the Fourth Week* (Fall 2006)
- 38/4 O'Malley, *Five Missions of the Jesuit Charism* (Winter 2006)
- 39/1 McKevitt, *Italian Jesuits in Maryland* (Spring 2007)
- 39/2 Kelly, *Loved into Freedom and Service* (Summer 2007)
- 39/3 Kennedy, *Music and the Jesuit Mission* (Autumn 2007)
- 39/4 Creed, *Jesuits and the Homeless* (Winter 2007)
- 40/1 Giard, *The Jesuit College* (Spring 2008)
- 40/2 Au, *Ignatian Service* (Summer 2008)
- 40/3 Kaslyn, *Jesuit Ministry of Publishing* (Autumn 2008)
- 40/4 Rehg, *Value and Viability of the Jesuit Brothers' Vocation* (Winter 2008)
- 41/1 Friedrich, *Governance in the Society of Jesus, 1540–1773* (Spring 2009)
- 41/2 Manuel, *Living Chastity* (Summer 2009)
- 41/3 Clarke, *Our Lady of China* (Autumn 2009)
- 41/4 Hezel, *Life at the Edge of the World* (Winter 2009)
- 42/1 McCarthy, Massaro, Worcester, Zampelli, *Four Stories of the Kolvenbach Generation* (Spring 2010)
- 42/2 Haight, *Expanding the Spiritual Exercises* (Summer 2010)
- 42/3 Cohen, *Jesuits and New Christians* (Autumn 2010)
- 42/4 Anderson, Numa J. Rousseve Jr. (Winter 2010)
- 43/1 Walsh, "To always be thinking somehow about Jesus" (Spring 2011)
- 43/2 McCarthy, "Let me love more passionately" (Summer 2011)
- 43/3 McKevitt, *The Gifts of Aging* (Autumn 2011)
- 43/4 Gavin, "True charity begins where justice ends" (Winter 2011)
- 44/1 Barber, *Desolation and the Struggle for Justice* (Spring 2012)
- 44/2 Geger, *The First First Companions* (Summer 2012)

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

U.S. JESUITS:

An annual subscription is provided by provinces of the U.S. Assistency for U.S. Jesuits living in the United States and U.S. Jesuits who are still members of a U.S. province but living outside the United States.

ALL OTHER SUBSCRIPTIONS:

Subscriptions to STUDIES:

U.S.: one-year, \$20; two years, \$38.

Canada and Mexico: one year, \$28; two years, \$52

All other destinations: one year, \$32; two years, \$58

Gift Certificates available

All payments must be in U.S. funds.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS INFORMATION:

Jesuit Subscribers: Your province office should send us your change of address; you need not do so.

Non-Jesuit subscribers: Subscriptions and change-of-address information should be sent to the business-office address given below.

Please include your former-address label if possible.

EDITORIAL OFFICE

Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality
Faber House
102 College Road
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3841
Tel: 617-552-0860
Fax: 617-552-0925
E-mail: fleminpb@bc.edu

BUSINESS OFFICE

Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits
Institute of Jesuit Sources
3601 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63108
Tel: 314-633-4622
Fax: 314-633-4623
E-mail: ijes@jesuitsources.com

SINGLE ISSUES (Current or Past):

The price for single copies of current or past issues is \$4.00, plus postage and handling charges. Double issues (for example, 5/1-2, 8/2-3, 9/1-2, etc.) are \$7.50 each, plus postage and handling.

RECENT ISSUES

An archive of recent issues is available on-line at: <http://www.jesuit.org/index.php/main/about-us/press-and-publications/studies/>

The Institute of Jesuit Sources
The Seminar on Jesuit Spirituality
3601 Lindell Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63108-3393