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Continuity and change is a dilemma that faces every religious order. On the one hand, religious must remain in vital touch with what Vatican II refers to as “the spirit and aims of each founder,” or what later ecclesial documents have referred to as “the charisms of your founders.” At the same time, religious must adapt themselves “to the changed conditions of our time” and contemporary society in every culture. The principal means for keeping in touch with that foundational charism, as it has been called, is, of course, the living tradition of the order itself. How do we pass on to younger religious “nuestro modo de proceder”? Or “our way of proceeding,” as Fr. Pedro Arrupe was so fond of repeating, echoing the words attributed to St. Ignatius and found so often in early Jesuit documents. The

1The first quote is from the Decree on the Up-to-Date Renewal of Religious Life, Perfectae caritatis no. 2 (Flannery 1985, 612). The second is from the “Apostolic Exhortation on the Renewal of Religious Life,” Evangelica Testificatio no. 11, issued by the Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes in 1971 (ibid., 685).

2Flannery 1985, 612.

3Jerónimo Nadal attributes the phrase to Ignatius himself (O’Malley 1993, 8).
words are equally applicable to any religious institute approved by the Church.

But that living tradition must itself continually refer back to, and realign itself with, its source. There are too many unfortunate periods in the history of religious life when supposedly "living traditions," by remaining simply "tradition," have fallen into meaningless routine, and thus in fact, failed to remain true to the real charism of the founder or foundress.

On the other hand, attempts to return to "our origins" or reform movements have all too often fixated themselves on some external practice or characteristic of the founder or foundress—what color or kind of material s/he used as a religious habit, whether they were "discalced" or "calced," whether he wore a beard or not, etc.4 Though "ways of proceeding" may and should change, the living tradition must continue to go back to the founder and his/her charism in its endeavor to realize that charism in our own time and place. There must be a continuing effort to realize through a deeper historical

---

4Without wishing to ridicule any religious order, and limiting our competence to male orders and congregations, one can think of the "reform movement" of Fr. Diego Collado, O.P., in seventeenth-century Philippines, who insisted that the elite group for other Asian missions he attempted to form within the Provincia del Santísimo Rosario de Filipinas should wear beards, thus earning for themselves from the less reverent Manileños the appellation "los Barbones." Or the genuine sixteenth-century Franciscan effort to return to the "true" St. Francis by insisting on wearing a particular kind of capuccio or hood, as well as beard—thus leading to the Roman street urchins calling them cappuccini, and in the longer run giving rise to the popular cappuccino—to be found today in every coffee shop. Or the titanic struggle which occupied any number of Jesuit General Congregations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries over 92 years on whether lay brothers should be allowed to wear the biretta, as the priests did—and thus seem equal to them (or perhaps just to keep their heads warm in the frigid Jesuit houses of Europe). For these examples see Fernández 1958, 67-69; De la Costa 1961, 377-78; Daniel-Rops 1964, 1, 36-37; Padberg et al. 1994, 1/95s, 3/22s, 6/30, 7/24, 7/27, 8/21, 9/24.
knowledge of the founder and how s/he understood the founding charism, which s/he attempted to express in the rule or constitutions of the order. In this article, we take as a case study the Society of Jesus, attempting to study the degree to which the original Ignatian charism had been maintained or obscured through the centuries before the Society made a fully conscious attempt, beginning with its 31st General Congregation in 1965, to make clearer its fidelity to that charism in the light of the challenge laid down by the decrees of Vatican II, particularly that on the renewal of religious life.

Such a return to the genuine Ignatian charism has been made possible by the past hundred years of work on the documentary series, *Monumenta Ignatiana*, which has afforded the deeper knowledge we now have of the life of St. Ignatius, as manifested in the now-classic books of Paul Dudon, Hugo Rahner, Pedro de Leturia, Ricardo García-Villoslada, James A. Brodrick and, more recently, the biography by the late Cándido de Dalmases, to name only the Jesuit biographical works. I think it is safe to say that today we can know substantially more about the facts of Ignatius’s life and his concept of the Society of Jesus than was known to anyone in the history of the Society, with the possible exception of a few of his closest companions, like Diego Laynez, Juan de Polanco and Jerónimo Nadal.

---

5The *Monumenta Ignatiana* (MI) comprise the writings of and about Ignatius within the larger series, *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu* (MHSI). Some of the other volumes in the larger series dealing with the writings of such close confidants and contemporaries of Ignatius as Jerónimo Nadal, Diego Laynez [Láinez], Juan Polanco, and Francisco de Borja [Borgia] have supplemented the information contained in the directly Ignatian documents.

6Laynez was one of Ignatius’s original group of companions in founding the order, and became his successor as general of the Society. He served as papal theologian, and later as one of the Council Fathers at Trent. Polanco became the secretary of Ignatius from 1547, and remained such under the next two generals. Nadal joined the Society shortly after its foundation in Rome, served as vicar-general during Ignatius’s sicknesses, and was entrusted by the latter and his successors with the promulgation of the Constitutions of the Society in various parts of Europe. O’Malley quotes Ignatius as saying of Nadal,
In large part because of that knowledge, there have been many changes in the Jesuit way of life since the 31st General Congregation—so much so that younger Jesuits cannot believe some of the things that were formerly done routinely. Indeed, sadly, during the time of Fr. Arrupe, a portion of the Society in Spain, with a few backers in Rome, attempted to separate themselves from the body of the Society, which they believed had turned aside from St. Ignatius. Their repeated efforts to obtain separate provinces or separate houses met with no approval from Paul VI.7

The principal reason behind the thinking of the latter group, I believe, was their identifying a particular form of Jesuit life and a particular image of St. Ignatius which they had, as it were, grown up with, and believed radically different from what was being practiced and upheld in the Society of Jesus in the name of St. Ignatius and of a fuller understanding of him and his charism. Fundamentally, they were lacking the historical perspective that the Society had gained of itself through the past century of research into its history. To apply to their spirituality a term that was coined, or certainly popularized, by the then forward-looking Michael Novak to express the

when he sent him to promulgate the Constitutions: “he altogether knows my mind and enjoys [for this task] the same authority as myself” (1993, 12).

7 There is a summary account in Carcel Ortí (1997, 627-39) which is not quite satisfactory. Though the author had access to a book of Cardinal Villot, Secretary of State at the time, and one of several curial cardinals whose support the malcontents sought, in which he detailed his meetings with Fr. Pedro Arrupe, it is rather one-sided. Villot would then and later take a much harsher attitude toward Arrupe and the Society than Paul VI, who was content that the matter be handled at a lower level, and who certainly did not sympathize with the efforts of the separatist Spanish Jesuits. Carcel Ortí’s account shows a great deal of sympathy with the dissidents, but fails to provide documentation for some of his statements. His account is in stark contrast to the succeeding section on the Opus Dei, with whom the author has close connections, and of which he gives a totally favorable account. (Whether he is a member of Opus Dei is not clear, but his books have largely been published by the university press of the Opus Dei University of Navarra.)
theology of the conservative opposition in Vatican II, they were prisoners of a "non-historical orthodoxy" (Novak 1964, 52-71).

I. Real Discontinuities in the History of the Society of Jesus

As a matter of fact, apart from the new knowledge of St. Ignatius and his Institute made possible by twentieth-century historical research, there are indeed good reasons for saying that the Society at particular periods and to different degrees has suffered from a certain lack of continuity. It was not a substantial discontinuity, to be sure—the substance of what it is to be a Jesuit was never lost—but some important modalities of that heritage were.

A. The Suppression of the Society of Jesus, 1773

The most significant of all these historical discontinuities, of course, was the suppression of the Society by Pope Clement XIV in 1773. When Pius VII, once he had escaped from the imprisonment imposed on him by Napoleon, restored the Society in 1814, anyone who had made his final profession of four vows before the Suppression was now well over seventy years old. Those who became provincials, rectors, and masters of novices often had little or no experience of living as formed Jesuits, with the partial exception of the handful who had been able to join the remnant of the Society which had survived in White Russia, with the benevolent tacit approval of Pius VI.\footnote{For this episode and its effects after the formal restoration of the Society in the whole world by Pius VII, see Bangert 1972, 402-6, 413-35.}

Hence, they had nothing but the printed text of the Constitutions of the sixteenth century and the Spiritual Exercises to serve as instruments of continuity with St. Ignatius. The result was an often-slavish adherence to the words of the text, understood in their most
literal sense, quite unaware of how they had been understood and interpreted in the preceding two centuries. One striking effect of that literalness, which has become obvious to all in our own times, is the narrowness and desiccated rigidity with which the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius were understood from the time of their translation into Latin by Fr. Jan Roothaan in the 1850s well into the second half of the twentieth century.  

B. The Sixteenth-Century “Monasticization” of the Society

Another significant narrowing and impoverishment of the Ignatian tradition was what I would term “the domestication of the Society” that took place during the generalates of St. Francis Borgia (1565-72), Fr. Everard Mercurian (1572-81) and, above all, in the turbu-

---

9 A particular case study has been done by Ladislas Lukács (summarized by Ganss in Loyola 1970, 349-56) in which he shows that, whereas the professed of four vows formed 98% of the priests with final vows in the time of St. Ignatius, and 94.9% in 1773, the percentage was less than 40% in the restored Society. The reason was precisely an ahistorical reading of Nadal on the subject.

10 Common opinion among modern Jesuits has placed the blame for the “monasticization” of the Society on Borgia. That opinion found its most open and detailed expression in Otto Karrer’s biography of Borgia, Der Heilige Franz von Borja, General der Gesellschaft Jesu, 1510-1572, highly-praised by leading Jesuit historians of the time, including Cardinal Franz Ehrle, S.J. The banning of the book for Jesuits by the highly authoritarian Father General Wlodziimir Ledochowski, led Karrer to a series of conflicts and recriminations, which culminated in his leaving the Society of Jesus, and even the Catholic church. He soon saw himself as being used by Protestants as a tool for anti-Catholic purposes and, within a year, returned to the Catholic church, was after a time rehabilitated as a priest in good standing, and even discreetly and informally received back into the Society of Jesus in his old age by Father General Pedro Arrupe, meanwhile having become renowned as a leading Catholic ecumenist (Köhler 1986, 138-41). The key chapter in Karrer’s biography has been translated into English in Karrer 1967, 349-57. Borgia’s “ingrained predilection for
lent and extraordinarily long term of Fr. Claudio Aquaviva (1581-1615). By "domestication of the Society" I mean that there was a process by which the Society was gradually reduced to something closer to the traditional forms of religious life of the older orders. This process involved the curtailment or abolition by that generation of Jesuits—not without strenuous opposition from other Jesuits, some older practices of religious life"—as an ironic but honest Jesuit historian has characterized his spirituality (Bangert 1972, 51)—cannot be denied, but he did remain substantially faithful to Ignatian ideas, and did not introduce his predilections into the permanent legislation of the Society. Moreover, he did act strongly against the Spanish and Portuguese efforts to introduce two or three hours of daily mental prayer into the Society. However, in spite of the efforts of his most informed and, in a sense, "official" biographer, Cándido de Dalmases (1991, 116-17; 159-65), he cannot be absolved from giving encouragement to a trend toward monasticization which would be vigorously and juridically imposed, in contradiction to the Ignatian vision, by Fr. Claudio Aquaviva. This will become clearer in our treatment of the rigidification of Jesuit prayer under Aquaviva.

Mercurian's role in the process was more in allowing Borgia's innovations to continue, while he himself engaged in issuing an ever-increasing number of detailed "Rules" outside the Constitutions. Though he made important contributions toward organizing various Jesuit works, which some would see as "consolidation" of the Society, his attitude seems best summed up by a remark attributed to him that it was not time to reform the Society, since it had not yet even been formed. Ignatius would have been no doubt surprised and probably quite chagrined to hear that. John O'Malley sums up Mercurian's general policy as one that even within the Society "tended to reduce the devout life to moralizing calculation and safe asceticism" (1993, 374).

Though the turbulence of Aquaviva's term was due to the effort of a small group of Spaniards—mightily backed by Philip II of Spain to Hispanize the order and bring it under the control that the Most Catholic King exercised over the rest of the Spanish Church, for what he conceived to be the glory of God as revealed to Philip—none of this was directly related to the changes being discussed here in the internal life of the Society. Aquaviva's negative role in the latter regard was in institutionalizing through rigid juridical norms the un-Ignatian tendencies of his two predecessors, thus absolutizing them for centuries.
particularly in France and Germany—of certain aspects of Ignatian creativity and innovativeness that seemed to them, and were deliberately intended by Ignatius to be so, little in conformity with the generally received ideas in the sixteenth century of what religious life should be. Put on the defensive by the wholesale attacks of people like the renowned Dominican theologian, Melchor Cano (not to speak of the harsh criticisms of Paul IV, and the more benevolent, but still uncomprehending insistence on practices of the older orders from Pius V), there was an effort to conform to the received molds of religious life as much as possible. Only thus, they felt, would they be able to safeguard the Society against more serious alterations in the Jesuit way of life. One such alteration was the chanting of the Divine Office in common, imposed for a time by both Paul IV and Pius V. It had been resolutely rejected by Ignatius, not as useless or meaningless, but as incompatible with the intensely apostolic purposes for which he had created the order.

The most notable of the modifications made from within the Society was the suppression of the freedom as to: the time, the form, the manner, and the amount of prayer, all of which Ignatius had entrusted to the discernment of the formed Jesuit, in conjunction with his confessor or superior. When one knows the vehemence with

---

13In the first case, canonists consulted after Paul's death agreed that since he had never put his demand into writing, it should be treated as a purely personal wish of the pope, without any canonical force after his death in the face of the Formula of the Institute, solemnly approved by the bulls of Paul III and Julius III. In the second case, Gregory XIII simply abrogated the rule of his predecessor (Bangert 1972, 47, 51-52).

14In the rules that he appends to the Spiritual Exercises, "Para el sentido verdadero que en la Iglesia Militante debemos tener, se guarden las reglas siguientes," commonly known in English as "Rules for Thinking with the Church," the third rule recommends esteem for the chanting of the canonical hours in church (Iparraguirre 1982, 271 [355]). In the Formula of the Institute presented to Paul III and Julius III, however, he rejects this monastic practice for Jesuits by reason of the nature of their vocation (Iparraguirre 1982, 539 [586]).
which Ignatius repeatedly condemned not only excessive length of prayer, but every attempt to lead all by a single prescribed way, it is difficult to see how this departure from Ignatius could have persisted until the 31st General Congregation in 1965. The persistence of this departure is explained by sixteenth-century domestication, combined with the discontinuity in the restored Society with regard to accurate historical knowledge of St. Ignatius.

Apart from the change in the Ignatian ideal of prayer, there were other aspects of this domestication to the forms of the traditional religious orders, most of them relatively trivial, but adding up to an altered orientation of perspective in the Society. Practices which Ignatius, or his faithful successor, Diego Laynez, had at times allowed, or ordered for a specific purpose and only for a limited brief time—such as a Friday evening fast, or the communal recitation of the Litanies of the Saints (Ruiz Jurado 1981, 151-61)—became general obligatory practices between Borgia and Aquaviva. As summed up by the principal study of the whole question, which played a major part in the restoration of the Ignatian ideal for Jesuit prayer at the 31st General Congregation, “[Aquaviva’s] generalate... succeeds in establishing definitively the legislation of the integral hour of mental prayer in the morning, although not yet in these express terms” (Fiorito 1968, 162; italics mine).15 None of these three stipulations were, of course, Ignatian.

---

15The definitive legislative expression of what had been the practice since Aquaviva’s generalate was made by the 27th General Congregation in 1923, which specified juridically that the hour prayer was to be integral, mental, and be made in the morning (Fiorito 1968, 162).
II. The Creation of an "Official" Image of Ignatius

During this same period it became more and more difficult for the ordinary Jesuit to know the real Ignatius. This became extremely important because, as an historian who has concentrated on the relation between the history of the Society and its Constitutions has noted:

It was decided rather early in the Society's history that the most authentic interpretation of the Ignatian legacy was to be found in the life of Ignatius himself. Thence came the avid search for the smallest detail about his life and those who knew him best were quickly granted by a solid but not unanimous consensus the prestige of being considered the surest guides to the Jesuit spirit (Clancy 1976, 117).

Though Clancy does not seem to see the implication of there

---

16The theology behind this was most clearly articulated by Nadal, seconded by Laynez, who explicitly attributed the idea to Ignatius himself. For Nadal's theology of religious life, and its relation to the life of the founder, see Nicolau 1949, 148-50, especially the long quotation on 149. Also Bangert 1992, 214-215. For Laynez see MHSI, MI, FN 2:137.

17The reference to the consensus not being unanimous refers to the efforts by Fr. Nicolás Bobadilla, playing on the suspicions and prejudices of Paul IV against Ignatius and Spaniards in general, to claim for the "founders," that is, the original companions of Ignatius, the right to determine the future shape the Society should take, inasmuch as the Constitutions drawn up by Ignatius had not yet been formally approved by a General Congregation. The first General Congregation was delayed two years by the war between Pope Paul IV and Philip II of Spain, and was only able to convene in 1558. In fact, the Congregation denied any special right to Bobadilla's "founders," all the rest of whom rejected his pretensions and approved the Constitutions of Ignatius without change. The whole episode is discussed competently by Bangert (1972, 47) and more extensively by Brodrick (1947, 18-25). An anti-Jesuit view which, however, is based on a quite anachronistic posing of the question, is to be found in Lewy (1960, 141-60). Its anachronisms and other limitations are briefly pointed out by Bangert (1972, 110-11, n. 12).
having been two distinct phases in the early history of the Society, he distinguishes them correctly.

It was Laynez, Polanco, Nadal, and Ribadeneyra who were considered to be the authentic interpreters of the Ignatian spirit and their prestige was assured by the complete absence of any ambition for high office on their part. In the generalates of Mercurian and Aquaviva, there was at the same time a willingness to look to the official leadership of the Society rather than to the survivors of the Ignatian age for the new directions the Society was to take (ibid).

Though Clancy intimates that the two phases were not really at odds, the period beginning with Borgia, and even more with his two successors, was quite in contradiction to the earlier view. As a matter of fact, during this same period it became more and more difficult for the ordinary Jesuit to know the real Ignatius. When in 1566 Borgia entrusted Pedro de Ribadeneyra with the task of writing an official biography of the founder, he ordered that all lives of Ignatius that anyone might have, particularly that which had come to be called the Autobiography, should be collected by the provincials and sent to Rome (Dalmases 1982, 78). The motivation for this is not absolutely clear. It has been said in defense that it was an effort to help Ribadeneyra with gathering the necessary materials.18

18Dalmases accepts this reasoning and attempts to justify it on the grounds that there would not be any need for the ordinary Jesuit to have anything further once Ribadeneyra’s biography was published. He reasons—spiciously, to my mind—“in large part, the Life by Ribadeneyra is nothing more than the Autobiography put into classic Castilian style” (1982, 79). Such an argument makes his own work of restoring the Autobiography—in its partly Spanish, partly Italian original, with his introduction and copious notes—seem a useless enterprise. Becher (1977, 75-76), though giving a fuller account of the directive and the opposition it aroused, in the end scarcely differs from Dalmases, brushing aside any difficulties. It should be noted that though Becher’s article was translated into English only in 1977, the original dated from 1956, long before Vatican II.
A. THE SUPPRESSION OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY

In fact, however, Borgia's order prohibited that the earlier lives should even be read: "and that they [superiors] should not permit that [the Autobiography] should be read or continue in the hands of Ours or of others." Even Nadal was forced to surrender his annotated manuscript copy of the autobiographical memoirs dictated by St. Ignatius to Fr. Luis Gonçalves da Cámara. Later, in reply to a request by the province of Castile in 1584 that the letters and documents of Ignatius be made available, Aquaviva praised their devotion to Ignatius, but declared that the official life by Ribadeneyra was sufficient, since "in [Ribadeneyra's biography] are contained those matters which seemed worth communicating." Clearly an official image was being created, and any deviation in thought was being prevented.

Though one can sympathize to a certain extent with Aquaviva in the light of the intrigue and open rebellion against him on the part of the Spanish provinces, it seems fairly clear that the figure of Ignatius was now being officially fixed in permanent form, and there was some fear of an Ignatius who could not be easily fitted into the mold of what the founder of an order should be like in the Counter-Reformation mentality increasingly taking possession of the Church.

In any case, it is certainly true that the Autobiography was not

---

19"...y no permitan que se lea ni ande en las manos de los nuestros ni de otros..." (MHSI, MI, FN 1:314). The exact same words are to be found in a letter of Ribadeneyra to Nadal, whether because the former wrote Borgia's letter, or copied them from it (MHSI, Epp. Nadal, 3:490).

20Dalmases 1982, 79: "...en la cual se contenían las cosas que parecían dignas de comunicarse." To this Dalmases adds, "A sufficient reply for those times" ("Respuesta suficiente para aquellos tiempos"). Perhaps for Dalmases, but not for the Jesuits of that time who protested! Moreover, though he does not claim he is translating a direct quotation, Dalmases does in fact translate, but not quite convey in his Spanish, the Latin original of Aquaviva: "in qua quae communicanda videbantur, exponuntur" (FN 1:347).
further heard of until a manuscript Latin translation—made about 1559-61 by Fr. Annibal du Coudret, and used in the process for the canonization of St. Ignatius—was published by the Bollandists in the eighteenth century in the Acta Sanctorum. Unfortunately, though they apparently had the text of Nadal in Spanish and Italian with his own annotations at hand, they chose to publish only the Latin (Dalmases 1982, 77-80). For those who know the massive folio volumes in which the Bollandists published their research, it is evident that, in spite of Dalmases's remark that "it is the merit of the Bollandists to have brought out of oblivion the principal narrative document on the life of St. Ignatius" (1982, 79), this did not bring the Autobiography to the notice—or certainly not to the hands, much less the reading—of the ordinary Jesuit. Though the Latin translation was reprinted in 1873, a copy of Gonçalves da Câmara's Spanish and Italian text only appeared in print in the Monumenta Ignatiana in 1904. Curiously, the first vernacular translation (of the Latin) appeared in English in 1900—in fact, two of them, both in the United States. The one originating in Britain contained a preface by the renowned Jesuit theologian, Fr. George Tyrrell, soon, for reasons totally unconnected, to be expelled from the Society and excommunicated by the Holy See as a leader of the Modernists. We may suppose that Tyrrell's preface was enough to consign most copies to the flames in the antimodernist witch-hunt that followed Pius X's condemnation of modernism in his encyclical Pascendi. Vernacular translations of the Autobiography into other languages are generally only from the 1920s or later (Dalmases 1982, 82-83).

B. THE RELIABILITY AND INTEGRALITY OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Still further problems remain—whether or not the so-called Autobiography actually represents what Ignatius dictated, and whether we have the complete text of what was written down. In fact, of course, it is not an autobiography in the ordinary sense of the word. Ignatius did not write it himself, and it is certain that he did not read afterward at least the Italian part of the text, which was only written
down in Genoa by Gonçalves da Câmara from his notes, after he had left Rome for Portugal, not to return to Rome during the few months of life remaining to Ignatius. Probably Ignatius did not even read the Spanish text (Dalmases 1982, 73).

In fact, one cannot even say that it was “dictated” by Ignatius to Gonçalves da Câmara in the commonly accepted sense of that word. Câmara himself is frank about the method he used. Ignatius would relate the facts of his life while Câmara listened intently. Immediately afterward he would go to his room to write it down, “first in handwritten notes, and later more at length, as it is written [now].” At some later time, when he wrote the prologue, he further explained: “I have taken pains not to put any word except those which I have heard from the Father,” and if there was any fault, it was that “in order not to deviate from the words of the Father, I have not been able to explain well the force of some of them” (Dalmases 1982, 74). Dalmases goes on to support Câmara's statement, pointing out that even the erratic style would make us believe his statement if he had not made it.

However, accepting the conclusion that we have in some sense a real autobiography, one supported by statements from others about the alleged tenacity of Gonçalves da Câmara's memory, there remains another difficulty which Dalmases does not hesitate to face—namely, the integrality of the account which survives. No doubt arises from the continuity of the text itself (though Ignatius dictated it in three separate periods, sometimes months apart) nor from the ending (where Ignatius protests that he has spoken nothing but the truth) but from the abrupt beginning. For Câmara, having said in the prologue (no. 2) that “he began to tell me his whole life and his travesuras del mancebo,” clearly and distinctly, with all their circumstances,” the actual narration begins quite differently:

21I have deliberately left the phrase travesuras del mancebo untranslated, as it has been given various translations, according to the susceptibilities of the translator, and not all are in consonance with the original Spanish. A manual dictionary of the Real Academia Española translates the word travesura itself
Up to his twenty-sixth year he was a man given to worldly vanities, and having a vain and overpowering desire to gain renown, he found special delight in the exercise of arms. Thus he was in a fortress under attack by the French, and while everyone else clearly saw that they could not defend themselves and thought that they should surrender to save their lives, he offered so many reasons to the fortress' commander that he talked him into defending it (Tylenda 1985, 7-8).

as "Acción culpable verificada con destreza e ingenio" (Real Academia Española 1927, 1904; italics mine). Older translations are circumspect to the point of falsification: one omits the phrase completely (O'Connor 1900, 12); another published the same year speaks of "the somewhat uncontrolled freedom of youth" (Rix 1900, 32); a French version speaks only of "les légèretés du jeunesse," where the translator, after giving such an anodyne translation, feels compelled to say in a note: "Cette partie du Récit manque dans les textes que nous possédons. Le rédacteur l'aura sans doute omise par discretion" (Thiry 1956, 38). Modern translations are somewhat more to the point: "his youthful excesses" (Young 1956, 4); "his youthful escapades" (O'Callaghan 1974, 16); and "the escapades of his youth" (Tylenda 1985, 3); and again "youthful escapades" (Divarkin 1990, 28). Dalmases in his Latin commentary in the FN edition speaks of "facinora," which could be translated as "crimes," though I have left it below as "misdeeds" without attempting to specify their seriousness. We should remember, however, that we do have evidence of Inigo and his scandalous priest-brother Pero López de Loyola (who had four illegitimate children) having been charged before the court of Azpeitia in 1515. We also have the local court's petition to the superior tribunal of Pamplona to deny Inigo's plea against its jurisdiction on the grounds that he was a tonsured cleric for exemption from civil jurisdiction. In the petition of the Azpeitia court, his conduct for several years previously is qualified as having forfeited any right to be considered a cleric, and the "crimes which he committed [in 1515] are proven and very enormous, since he and Pero López, his brother, committed them by night, of set purpose, plotted among themselves with malice aforethought, and committed [them] with treachery" (MHSI 115, MI, Fontes Documentales, 237-38). Surely something more than youthful pranks are behind this accusation.

22 I have used the translation of Tylenda, as one of the more recent, easily available, and well documented and annotated for the historical context.
To be blunt, despite Ignatius having "clearly and distinctly" narrated to him all his "youthful escapades," the account of Câmara ignores them completely, and begins the narrative with Inigo's twenty-sixth year at the siege of Pamplona. Various possibilities offer themselves. Dalmases, however, even in his fourth edition of the Autobiography, contained in the complete works of Ignatius, puts forward only one of them. "There is no room for any other explanation than that the respect and filial piety prevented him from giving publicity to what the Saint with so much artlessness had not had any difficulty in manifesting to him" (Dalmases 1982, 73). Dalmases had made the same assertion in the second edition (1963, 74), and presumably in the first and the third, which are presently not available to me.

Though maintaining the essence of this assertion, Dalmases himself had taken up the question with more careful distinctions in the edition of which he was a participating, if not the primary, editor in the *Monumenta Ignatiana* of 1943.23 Here the text says:

A doubt has arisen among some authors as to whether the text of the Acta [the Autobiography] in the form that it has come to us is complete, or mutilated in some part... [Here the editor gives the reasons we have outlined above, concerning the *travesuras del mancebo*.]

Nonetheless one should ask whether Luis González [Gonçalves da Câmara] wrote them down, or whether, due to his reverence for the Father, either did not dare to write them or to communicate them to others. In the manuscripts known to us, the only trace of a mutilation would be that the end of the preface is lacking in them, and one might suspect that the beginning of the narrative was torn off with the last part of the preface. Still Pinius [Fr. Jean Pien, the

---

23The reason for my accepting probability rather than certainty is the peculiar joint editorship of the volume. Its title-page may be rendered into English: "Edited by Dionysius Fernández Zapico, S.J., and Cândido de Dalmases, S.J., with the cooperation of Pedro Leturia, S.J." ("Ediderunt Dionysius Fernandez Zapico, S.I., et Candidus de Dalmases, S.I., cooperante Petro Leturia, S.I.") Though it is presented as a team work, it appears to have been begun by Fernández Zapico, but was completed by Dalmases after the latter's death.
Bollandist editor], who at the beginning of the seventeenth century found a complete copy of the preface, seems not to have suspected anything concerning a mutilation of the text. It should also be noted that for the comparison of the Latin version of Annibal Coudret with the Spanish text he always used our manuscript N.24 Therefore there is no proof for asserting a mutilation.

On the basis of this fact, it seems that we should rather say that either Father Luis González did not entrust to the written page those misdeeds [facinora] from the youth of the founder, or having written them down only for himself, he did not communicate them to others (MHSI, MI, FN l:330-31).

One may comment here that though there is no clear proof that the beginning of the account had been torn off, the only proof to the contrary is one from silence. It does seem still possible that, in spite of the silence of Pien (and du Coudret), pages might have been torn off, especially since the original is lost. But it is more likely that the somewhat peculiar character of Gonçalves da Câmara probably accounts for this “pious” concealing of the true facts of Ignatius’s youthful misdeeds or even crimes, rather than a destruction of part of the account.25 For it must be remembered that the phrase “travesuras del mancebo” is not Ignatius’s but Câmara’s, and meant to minimize their gravity.

24N is the manuscript used by Nadal, written partly in Spanish, partly in Italian. This is the basis of the text of Dalmases 1982, and is the basic text of the FN critical edition. Fr. Herbert Thurston, S.J., believed—on the basis of the description by Cardinal Ehrle—that this was the original manuscript (Rix 1900, 37, n. 1, and 216). Dalmases and others have rejected this (MHSI, MI, FN 1:332). The question need not concern us here.

25So intensely did Gonçalves da Câmara take to heart the principle of finding in Ignatius’s life the model for the Society that in his “Memoriale”—a kind of diary on Ignatius he kept while Minister of the house in Jan-Oct 1555—he recorded the most minute actions or most trivial words of Ignatius. His devotion was no doubt sincere, but somewhat unbalanced, and one can well believe that he simply did not record the travesuras that Ignatius narrated to him out of misplaced reverence for the founder. It might also be noted that later Gonçalves da Câmara would be tutor to the teen-aged King of Portugal, Dom
Leturia, among others, has brought forth ample evidence that these were not mere “escapades” but much worse. Whatever may have been the precise crimes that Iñigo and his priest-brother Pero López were charged with committing in 1515, his fellow-townsmen passed a judgment not only on that incident, but on previous years: “the aforesaid Iñigo... was disgraceful in his way of dressing [he was a cleric, but had put aside clerical garb] and even worse in his conduct” (Leturia 1949, 47).

C. Testimony of Ignatius’s Closest Confidants

Apart from these accusations from public authority, his closest companions give us an idea of how much was concealed by Gonçalves da Câmara, or was destroyed by him or others. Lainez says bluntly of this period that Iñigo was “tempted and overcome by the lusts of the flesh” (Leturia 1949, 45). Polanco, Ignatius’s faithful secretary and confidant, confirms this judgment of Laynez concerning the period before his conversion:

Up to this time, though he was firm in the faith, he did not live in any way in conformity with it, nor did he keep himself from sins. Rather he was involved in the vice of gambling, and dissolute in affairs with women [travieso en cosas de mujeres], and in seditious acts and armed conflicts (MHSI, MI, FN 1:154).26

Sebastião I. At the age of seventeen, the young king resolved to go on a quixotic crusade against the Muslims in Morocco, where he was killed in a disastrous rout of the Portuguese forces. Since he had no heir, being still unmarried, the throne passed to his aged uncle, Cardinal Henry, and on the latter’s death two years later, to Philip II of Spain, who invaded the country to enforce his dubious claim. A number of historians have blamed Gonçalves for the foolhardy venture of his pupil and penitent, but the most recent and authoritative study absolves him from responsibility, and shows that “the blind, crippled, and discouraged” former tutor who was dying, strongly opposed the rash action of the king but in vain (Alden 1996, 85-86).

26Polanco in a somewhat different Latin version of Ignatius’s life says much the same thing about Iñigo’s sexual mores: “He lived a life quite uninhibited in
In view of the discrepancy between the "official" autobiography of Ignatius and the uncensored statements of his closest confidants, the comments of a Spanish Jesuit reviewer on the latest biography by one of the leading Spanish Jesuit historians of the period and of Ignatius are understandable. Characterizing the "new" biography as panegyrical in tone and conceding that it is successful in delineating the sanctity of the man, he comments in a passage which summarizes all the evidence of an officially created image from the time of Borgia in place of the Ignatius who really existed:

This filial attitude, very understandable, is less so when it is transferred to the secular life of Inígo. The persistent desire to attenuate the moral corruption of the step prior to the conversion, some of whose "travesuras" are minimized beyond what is right, seems excessive to us. There is no allusion, for example to the "edifying" character of Ribadeneyra's biography and its consequent reduced historical value, nor to the fact that by order of Francisco de Borja, third general of the Order, all the handwritten accounts dealing with the secular life of Ignatius disappeared. Nor is there allusion to the fact that the chapter relative to the very same theme is lacking in the "Memorial" of L.G. de Cámara. These and many other obscure points ought to have received a critical analysis in a work of such length. Nor does he even touch on the much-discussed problem of the "natural daughter" of Inígo de Loyola, a delicate subject, but one which does not tarnish the figure of the saint, and which is becoming more probable all the time, in proportion to the extent that new data keep appearing, coming from diverse documents, ever more in agreement, even though they shine forth here by their absence (Alcalá 1986, 443).

love affairs with women" ("satis liber in mulierum amore... vixit," MHSI, MI, FN 2:513).

Alcalá evidently refers here to the work we have called Autobiography, though, as noted above, Gonçalves did have a kind of manuscript diary on Ignatius's words and actions, usually referred to as the "Memoriale." Alcalá evidently confuses the two works of similar purpose.

In the 1940s, after the appearance of James Brodrick's The Origin of the
While agreeing with the critique by Alcalá as to the destruction and prohibition of documents, as we have already indicated, the issue of a hypothetical illegitimate daughter of St. Ignatius is not our point. It is discussed in the footnote below, and is something worth knowing, but whether Inigo’s proven affairs with more than one woman resulted in a daughter or not, is not a further moral question. His

_Jesuits_—one of the earliest modern accounts of the early Society up to the death of Ignatius, one which, though now outdated, is still being republished for its insights and fine writing—it was common Jesuit folklore that Brodrick had searched vainly in Spain for the record of Ignatius’s illegitimate child who was not then specified as a daughter. Given the nature of a book review, Alcalá does not elucidate what the converging new sources are. In an evident retort to Alcalá, a recent exhaustive article, “El apellido ‘Loyola’ en La Rioja del s. XVI” (Manresa 73 [2001] 65-94) by José Martínez de Toda, S.I. (to whom I am grateful for an advance copy), has taken up the question by examining all the parish books—baptisms, marriages, deaths—of the La Rioja region [in northern Castile, bordering on Navarre], where Ignatius spent most of his worldly years in the service of the Duke of Nájera. According to Martínez de Toda, the rumor has circulated in the past fifteen years, “especially orally,” of a natural daughter of Ignatius, spread to Jesuits in other parts of the world, and in addition to Alcalá’s review, appeared in some Spanish mass media. Unfortunately, he does not specify the suggestive words or phrases in documents of the sixteenth century any more than Alcalá, but insists that the proponents of the rumor “have not been able to supply definitive documents which clarify the problem with certainty.” After a search which is truly overwhelming in its effort to cover any possibility up to the end of the century, he concludes: “The present investigation has not found any document which supports said rumor. Even more, it now makes it more difficult” (2001, 65). “None of the 45 documents mentioned in the present investigation expressly relates any surname Loyola with Inigo” (93). The amount and difficulty of the research involved, especially when one sees the paleography of some of the documents reproduced in the article, is impressive, even overwhelming. However, it does not cut off definitively the possibility, but, as the author says, the burden is on those asserting the fact to produce “more proofs, more precise and especially, more documented.” As far as this writer can determine from the article, the search of all the Loyolas leaves only one woman whose father is not to be found in the documents, and hence is a possibility, but no more, unless further proofs be offered.
moral physiognomy in this period is not determined by that, but by his habitual womanizing. The procreation of a child would confirm the documentary evidence of his way of life, but it would make his conduct neither better nor worse, unless he neglected his obligation to see to the hypothetical daughter's support. Its significance to this article would be simply another piece of evidence that there was a deliberate creation of an official image of Ignatius by the men in power from Borgia to Aquaviva.

III. The Ignatius of History

A knowledge of Ignatius as he really was has been the chief means by which, in the second half of the twentieth century, the Society has overcome most of the discontinuities that entered the Jesuit story. This, of course, does not mean to imply that earlier Jesuits really did not understand the Ignatian charism at all. It has always been understood that the Jesuit vocation is to follow Christ our King under the banner of the Cross—to use the words of the papally approved Formula of the Institute, generously making the magis the measure of a Jesuit response in service to God and to his people, and in loyalty to the Church. This is the core of the Ignatian charism, and to say that we have today a fuller understanding of Ignatius and his breadth of vision than was possible in the past does not necessarily imply that we have better Jesuits today. What we do undoubtedly possess, however, is a fuller knowledge of Ignatius and the possibility of a deeper understanding of the Ignatian charism and its implications for today's world.

The main lines of Ignatius's life have been firmly established by the publication of the sources in this past century. But there is more that can be done. For such a historical knowledge necessarily also includes putting the factual data of Ignatius's life within their historical context. It is on this dimension that we wish to concentrate here. In the last few decades, we have also come to know a great deal about the context of Ignatius's time, of the movements he was involved with, and of the spiritual orientations of persons who were close to him and were thought to have influenced him.
More than particular books that Ignatius may or may not have read, it is these movements in the Church during his lifetime with which he is known to have been in contact that are of interest. This brings us to the extensive re-reading of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation that has been undertaken by historians in the last several decades.\textsuperscript{29}

A. REFORMATION AND COUNTER-REFORMATION

Though the use of terminology for the period we are discussing may seem to be peripheral to St. Ignatius, in fact it has some importance for understanding the influences on him and his reaction to them. The term “Counter-Reformation” arose among German Protestant historians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. For them there was only one “Reformation,” the one initiated by Luther’s posting of the Ninety-five Theses against indulgences in 1517, and brought to a successful completion with the 1555 Peace of Augsburg, which legalized Lutheranism within the Holy Roman Empire and accepted the fact of permanent religious division. The great German Protestant historian, Leopold von Ranke, in his monumental six-volume German History in the Epoch of the Reformation (Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation), gave the definitive stamp to this chronology, and through his prestige it received general acceptance among historians (O’Malley 2000, 18-19).

This inevitably led to the characterization of the subsequent period, in which the papacy, through the instrumentality of the Inquisition, the Jesuits, and the Council of Trent, endeavored to restore its discipline over the Catholic church, while the Catholic princes by military and political means attempted to push back Protestantism, as a “Counter-Reformation” (Gegenreformation). For Protestant historians, this principally comprised the period from the 1555 Peace of

\textsuperscript{29}In writing this section, I have profited greatly from two overlapping books: Bireley 1999 and O’Malley 2000, particularly the latter, even more than the explicit citations indicate.
Augsburg, which established Lutheranism as an official religion of the Empire, to the close of the Thirty Years’ War in 1648, generally conceded to be the last of the wars of religion.

Catholic historians, though recognizing that not all had been well with the Church in the late Middle Ages, rejected Luther’s movement as being the real reformation, and rather characterized it as the “Protestant Revolt.” The Protestants had not only broken with the true Church of Christ, but had adopted many of the unhealthiest elements of the late Middle Ages, such as nominalism. Johannes Janssen’s *History of the German People since the Close of the Middle Ages (Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters)*, a massive eight-volume social history, running to seventeen volumes in its late nineteenth-century English translation, strengthened this retort of Catholics, showing the vitality and holiness which had been part of the late-medieval Church (O’Malley 2000, 21-22). Had Luther not acted so rashly, it was argued, the Church would have renewed itself, rather than being torn apart by Luther’s unjustified revolt.

Once again it would be von Ranke who would set the Protestant pattern. In his earlier major work, *The Roman Popes (Die Römische Päpste)*, he had acknowledged the spiritual forces at work in sixteenth-century Catholicism, which were not simply a reaction to Luther. Though he saw them in large part frustrated by the end of the century, his recognition of the contribution of the papacy, the Council of Trent, and the Jesuits, turned away from the purely political and military interpretation of the Counter-Reformation that had been current (O’Malley 2000, 23).

**B. TOWARD A SYNTHESIS**

It would be the essay of Hubert Jedin in 1946, *Catholic Reformation or Counter-Reformation? (Katholische Reform oder Gegenreformation?)*, which would take the first major mediating step. He insisted that there had been a Catholic Reformation or Reform, long before Luther, which owed nothing to an opposition to the Lutheran position. It was represented by such movements as that of Cardinal Jiménez de
Cisneros in early sixteenth-century Spain; or the Oratory of Divine Love, that Italian group loosely-centered around St. Catherine of Genoa; and the so-called *Devotio moderna* in the Netherlands and in Germany.

These [Jedin] likened to streams or rivulets, which only the shock of the Protestant Reformation sufficed to merge into a river encompassing the whole Catholic Church. This happened when they were taken up by the papacy and then led to the Council of Trent (Bireley 1999, 4).

Not denying the repressive aspects of the Counter-Reformation, Jedin insisted nonetheless that it was "something positive, self-assertion. He also defined it as the church's rightful defense of its truth and heritage" (O'Malley 2000, 55). For Jedin, the Catholic Reform and the Counter-Reformation after Luther are phases of one movement, and in them the three principal agents are the same as von Ranke had seen—the papacy, the Jesuits, and the Council of Trent—but continuing through the seventeenth century. Though the distinction of the two movements in the Catholic church is important and accepted generally in substance today, the old term "Counter-Reformation" continues to be used indiscriminately by historians, even Catholic ones.\(^\text{30}\)

---

\(^\text{30}\)A relatively recent book by a Catholic priest-historian is Marvin R. O'Connell, *The Counter-Reformation, 1557-1610*. O'Connell was, however, constrained both by the nature of the 20-volume series, "The Rise of Modern Europe," originally edited by William Langer, whose first volumes appeared in the early 1930s, with others through the 1940s and 1950s. The last two to be written were those on the Reformation period. The original plan called for a volume entitled *The Protestant Revolt*, to be written by the Lutheran Wilhelm Pauck, while the subsequent volume was first entitled *The Catholic Reformation*, entrusted originally to Fr. Robert Lord, then to Msgr. Philip Hughes, whose deaths prevented their finishing the volume. Almost half a century later in 1984, the volume originally entrusted to Pauck appeared, authored now by Lewis Spitz, with the title *The Protestant Reformation, 1517-1559*, while the intended sequel by O'Connell, bearing the title *The Counter-Reformation, 1559-1610*, had appeared a decade earlier (1974). These two were the last in the
When Jean Delumeau, a French Catholic historian, after writing the volume of the “Nouvelle Clio” series on the Protestant Reformation, followed it up with the corresponding volume, he called the latter *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire*, thus accepting the substance of Jedin’s thesis in one way—that there was a single Catholic movement, but at the same time no longer fixing on the institution, which “reform” or “counter-reform” necessarily connote. Rather, the focus was on a “history of mentalities, practices, and collectivities within Catholicism,” in accord with the approach of the “Annales School” of French historiography. Ironically, however, the English language editor of its translation believed it necessary to add a clarifying subtitle: “A New View of the Counter-Reformation,” thus implicitly negating Delumeau’s approach.

The constantly evolving history of historiography found in O’Malley’s *Trent and All That* has led him and most other scholars of whatever religious persuasion today to one of two directions. One has been to keep the basic distinction made by Jedin, as in the two books of the Langer series mentioned above, while greatly extending in both directions the period covered by the Catholic or Counter-Reformation, and giving it a far broader and deeper content. The other has been to simply set aside the terminology and to speak instead of “early modern Catholicism,” a term foreshadowed in Delumeau’s work, and adopted by O’Malley (2000, 140-43), Bireley

series to be published. The time frames were determined from the beginning by their place in the series, but presumably the various titles reflected the changing ideas of editors and/or authors. The vicissitudes indicate the fundamentally non-ideological character of period titles today.

31 Of course by beginning with Luther, he seems to return to the old thesis, which saw the Catholic Reform merely as a reaction to Luther. But this appears to be more the organization of the series than a statement of position. (The preceding volume had been entitled *Naissance et affirmation de la Réforme*). In fact, as O’Malley notes, “without denying the critical importance of the early sixteenth century [he] located his theses in a much larger chronological framework reaching far back” (2000, 102).
(1999, 8) and many other scholars today.\textsuperscript{32} The term has its weaknesses, as it seems quite bland, as O'Malley himself admits. But as he points out, some of these weaknesses have their obverse. For example "it makes room for other names that we have encountered—Renaissance, Baroque Era, Siglo de Oro, for instance—that do not deserve to sink out of view" (2000, 140-41). Among other points that he indicates is that

It leaves the chronological question open at both ends, thereby allowing different determinations to be made according to different cultures and different issues. It meanwhile indicates a span that has some determinacy, a span of two hundred to four hundred years, somewhere between the fifteenth and the late eighteenth centuries, far less extensive than the thousand years we call the Middle Ages (ibid., 141).\textsuperscript{33}

There are other reasons for and against, but what concerns us here on this question of terminology is limited to its relevance to the effects it has had on our view of Ignatius and the Society he founded. One final comment that should be made is the increasing realization by historians of the great similarities between Protestant and Catholic Reformations, if we are to speak of such, and that to a great extent both must be seen as emerging from a general desire for reform in the Church. A recent text for advanced university students,

\textsuperscript{32}Bireley states this preference clearly, though he gives it more content by entitling his book, The Refashioning of Catholicism, 1450-1700, which takes account of the concerns of Delumeau, as well as giving a hint of other features of the period that have nothing to do with the Reformation, such as the missionary expansion of Catholicism and the emergence of new orders dedicated to education and service of the sick and the poor.

\textsuperscript{33}Some of the limitations of the earlier terminology derive from the fact that the problem of periodization and terminology was first posed and contested among German Lutheran and Catholic historians, so that it centered on Germany and Italy. No account was taken of French-Swiss Calvinism, nor the Europe-wide Radical Reformers, nor of Britain. Hence, the Protestant Reformation must be seen as extending itself at least to 1648, and in the case of Britain, perhaps to 1688.
which sums up briefly much of current scholarship, says: “Scholars now suggest that the Protestant Reformation and the Catholic Reformation were sisters, or perhaps cousins” (Jones 1995, 4). This desire for reform was expressed by various groups, chief among whom were the disciples of Erasmus, calling for a more personal commitment to Christ, and deploring the superstition and corruption with which the late medieval Church was afflicted. The change in terminology has been briefly pursued here because most historians now see Erasmus as a major factor not only in inciting the movement carried out by Luther, but as having earlier, and for some time after until the real Counter-Reformation took hold, acted as a major stimulus to the Catholic Reform independent of Luther.

C. ERASMIAN HUMANISM AND BOTH REFORMATIONS

Both Protestants and Catholics, it is now recognized, in the pursuit of these desires for reform, undertook new ministries which had not existed in the Middle Ages. Confining ourselves to Catholic efforts, among those new ministries in which the Society of Jesus was principally active were the efforts to evangelize the rural areas, the catechizing of the urban poor, and the Christian humanist education of the middle and upper classes. These new ministries of the Catholic Reformation were answers to the early sixteenth-century demands of the Christian humanists, most especially Erasmus, for an education which would promote genuine, intelligent piety among the laity as well as the clergy (O’Malley 1982, 10-13).

34We would not wish, however, to return to the notion that the Reformation was primarily concerned with reforming abuses. There is general consensus today that it was about reform of doctrine rather than of abuses. This consensus has been expressed succinctly: “The western church of 1500 was probably in better health than the church of St. Bernard; it was certainly not worse” (Jones 1995, 28). Any number of non-Catholic historians could be cited in the same sense. Indeed, Luther himself in his later years can be quoted to that effect, for example in 1533: “Doctrine and life must be distinguished. Life is bad among us as it is among the papists” (Luther 1967, 110).
This raises the question of the possible influence of Erasmian humanism on Ignatius. It is clear that he turned the direction of the Society's apostolate to rural preaching and to the catechizing of the urban poor. But, somewhat later in his life, he also gave the impetus to the apostolate of education. In spite of his early concern that Jesuits live in the poverty of professed houses, supported only by alms, we find that after having accepted the first Jesuit school for lay students in 1548, by 1554 he was urging that the Society should be more concerned to open new colleges than professed houses (Farrell 1938, 133-35). This change in orientation on the part of Ignatius was to make Jesuit colleges synonymous with Christian humanism for the next two centuries. Did Erasmian humanistic ideals contribute to this?

For a long time, particularly under the influence of Jacob Burckhardt's nineteenth-century classic, The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy, most historians looked upon the Renaissance as a paganizing influence on Church and culture, symbolized by such Renaissance popes as Alexander VI. Though there were indeed paganizing influences in fifteenth-century Italy—and even there these should not be exaggerated—the humanism of northern Europe is now seen to have been generally profoundly Christian. Founded on a return, not so much to the pagan classics as to the sources of Christian spirituality in the Bible and the Fathers, this humanism called for an education that would produce a genuine piety, based not merely on external practices but on interior commitment to Christ. As humanistic, it tended to be an optimistic, world-affirming spirituality, an activist spirituality, suitable for the laity and secular clergy, unlike previous spiritualities articulated from within the cloister. All this would be characteristic of the Society of Jesus (O'Malley 1982, 16).

The key figure in all this was Erasmus, with his Greek New Testament, his many editions of the Greek and Latin Fathers, and especially his best-selling book in many languages, The Handbook of the Christian Soldier (Enchiridion militis Christiani). Here Erasmus with biting but earnest wit castigated the superstitious religious practices of the day, the vices of the clergy, and the external formalism of the
religious orders. In contrast to these distorted notions of religion, he promoted as an antidote the true "philosophy of Christ." No other historical figure was as much the light of Christian Europe as was Erasmus, and his works are now seen to have had enormous influence on the leaders of both the Protestant and Catholic Reformations, though both would in the end reject him.

Nowhere was this admiration more true than in Spain, and most particularly at the new university founded by the reforming Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros (Ximenes) at Alcalá. The best-known symbol of Alcalá's humanistic orientation was the Biblia Complutense, the edition of the Bible in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, patronized by Cisneros. But it was not merely in the return to the biblical sources in their original languages that the new university was a stronghold of Christian humanism, but also by its promotion of Erasmian theology and spirituality. An older historiography of Erasmus, whether coming from rationalist, Protestant, or Catholic sources, has tended to see him in accordance with each author's prejudices. For a sympathetic, but rationalist, biographer like Preserved Smith, he is the forerunner of the Reformation, but a progressive Reformation leading to liberalism.

Convinced as I am that the Reformation was fundamentally a progressive movement, the culmination of the Renaissance, and above all, the logical outcome of the teachings of Erasmus himself, I cannot but regard his later rejection of it as a mistake in itself and as a misfortune to the cause of liberalism (Smith 1962, 439).

Conversely, a conservative Catholic historian renowned for altering radically the former totally negative Catholic view of Luther,
Fr. Joseph Lortz, painted a picture of Erasmus from a totally different point of view, remarkably like the views of Smith in a key aspect, while utterly disapproving of both the man and his program.

Erasmus had no part in real Catholic revival. We have already acknowledged his efforts to deepen Christian piety and to purify the administration of the Church from many abuses. But we saw too, that these efforts were so bound up with an a-dogmatic and relativist basic outlook, that there can be no talk of Catholic reform instigated by him. His zeal for peace and tranquility was not Catholic, was not even religious, but rather relativist. He was very little interested in the doctrinal aspect of the reunion of the two parties. His ideal was education, not religion (Lortz 1968, 245).

Similarly, a leading Protestant historian of the Reformation, though recognizing something more positive in Erasmus, considered him little differently than the rationalist or the conservative Catholic authors cited.

In assigning Erasmus a place among the anticlericals and the sceptics, one must not forget that other and devouter Erasmus who aspired to see untutored men embrace the person of Christ, the scholar who abandoned scholasticism only to spend much of his life editing the New Testament and the Fathers (Dickens 1969, 12).

The latter part of the twentieth century has seen a change of views. Few today would see him as a skeptic or early rationalist. Both Protestants, like Roland Bainton, the admiring biographer of Luther as well as of Erasmus, and Catholics like John C. Olin and John W. O'Malley, S.J., specialists in Catholic Renaissance and Reformation history, have written appreciatively of him; a critical edition begun in 1969 is being published by the Royal Dutch Academy; and a massive English translation, *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, is being published by the University of Toronto Press with the collaboration of Catholic, Protestant, and non-religious scholars (McConica 1991, 100). In many of the recent works on Erasmus, we see, in contrast with scholars like Lortz, less concentration on the personality of Erasmus, with its obvious weaknesses, and more on his program of reform, which almost all see to have been eminently Catholic.
D. IGNATIUS AND ERASMUS

In the light of this contemporary appreciation of Erasmus and Christian humanism, there has also been a new look at the supposed antipathy of Ignatius to his writings, whose source is a story related by Ribadeneyra in his biography of Ignatius. According to Ribadeneyra, Ignatius had begun to read the Enchiridion while in Barcelona in 1523-24, at the suggestion of his confessor and other pious men. But as he read, he

observed that the reading of that book chilled the spirit of God in him and gradually extinguished the ardor of devotion.... Finally he cast the book aside, and he conceived such an aversion for the author that he never afterward would read him, nor would he permit his works to be read in the Society (MHSI, MI, FN 4:174, translated in Olin 1979, 77).

Several historians have called the whole episode and its result into question. The last part of the statement quoted above, that Ignatius prohibited the works of Erasmus in all Jesuit houses or schools, is demonstrably false.36 It is true that he began to show a more cautious attitude by 1552, and in some of his letters discouraged, or even forbade at times, their use as textbooks, but not their being read by Jesuits. However, he showed a certain flexibility, as did Laynez and Nadal after him. The reasons are not totally clear be-

36However, it should be noted that the second part of the quotation is Olin's paraphrase, and takes no account of the word "passim" in the Latin text. It should therefore be translated to say that he would not permit Erasmus's works to be read indiscriminately in the Society, which is correct for the decade of the 1550s, though not before that, as may be seen from the example of Nadal at Messina below. Moreover, in Ribadeneyra's own Spanish translation eleven years later, he says that Ignatius would not allow Erasmus to be read in the Society "except in very selected cases and with much caution" ("sino con mucho delecto y mucha cautela," MHSI, MI, FN, 4:175). Olin, in his anxiety to prove that Ignatius was not anti-Erasmian, ignores the excepting word or phrase in both versions, thus failing to take account of the evolving mind of Ignatius on the subject as he was subject to external pressures.
cause of this variation in his different letters, but undoubtedly a great part of it was the increasing hostility to Erasmus in many sectors of the Catholic church, culminating in Paul IV's putting all of his works on the Index of Forbidden Books (O'Malley 1993, 261-64). Olin has put it well:

Ignatius' concern and caution, I submit, is reflective of a general attitude toward Erasmus that began to harden in these years of a climate of opinion that was superorthodox, suspicious, and unbending. Prudence became his guide in the matter, for he had no desire to see his Society falter under the burden of Erasmus and other controversial authors. It had, indeed, enough problems of its own. There are no grounds, as far as I can see, for connecting this cautionary attitude with a reading of the *Enchiridion* almost thirty years before (1979, 81).

In substantiation of this explanation, we should note that, beginning with the first college of the Society primarily for externs in Messina in 1548, the rector, Jerónimo Nadal, reported that they were using several of Erasmus' books (as well as others by such humanists as Lorenzo Valla and Juan Luis Vives) in the college curriculum, one which Ignatius would later order him to send to Rome to serve as a model for the Roman College (Olin 1994, 95).

These attitudes and prohibitions in the 1550s, however, are principally concerned with Erasmus's textbooks and some of his commentaries on Scripture. The question of Erasmian piety, specifically in the case of the *Enchiridion*, and Ignatius's attitude in his earlier years is another question. It seems quite untrue to say that Ignatius read this book at Barcelona, since it does not appear that he knew enough Latin at that time, and the book had not been translated into Spanish. It is true that Ribadeneyra says that he was advised to read the book so that he might simultaneously achieve elegance in Latin as well as nurture for his piety. But judging from the fact that Ignatius started Latin all over again in Paris, it is unlikely that whatever progress he had made in Latin in Barcelona would have enabled him to achieve that dual purpose with a writer of such elegant style as Erasmus.

However, a Spanish translation did appear the very year he ar-
rived in Alcalá, in 1526. The principal publisher of Erasmus in Spain was Miguel de Eguía, a benefactor of Ignatius when he was studying in Alcalá, two of whose brothers, Diego and Esteban, would in 1540 join the Society in Rome. It was Diego, moreover, whom Ignatius would choose to be his confessor in later years. At Alcalá itself, his confessor was a Portuguese secular priest, Fr. Manuel Miona, himself an Erasmian who had to leave for Paris when the tide began to turn in Spain and the Inquisition started to investigate the Erasmians at Alcalá. He too would later join the Society in Rome, as would his Erasmian companion in the flight to Paris, Dr. Miguel de Torres, a man whom Ignatius would appoint, shortly after his entrance into the Society and less than a year after his solemn profession, as visitor to the province of Portugal to correct the problems created there by Simão Rodrigues (O’Reilly 1979, 118).

Thus there were many sources from which Ignatius would have made contact with Erasmian piety at Alcalá. In fact, Gonçalves da Câmara says in his “Memoriale” that Ignatius had told him that while he was a student there,

many persons, including his own confessor... advised him to read Erasmus’s Enchiridion militis christiani. But he did not wish to do so, because he had heard some preachers and persons of authority even then find fault with this author. He replied to those who recommended it that there were other books about whose authors no one would say anything bad, and that he wanted to read these (MHSI, FN 1:585).37

37The “Memoriale,” as mentioned previously, was a kind of diary in which Gonçalves da Câmara wrote down during Jan-Oct 1555 whatever he observed about St. Ignatius or heard from him. Parts are in Portuguese, parts in Spanish. Without doubting the substance (he repeats it in slightly different form in Spanish [MHSI, FN, 1:669]), he is evidently writing more negatively under the influence of Paul IV’s condemnation of Erasmus’s works, and the reaction against him among many Catholics. It is relevant to note that Ribadeneyra in his “Collectanea,” a series of notes that are evidently made in preparation for his biography of Ignatius, almost certainly around 1566-67, has a paragraph that is definitely taken from Gonçalves da Câmara’s “Memoriale.”
There is an obvious contradiction with Ribadeneyra's version, which postulates that he did read the book, and that it chilled his fervor. Some writers have adduced certain texts which, when compared with some passages of the Spiritual Exercises, at least at first sight seem to indicate that Ignatius at some point did in fact read the Enchiridion in its Spanish translation\(^{38}\) and was in some points influenced by it.\(^{39}\) It is difficult, however, to achieve any certainty from these brief apparent allusions. In an extensive more recent study of the texts adduced, Mark Rotsaert concludes "they were both written in an identical spiritual climate. The spirituality of the two works results from the use of common materials, but it is the arrangement of these which causes the differences" (1982, 144). O'Malley in his

It likewise puts the statement of Ignatius in Alcalá, and has him refusing to read the book for the same reasons. However, he has him ordering Erasmus's books to be burned, even before they were forbidden by Paul IV. Dalmases considers this to be a slip of memory, which is possible, since Polanco clearly says that heretical works were ordered burned, but certain others, like those of Erasmus and Juan Luis Vives were set apart. However, Dalmases also suggests that "it was possible" that Erasmus's book was recommended to Ignatius both at Barcelona and at Alcalá, the first time as an aid to improving his Latin style, the second for his spiritual progress. We cannot deny the possibility, but it seems to stretch the imagination. See MHSI, MI, PN 4:416-18, especially nn. 12 and 15.

\(^{38}\) It is of some significance to emphasize the Spanish translation. The Spanish translator of this and certain other works of Erasmus at times omitted or softened an overly sharp or sarcastic phrase of Erasmus, or added a nuance "without ever being disloyal to him" (Bataillon 1966, 191).

\(^{39}\) Since the early parallels adduced by Bataillon and Olin, among others, there has been a considerable amount of more critical writing on the subject. Republishing his 1967 essay in 1979, Olin added a brief supplement pointing out the conclusions of a number of them. Though he leaves his original article untouched, he puts more emphasis on the overall thrust of the spiritual projects of the two men (1979, 86-88). And in his most recent book, his concern is rather with the influence of Erasmian humanistic educational methods on the Jesuit colleges from the time of Ignatius rather than on direct influences on Ignatian spirituality.
most recent treatment of the attitudes writers like Gonçalves da Cámara and Ribadeneyra attribute to Ignatius expresses more emphatically the observation he had made on the subject a decade earlier: "[T]he style and content of the *Enchiridion*... especially in the Castilian translation, contained so much that was compatible with Ignatian *pietas* and little or nothing that ran counter to it" (1993, 260; cf. 1982, 17-18). He adds, however, what can be the final word on the real relation between Ignatius and Erasmus:

There is no problem... in imagining that other popular works of Erasmus, including the *Praise of Folly* and some of the *Colloquies*, would have been distasteful to Ignatius for their caustic and sarcastic criticism of the abuses, venality, and superstition in the church. Such criticisms of the church he loved so much, although they appeared in mitigated form in the preaching and other public utterances of some of his Jesuit brethren, could indeed have cooled Ignatius’s ardor. But with the possible exception of the *Enchiridion*, there is no evidence that he had firsthand knowledge of these works or of anything else Erasmus wrote (ibid., 261).

Nonetheless, the fact remains that by the 1560s and 1570s the tendency to fit Ignatius into the "orthodox" theological climate of the time, with the repressive aspects of the Counter-Reformation well under way, seems clear, particularly from the contradictions in different writings of Ribadeneyra and between the former and Gonçalves da Cámara. The efforts of Ribadeneyra, seconded or inspired by Borgia, to eliminate, as it were, all competition to his own life of Ignatius is one indication; the self-censorship and even deliberate suppression by Gonçalves da Cámara of the less edifying part of Ignatius’s life in the Autobiography even in 1555 gives credence to the likelihood that in the 1570s he too was involved in the suppression of the then unacceptable picture of the early Ignatius. The officially created image of Ignatius colored all.
IV. Ignatius’s Ideas on Religious Life

Whatever may be the final verdict on Ignatius’s attitude to the general manner of achieving reform in the Church, it is clear that he did not change his overarching vision of what the Society should be and how it should operate. He appreciated the need for prudence and recognized where there were dangers. But he was not afraid to innovate and to exert major coordinated efforts, including political influence, to get the approval of the Church for his innovations.40

It is difficult to appreciate today how radical many of his ideas seemed at the time. But while recognizing the risks involved in an approach to religious life so different from that of all the centuries before him, he placed his confidence in the formation that he wanted of his men—a formation which would enable them to operate as faithful servants of the Church without the traditional restraints and safeguards others considered essential to religious life.

John Bossy, a contemporary historian of the Catholic Reform has summed up Ignatius’s ideal of obedience succinctly:

Ignatius’s, I would suggest, was an ideal which demanded almost as much of the hierarchical Church as it conceded to it, and no interpretation of it will do which makes too little room for the dialectics of obedience and initiative. Few religious superiors can have told members of their order so firmly to forget the rules and do what they thought best (Bossy 1968, 130).

That dialectics of obedience and initiative has not always been understood by those in authority in the Church. One can see this in the misunderstanding between Pope Paul VI and the 32nd General

40See for example the brief account in Brodrick of his efforts to obtain the approbation of the Society, for which he not only ordered three thousand masses to be offered to change the opposition from Cardinal Guidiccioni, but employed the influence not only of a number of dukes, cardinals, archbishops, as well as the senate of Parma, but likewise the persuasion of Costanza Farnese, favorite illegitimate daughter of the pope (1940, 78-79).
Congregation, when the Congregation thought that it was acting in accord with Ignatian obedience in making representation with the Pope, while the latter saw the delegates as ignoring his sufficiently clearly expressed wishes that the extension of the fourth vow (taken by the solemnly professed) to the rest of the Society not be further discussed.41

Bossy’s reference to Ignatius’s attitude toward rules is a bit oversimplified, but it is basically accurate. Fr. Oliver Manare related how he had set aside Ignatius’s explicit instructions when rector of the college at Loreto, because he believed that in the different concrete situation a different course of action was what Ignatius would have wanted. Ignatius replied that he had done rightly.

It is man who confers the office, but God who gives discernment. I wish that for the future you do, without scruple, as your judgment tells you to do according to the circumstances, rules and ordinations notwithstanding (quoted in de Guibert 1964, 102).

Examples could be multiplied. During the crisis in Portugal, the largest province of the Society, which had gotten out of control under the provincialate of Simão Rodrigues, one of Ignatius’s first companions, Ignatius appointed in 1552 as visitor with complete authority over the province for its reform, Fr. Miguel de Torres. Though the latter had been in the Society only a short time and made his solemn profession just prior to his assignment, Ignatius provided him with blank letters, signed by himself, giving him authority to use them as patents to remove or appoint any superior, or as letters coming from Ignatius, together with authority to dismiss from the Society anyone he deemed necessary (Gonçalves da Câmara, “Memoriale,” MHSI, MI, FN, 1:684-85). The number who left or were dismissed was considerable, yet he received the full backing of Ignatius.42

41The whole episode is lucidly and objectively discussed, with proper attention to all the factors, both on the part of the Pope and of the Congregation, by McGarry (1977, 119-125).

42The classic historian of the Spanish Assistancy, Fr. Antonio Astrain, rely-
Conclusion

In the light of the discontinuities we have pointed out in the history of the Society, and worse, of the creation of an "official" image of Ignatius and the "domestication" of his charism, it seems evident that a more soundly based history has had much to do with the efforts to rethink our "traditions" during the past half century. It would be a mistake, however, to consider that the process has been complete, or that it has been fully successful on all points. The process must continue or we will once again fall back into a "non-historical orthodoxy." As Father General Peter-Hans Kolvenbach put it pithily in a meeting of provincials from the whole Society in 2001, the question we must continually ask ourselves is not "What did St. Ignatius do?" but rather, "What would St. Ignatius do today?" This is

---

ing on the letter of 6 Jan 1553 from Torres to Ignatius, where he says: "of the 318 vines which have been planted in it [i.e., members of the Society who had entered the Portuguese province] more than 127 are out of it" (MHSI, Epp. Mixt., 3:25). Deducting those who had gone to India or Brazil and thus become members of those provinces, or who had left earlier or had died, he estimates that in 1552, the Portuguese province had only 250-260 individuals; hence at least one-half had left or been dismissed by Torres. Since a good number left for the Indies or Brazil in the succeeding months, he concludes, with the support of the history written by Polanco, that by Jul 1553, only 105 Jesuits remained in Portugal (Astrain 1912, 607-8). Astrain's conclusions find support in Polanco (MHSI, Chron. 390; 416). Nadal likewise reported that sixty Jesuits had left or been dismissed from the College of Coimbra alone (MHSI, MI, FN 2:214). However, these conclusions have been indignantly challenged by the later historian of the Portuguese Assistancy, Francisco Rodrigues, S.J., in his Historia da Companhia de Jesus na assistência de Portugal (Porto, 1931-50), partly on the grounds that the number who had left or been dismissed dated from the beginning of the Portuguese province, a probable more correct interpretation of the text of Torres cited by Astrain. Unfortunately, I do not have access to the work of Rodrigues, but I do not see how the texts of Polanco and Nadal can be ignored. However, Iparraguirre (1963, 806, n. 1) accepts Rodrigues's conclusions, as apparently does Alden (1996, 288-89).
just another way of phrasing what Vatican II called for in the renewal of religious life, and applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to every religious congregation in the Church today.

### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHSI</td>
<td><em>Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td><em>Monumenta Ignatiana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td><em>Fontes Narrativi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epp. Mixt.</td>
<td><em>Epistolarum Mixtæ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chron.</td>
<td><em>Polanco, Chronicum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epp. Nadal</td>
<td><em>Epistolarum Patris Hieronymi Nadal</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### References Cited


