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Spiritualities are affected by the cultures they live through. To see ignatian prayer as it was in the beginning, it is necessary to understand something of the shifts of culture and consciousness that have occurred since the sixteenth century. William Blake saw the cause of all the ills of his day in the ‘two-horned heresy’, the heresiarchs being Bacon, Locke and Newton. Somehow man had become more at odds with his world and at odds with himself, his head in disharmony with his heart, the cerebral with the affective. ‘Imagination’ would put him together again and re-unite him with the world. T.S. Eliot coined the phrase ‘dissociation of sensibility’ to describe something similar. Changes in the language of poets pointed to a shift in consciousness that occurred at some time in the seventeenth century. The sixteenth-century poets were able to incorporate ‘their erudition into their sensibility: their mode of feeling was directly and freshly altered by their reading and thought’. ‘There is a direct sensuous apprehension of thought, or a recreation of thought into feeling.... A thought to Donne was an experience; it modified his sensibility’. By the end of the seventeenth century, ‘wit’ and ‘feeling’ had been divorced; the poets ‘thought and felt by fits, unbalanced’. ‘Tennyson and Browning are poets, and they think; but they do not feel their thought as immediately as the odour of a rose’.

In many ways ignatian prayer is like an old painting covered with layers of varnish and touched up by inferior hands. The art of removing varnish in order to disclose the living colours of the original is a relatively recent one. Similarly, it is only recently that the writings of Ignatius apart from his Exercises and Constitutions have been edited and to some extent studied. Future generations will see us to have had our proper biases and distortions. But we are in a better position to see what Ignatius was saying about apostolic contemplation than any generation since the death of the first companions. We have documents that they could not have had and we can see him more clearly in the current of the tradition that he reverenced, selected from and changed.

In his teaching on prayer, as in his conception of a group of consecrated men wholly given to apostolic work, he was both more innovative and more traditional than has usually been realized. His immediate successors did not quite see how revolutionary he had been.

The charges made by sincere men against Jesuit spirituality are many. It is individualistic, rationalistic, voluntaristic, semi-pelagian, introspective, moralistic, desiccating, a bully; it would force the free play of the spirit into a prison of methods.

The Exercises were attacked at the beginning for opposite reasons. They were seen by sixteenth-century opponents like Melchior Cano and Thomas Pedroche as too mystical and affective, as insufficiently ascetical and rational, as giving a dangerous prominence to the interior illumination of the holy Spirit. Their fears are like the fears of some Jesuits today in the face of recent writing on the central place of discernment in Ignatius’s Constitutions and Exercises and on the contemplative implications of his pedagogy of prayer.

It is ironical that the spirituality of many nineteenth- and twentieth-century Jesuits should have come to resemble the spirituality of Melchior Cano, the Society’s ferocious opponent in its early years. In his study of sixteenth-century spirituality in Spain, Emilio Colunga o.p., calls men like Cano and Pedroche the ‘intellectualists’. The more contemplative Ignatian tradition always remained alive, sometimes more vigorous, sometimes less so. But unquestionably many were fearful of mysticism, suspicious of affectivity, sceptical about the probability of ‘the Creator and Lord communicating himself to the devout soul in quest of his will’, and inclined to assume that discursive meditation remained for most the normal way of prayer.

Ignatius and the men who knew his mind best like Jerome Nadal were well aware how open the Exercises were to the charge of illumism. In the text of the Exercises, reference to the holy Spirit is notably absent where you would expect it. In the Spain of the
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4 Colunga, E., o.p.: ‘Intelectualistas y místicos en la teología española en el siglo XVI’, in Ciencia Tomista 9 and 10 (1914), cited in Iparraguirre, Practica de los ejercicios de san Ignatio de Loyola en vida de su autor (Rome, 1946), pp 92-99. According to Iparraguirre, theologians like Melchior Cano were concerned for the purity of the faith, opposed religious publications in the vernacular, were afraid of urging laymen to the spiritual life lest the distinction between religious and lay be weakened, were suspicious of anything affective in prayer, and were inclined to scent illumism in any writing that strayed from the language of the schools.
5 Exx 15.
The fear of being charged with illuminism and later the fear of illuminism itself, especially in the period between the Church's condemnation of quietism and the condemnation of modernism, helped to distort Jesuit understanding of Ignatius's teaching. Pedroche, the Spanish inquisitor, was accurate in pinpointing those places in the Exercises that seemed to smack of illuminism: annotation 15; the parts on indifference; everything to do with election; the description of spiritual consolation. Those parts, if you add the remaining guidelines on discernment, are the heart of the Exercises and of Ignatian teaching on apostolic life. When they are given small importance, Ignatian spirituality easily becomes an asceticism only.

The dangers of illuminism, the well-founded fear of the early Jesuit Generals that some Spanish Jesuits would turn the new order from its apostolic calling and make it purely contemplative, the silliness occasioned in Spain and France by the fashionable fervour for mysticism: these reasons largely explain the reserve of Borgia, Mercurian and Vitelleschi towards certain Jesuit contemplatives. Largely, but not entirely: something else was at work that does not emerge explicitly in the documents of the time.

St Francis Borgia, himself a mystic, ordered Fr Antonio Cordeses, one of the Spanish Provincials, to stop teaching his subjects a simple affective prayer. The terms of Borgia's letter to Cordeses are surprising:
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7 That is, 1687 to 1907.
8 Exx 15. Here is Pedroche's comment on annotation fifteen: 'These words manifest and clearly contain and affirm and teach a proposition and assertion that is temerarious and scandalous and heretical. . . . Preaching has no place, nor a preacher, to persuade (the exercitant) which particular choice among many goods he ought to make. . . . It is clear to me that this doctrine belongs to the dejados and alambreados; the written work is left aside, with all the teaching and doctrine which good and wise men have given. These men give themselves over to what the spirit and God tells them there in the recesses of the soul'. MHSI, Chron. Ppl. III, 509-10.
9 Exx 23, 46, 157, 170, 179. The word 'indifference' is not found in the text of the Exercises.
10 Exx 135, 169-89.
12 Exx 313-36.
13 Generals of the Society of Jesus: Borgia, 3rd General 1565-72; Mercurian 1573-80; Aquaviva 1581-1615; Vitelleschi 1615-45.
I understand that your reverence requires your subjects to make acts of love in their daily prayer, and that you desire to lead them all by this way. I praise your zeal and your good desires, for it is quite true that that is the best and loftiest spiritual exercise. But I warn you, my father, that not all are developed enough for this exercise, and that not all understand it or are capable of it. To teach them how to pray, the Lord has given us a good guide in the Spiritual Exercises of the Society. Later, some will continue in this manner of praying, others in another. . . . For the movements of the holy Spirit are different, and different the characters and minds of men.¹⁴

Borgia’s successor, Everard Mercurian, the fourth jesuit General, went further. He was a Fleming, formed in a climate of anti-protestant polemic and fear of illuminism, with a liking for what was logically coherent and systematic in spirituality.¹⁵ His character and government are well conveyed by his statement that the Society needed ‘not so much to be reformed as to be formed’. He forbade Jesuits to read Tauler, Ruysbroeck, Mombaer, Herp, Raymond Lull, Gertrude, Mechtilde of Magdeburg and ‘others like them’.¹⁶ It was by his authority that the saintly director of St Teresa, Fr Balthasar Alvarez, was ordered to stop praying contemplatively and to bring back those he was directing to safer ways.¹⁷

The incident helps us to understand the climate in which the definitive 1599 Directory could say:

Applying the senses is different from meditation, since meditation is more intellectual and consists more in reasoning. Meditation is altogether higher, since it reasons concerning the causes and effects of those mysteries. . . .¹⁸

The president of the commission which completed the text of the Directory was Fr Gil Gonzales Davila, one of the first to be alarmed by Balthasar Alvarez’s way of prayer. The observation on meditation did not go unchallenged, and was ignored in practice by men like
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¹⁶ ‘et alia huiusmodi’.
¹⁸ MHSI, Directorio, 681, Cap. 20.
Gagliardi, La Palma, La Puente, Alvarez de Paz and Francis Suarez. For the moment, however, the men wary of contemplation had prevailed. In the nineteenth century, in a Church even less favourable to contemplation, the authority of the Directory was to carry more weight than the Spanish writers.

The correspondence connected with the affair of Cordeses and Alvarez demonstrates how soon on both sides the characteristic language and attitudes of St Ignatius had been weakened. If, for convenience (however misleadingly) we label one side the ‘ascetics’ and the other the ‘mystics’, the ‘ascetics’ constantly stress the importance of prayer; the ‘mystics’ are equally concerned with the importance of the apostolate. Both are zealous to preserve the authentic tradition and calling of the order. The ‘mystics’ appeal to the authority of the Exercises, especially by quoting the fourth addition: ‘I will remain... where I have found what I desire, without any eagerness to go on until I have been satisfied’. But neither side argues from a close examination of the text of the Exercises, nor from the experience of making or giving them. Neither side appeals to the ignatian phrase ‘to find God in all things’, nor to Nadal’s *contemplativus in actione*. The ‘ascetics’ see prayer as being either discursive meditation, which they take to be suitable for beginners, or as mystical prayer in the sense of an extraordinary gift; they see it as being possible for active apostles, though unusual. The ‘mystics’ were convinced that the degree of abnegation pointed to by the ignatian Exercises and Constitutions must lead almost infallibly, in view of the divine munificence, to the gift of contemplation.

Jesuit folklore tends to cast Fr John Roothaan, the General who re-established the Society after its restoration in 1814, in the role of the man who influenced Jesuit spirituality along an excessively rationalist path. The truth is not so simple. A man who wanted, in the midst of the labours of government, to edit and publish Gagliardi’s commentaries on the Exercises, was certainly familiar with the contemplative Jesuit tradition. It is true that Jesuits in the nineteenth century interpreted the Exercises in a rigid and literalist way. But it is more accurate to say that their lack of flexibility
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20 Exx 76.
21 Cf de Guibert: *op. cit.*, pp 468-70.
is due less to a single man or a single doctrine than to institutional forces: the formation of scholastics (with numerous borrowings from sulpician seminary practice), the long years when young men, just emerging from adolescence, were daily exposed to the care of men whose specialization was formation and isolated from the normal life of the Society.²⁴

It is through such fortunes as these that the Jesuits came to be accused, some rightly and some wrongly, of an intellectualism or rationalism in spirituality and theology that is at the opposite pole from all that Ignatius taught about apostolic prayer.

The Exercises are essentially a point of departure. It is surprising to find Borgia and Mercurian so soon after Ignatius’s death confining the prayer of Jesuits to what the surface meaning of the Exercises says and further, as far as one can judge, to the type of meditation recommended in the First Week. To understand the contemplation that finds God equally in the midst of action as in time of formal prayer needs, besides the text of the Exercises and reflection on the experience of making them, an acquaintance with the ignatian Constitutions and reflection on the experience of trying to live them.

When we remember how exigent Ignatius was in selecting and preparing men for making the full Exercises and how careful he was in selecting those he allowed to give them, we begin to realize how essential to the Exercises is the function of ‘the one giving them’, and how central to the whole pedagogy of spiritual growth is the discerning relationship between one ‘maker’ and one ‘giver’.

It is possible to read the text in an excessively quietist or in an excessively pelagian way. Ignatius gave those he trained to give the Exercises no theory of prayer or spirituality. He apprenticed them to the art, and they acquired it in a living tradition. He would have wanted them to be neither doctrinaire pelagians nor doctrinaire quietists, neither anti-mystical nor anti-ascetical, but capable flexibly of guiding a particular man ‘according to the measure of God’s grace’ given at any particular time, away from inert passivity or anxious activity.

The somewhat useful theoretical distinctions we are familiar with — ‘ordinary’, ‘extraordinary’, ‘acquired contemplation’, ‘infused contemplation’ — are all tools of the seventeenth century. Had he known them, Ignatius might still have refused to use them. They can be of some use to directors. It is another question whether they have been of more help or hindrance to learners. It is clear that Ignatius was

well aware of the invitation to illusion and self-deception entailed in a certain kind of chat about ‘mysticism’.

Yet, had he lived in the aftermath of the quietist rumpus or in the bleak aftertaste of the Age of Reason, he might well have been trenchant in his comments on those who, like Bossuet, insisted on the great rarity of ‘more visitations’ and the dogged expectation of ‘fewer’.

It is not a question of conjecturing how many there are whose prayer remains fallow, how many succeed in emerging from spiritual or emotional self-centredness, how many reach a high degree of charity without exceptional gifts of prayer. These are speculative questions. It is rather a question of the effects a particular style of pedagogy may have on limiting or expanding the expectations and preconceptions of those who embark on a life of prayer. Ignatius would keep his counsel. He would place the responsibility for encouragement or deflation where it belongs, on the director.

The evils that Jesuit spirituality has sometimes committed would have been avoidable if succeeding generations had taken Ignatius’s directives seriously. When the Exercises are given a Pelagian interpretation, and when the role of individual direction is diminished or precluded, whether in the making of the Exercises or in the living of the Constitutions, manipulation is at once a danger and the invasion of the Spirit’s freedom is to some extent inevitable.

Ignatius valued freedom. ‘Our Father wanted us, in all our activities, as far as possible, to be free, at ease in ourselves, and obedient to the light given particularly to each one’. ‘The Father said to me that there can be no greater mistake, in his view, in things of the spirit, than to want to mould others in one’s own image’. This is only the extension to government, to spiritual direction and to prayer, of the clear directives of the text of the Exercises and of the autograph Directories. The one giving the Exercises ‘should not influence him to adopt one state or another . . . That is against the directives of the Exercises and the spirit of the Company, which desires that men should be led to enter the Company freely and only by God’s movement . . . To do the contrary is to introduce the sickle into the harvest field of our Lord God’.

It is possible to find a purely ascetical meaning in the Exercises. It is easy, since it has often been done. It would be possible, though not so
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25 da Camara: op. cit., nos 195, 196.
26 Cf Constitutions, 260.
27 Ibid., no 256.
28 Ibid., no 256.
29 MHSI, Directoria, Doc. 4, p 95.
easy, to give an excessive mystical reading to the text. A logician coming innocent to the text might possibly be puzzled by the incompatibility of the active and passive verbs: ‘their purpose is to conquer self and to regulate one’s life’; ‘I call it consolation when an interior movement is aroused in the soul’; ‘every way of preparing and disposing the soul to rid itself of all inordinate affections’; ‘it is better that the Creator and Lord in person . . . himself dispose the soul’. The words need to be placed in the context of an experience of growth: ‘The more the soul is in solitude (the more it co-operates as best it can to dispose itself), the more fit it renders itself to approach and be united with its Creator and Lord. The more closely it is united with him, the more it is disposed to receive . . . gifts. . . ’\(^{30}\) All growth towards God is, from the beginning, at the same time both passive and active. The Exercises might be described as an art in which the ‘giver’ is aware that with God anything is possible.

Nadal, faithful to Ignatius’s mind, demonstrates the same refusal to close doors that is implicit in the Exercises, and that Ignatius trusted to the good sense and discernment of the men he trained to give them:

> We are sure that the privilege given to Fr Ignatius is granted to the whole Company; the same grace of contemplation is meant for all of us and is given along with our vocation. Superiors and prefects of prayer are to show that good sense that we know to have been native to him. When they judge in the Lord that someone is growing in prayer and led by the good Spirit, they are to avoid interfering. They should rather give him heart and confidence, so that he may grow with ease and strength in the Lord (in Domino suaviter quidem et fortiter).\(^{31}\)

The Exercises are a point of departure.

But towards what destination? We know that at the beginning some found, through making the Exercises, carthusian or dominican vocations. Many were led into the new purely apostolic vocation. It seems evident that even the second generation of Jesuits did not altogether grasp the originality of a life in which everything, including prayer, its kind as well as its measure, was to be determined by the overriding claims of the needs of men. But Nadal was sure that the apostolic vocation, if faithfully lived, would mean a participation, in however modest a degree, in the privilege given to Ignatius. He describes it as a contemplative gift:
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\(^{30}\) Exx 20.

\(^{31}\) MHSI, Epist. Nadal, 'In examen annotationes', p 652.
To contemplate and to savour affectionately the things of the spirit and God present in all things, in all activities and relationships.\textsuperscript{32}

We know that Ignatius’s own prayer was eucharistic and trinitarian. But that of itself would not indicate any difference from the tradition of monastic prayer. The account we have of his prayer in the diary fragment of 1544-45 reveals the highest mystical graces.\textsuperscript{33} It is not a prayer that abstracts from the world of creatures. It is absorbed in God and focused on the concrete and the particular. We find sense, sensibility, imagination, will and intelligence, the whole person concerned with a practical decision, with finding what God wants in the matter of poverty in the new order. It is a kind of sensibility of the intelligence.

The great bulk of the western writings on mysticism belongs to the tradition that goes back from John of the Cross, through the rhenish mystics, to the pseudo-Denis. It does not follow that most of those raised by God to close contemplative intimacy were of that kind; we simply do not know. But so great is the authority of that tradition that some writers, including Jesuit writers on apostolic prayer, assume that ‘mysticism’ is of one kind.

Such an assumption has practical consequences. A spiritual director may take it that everyone who is drawn to prayer must follow more or less the same road. And those who want to pray may similarly assume that the contemplative path described by John of the Cross is the only one, or the only ‘real’ one. If they are also called to consecrated apostolic life, they may become bewildered and lose their way, or give up and turn to ‘activism’. Or they may become ‘Carthusians in action’ or ‘Carmelites in action’. But it may not be what God was drawing them to, to the possible detriment of apostolic effectiveness. It is thirty-seven years since Joseph de Guibert’s authoritative study of Ignatius’s mysticism was published.\textsuperscript{34} In the English-speaking world, at least, not very much reflection has been made on its implications for the prayer of those who are called to some level of participation in the Ignatian grace of ‘finding God in all things’.

Michael Wadding of Waterford — the only Irish Jesuit who has given a small classic to the literature of spiritual theology — in his \textit{Practica de la theologia mistica} (1681), used a terminology that goes back to the

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., p 651. \textit{In omnibus rebus, actionibus, colloquitis, . . . Dei praesentiam rerumque spiritualium affectum sentire atque contemplaretur.}

\textsuperscript{33} ‘We are in the company of a soul that is being led by God in ways of infused contemplation to the same degree, though not in the same manner, as a St Francis of Assisi or a St John of the Cross’; de Guibert: \textit{op. cit.}, p 44.

pseudo-Denis to distinguish different kinds of contemplative gifts: the 'seraphic' and the 'cherubic'. Auguste Saudreau added a third kind, the 'angelic'. De Guibert accepts the rough categories and finds from his analysis of Ignatius's letters, from the autobiography and from a close examination of the diary, that he belongs like St Paul to the third kind.\(^{36}\)

The terms conveniently describe different ways in which men are led by God's infused gifts, 'three main currents of catholic mysticism'. St Francis of Assisi is an instance of the first; in him affective love is dominant; the direct effect of grace falls chiefly on the will. St John of the Cross is an example of the second; grace chiefly affects the intelligence. In the third kind the infused gifts more directly affect the memory and imagination, the faculties that look to the concrete and to action.\(^{36}\)

We do not find any trace of ideas or words (in Ignatius) influenced by pseudo-Denis. The part played by imagination, by the sensibility, by tears, as much as the direction of his mysticism, not to contemplative union seen as centre and summit, but towards the service of God, placed him outside the current of intellectual and 'speculative' contemplation. . . . Service of God is not, of course, lacking in either the cherubic or the seraphic kind of mystic. But in Ignatius service is not simply the sequel or consequence of the infused light. It is the very object towards which all his infused gifts tend and upon which they centre.\(^{37}\)

The holy Spirit is not confined by man's categories, no matter how rough or refined. They serve, however, sufficiently to point out the differentiations that may be made between the contemplative ways in which the Lord guides men in the monastic and apostolic callings towards the perfection of charity. No adequate study, to my knowledge, has yet been made of the common ground and the important difference between monastic, mixed and apostolic contemplation. It is misleading simply to equate John of the Cross's nada with ignatian 'indifference'. It can be unhelpful to assume that carmelite prayer is the way for all. What is inescapable in any way is an experience of purification and illumination, whether the image of night or darkness be used or not. Maurice Giuliani is convincing in finding the apostle's purification and illumination in the radical contemplative abnegation of faith-full obedience.\(^{38}\) The frustrations of apostolic life are a part of that obedience.

\(^{35}\) Ibid., p 136. All this section is, of course, based on de Guibert's study.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., p 135.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., p 137.

Which brings us back at last to the curious fact of Borgia's reserve towards Cordeses, of Mercurian's towards Alvarez, of Vitelleschi's towards Lallemant. It was not, as has sometimes been suggested, a simple alignment of ascetics against mystics. (There was a time when writers on spirituality tended, like some journalists, to dramatize differences of emphasis into confrontations of schools. We would hope to avoid doing that.) In a sense both sides were right and both were wrong. The Generals were right in seeing that not all that the mystics were saying was according to Ignatius's mind. The 'mystics' were right in seeing that Jesuit spirituality is not a pure asceticism. But Cordeses and Alvarez, like all the Spaniards of that time who took prayer seriously, and Lallemant later, were influenced by Herp. When Ignatius's good friends, the Carthusians of Cologne, dedicated an edition of Herp to him, his reply was a classic of courteous embarrassment. There was something in Herp, whose work dominated sixteenth-century Spanish spirituality, as there was in Tauler, that Ignatius found unacceptable. But he had found himself immediately at home in the tradition he discovered in Ludolph and Cisneros.

These are not just battles long ago that have nothing to do with us. The only way to dissolve false traditions is by trying, as best we can, to get at the real ones. We are now in a position to discard a false impression, common at one time, that writers like de la Puente and la Paz were marginal and out of step, that the ascetic tradition was the central and authentic one in Jesuit spirituality. We can see, too, that we have somewhat less to learn from the French mystical writers of the seventeenth century than we have from Gregory the Great, Bernard, Aquinas, Bonaventure, and the great Carthusians and Cistercians. The words Ignatius received from them and transposed, especially key words like sentír y gustar, affectus, devotio, begin to be understood as soon as they are seen in the tradition of monastic theology and contemplation.

Besides, there are present trends in spirituality and Christian living that we need to look at. There is the possibility of a new illumism in the charismatic movement. There is the constant danger of
subjectivism in theology. Ignatius left us, in his art of discernment, if we can use it, a way of avoiding the pitfalls of subjectivism and objectivism. In the tenth part of the Constitutions he has also left us his balanced sense of the relationship between the human and the divine. We need that, if we are to avoid the extremes of neglecting the human and neglecting the divine. There is a new devout humanism in the air, less elegant than the seventeenth-century kind, that can be so concerned with the development of human potentialities as to soften the gospel’s point and pain. We must hope, too, that we are not in for a new version of the mutual incomprehension of the ‘mystics’ and the ‘ascetics’, with the possibility of an asceticisme coming from the world of psychology. A new pelagianism might tend, as Thomas Pedroche did, to say of the fifteenth annotation, ‘There is no such experience’. In the work of the Exercises we need all the help we can get, since ‘human means ought to be sought with diligence . . . and the art of dealing and conversing with men’.42 But it is ‘the love which will descend from the Divine Goodness, 43 “the interior gifts” 44 that alone will make . . . the exterior means effective’.

It would be failure indeed to fail to help those whose vocation it is to labour in the world to find a way towards a contemplation that goes with work and transforms it, so that eventually by God’s gift the world of work and the world of prayer compenetrate. Karl Rahner once committed himself to saying: ‘I dare to think that Ignatius belongs to the future, not to the age now coming to an end’. But he added the observation: ‘It remains to be seen whether those who historically call themselves his disciples and pupils will be the ones who really represent this spirit in the future’.45

42 Constitutions 814.
43 Ibid., 671.
44 Ibid., 813.