Philippe Lecrivain

CHARITY IN UNION OF HEARTS

A hermeneutical exploration of the Acquaviva period

Précis: A study of severe conflicts among good Jesuits during Fr Aquaviva's generalate offers insights into our own times--not unsimilar in demographics, political tensions, and the struggle to interpret the institute. The first section gives an account of tensions in Spain and in France, including attempts to change the Constitutions and to remove Fr Aquaviva. The second studies Fr Aquaviva's actions and the responses of the Fifth General Congregation. The final section tells of a division concerning interiority and exteriority. Of current experience, then: The Society's place and ministries in the world have changed. In consequence, so have our union and our way of being 'friends in the Lord'.

The years of Claudio Acquaviva's generalate, 1581-1615, are very important. At this point the Society was taking on a new look. Its demographic expansion (from 5,000 to 13,000) was leading to a strengthening of its governmental structures, to a closer definition of its ministries, and to an increased regulation of life within its houses. A veritable refoundation was taking place as a transition was being made—a transition from the 'first Jesuits', so well presented by John O'Malley,[1] to a generation who saw Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier as *beati* (they were beatified in 1609) rather than as close companions.

We too, as this century ends, are approaching a threshold. It is not just our demography (in 1945 we were 23,000; in 1965 we were 36,000; in 1995 we were again 23,000) that is facing us with transformations. Our role in the Church, our presence in society, in short our 'ministries', have been profoundly modified during recent decades. So too has our way of being Ignatian, and it is this which has led us, faced with these new realities, to need to invent another way of being 'friends in the Lord'.

In these pages, we do not look to bring to life the bonds of fraternal charity in the Acquaviva period, but rather to understand, with our own questions in mind, what was at stake in a debate which, *mutatis mutandis*, is perhaps still ours. This small exploration in hermeneutics will lead us across the field of politics, which will enable us to

move from an initial, rather superficial, sketch of the spiritual issues at stake to a more profound account.

Acquaviva inherited a conflict from his predecessor, Everard Mercurian. Mercurian's conviction, overriding all else, had been that the Society needed 'forming rather than reforming'—*forma más que de reforma.* As Visitor to France, he had already wanted all Jesuits there to be 'in conformity with the Institute's mode and norm': 'There is nothing I want more, in the post of responsibility I hold, than to see things go according to the original track of our father Ignatius'.[2] His interventions on matters regarding prayer were all of a piece with this attitude. In 1574, he forbade Antonio Cordeses to spread affective prayer and in 1578, Balthasar Alvarez to propagate *el modo peregrino de orar*. There were virtues in this insistence, but it did not leave enough place for liberty of spirit or for diversity of temperaments.

This paper falls into three main sections. The first brings out how this strategy was conditioned by the involvement of Jesuits on different sides of political conflicts, notably in France and in Spain; the second explores Acquaviva's strategy in more detail. The final section reflects more explicitly on the spiritual issues at stake.

Politics and its Risks

Spain. One often gets the impression that sixteenth-century Spain was simply a Golden Age, with mystics reaching out towards an otherworldly heaven, and explorers encountering the strangeness of a New World: the Spain of Ignatius, Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross; the Spain of Bartolomé de las Casas and of Bernadino de Sahagún. But behind the aureate veil one finds a different reality.[3] In the years following the 'discovery' of America and the 'reconquest' of Granada, the Jews were expelled (1492) and the Muslims forced to convert (1509). Shortly following the dispute under Domingo de Soto's presidency between las Casas and Sepúlveda about the Indians, *limpieza de sangre* became a matter both of Church and civil law (1555). Finally, just as Ruiz de Montoya was founding the first reduction in Paraguay, the Moors were expelled from Spain (1609).

Both sides of this history had their effect on the mystics. Teresa of Avila was from Jewish stock, and in the early Society, the Inquisition[4] caused a permanent threat to weigh down upon the whole population, in a way reminiscent of contemporary totalitarianism. The political realm seized sole responsibility for the defence of the faith—the Inquisition was an institution of the state. Moreover, and more importantly, the Inquisition was the only institution which had the right to pursue anyone, without any distinction. The Inquisition established the equality of all before its law, and recognized no privileged exceptions.

During the decades under discussion, the 'Spain of three religions' yielded place to the absolute power of the 'most Catholic sovereigns'. This transition offers some new light on the difficulties encountered by the Society at this period. About thirty Jesuits, supported by the monarchy and the Inquisition, were opposed to the international

nature of the Society as envisaged in its foundational documents. To attain their purpose, they aroused the suspicions of the Inquisition regarding the authority of the General. But the Grand Inquisitor went too far. Not content with having interned several Jesuits and with having demanded that the Society's documents be handed over to him, he forbade any Jesuit to leave the kingdom without his authorization. This step deeply offended the Pope, who demanded that the matter be reserved to himself. However, the Jesuit troublemakers continued their attacks. The King demanded that the Society receive a Visitor, but the unworthiness of the bishop designated for this task led to his replacement by other Jesuits. This new setback did not restrain the zeal of those seeking an attenuation of the General's powers, or at least the nomination of an independent superior for Spain and Portugal. They campaigned for the convocation of a General Congregation, to which José de Acosta, whose ideas were close to theirs, should be sent. This General Congregation was indeed convoked, in 1593, but it made no concessions to the troublemakers. Nevertheless, the matter was not closed.[5]

France. The Society in France, similarly, went through a very great crisis at the end of the sixteenth century, with two opposing camps: that of the kings, Henri III and Henri IV, and that of the League.[6] Here is not the place to go into the details of the conflict, nor into the various ways in which historians have interpreted it. Suffice it to say that the point dividing the adherents of the League and of the monarchy was their conception of the nation. The former—even if one can see many different nuances and differences in their positions—thought that the nation, and *a fortiori* the state and hence the king, had to be subordinated to Catholicism. For that reason they could not accept a Protestant king. By contrast, the royalists allowed a distinction between the nation and the Catholic religion, and were therefore prepared to tolerate Protestants. In other word, the royalists were prepared to countenance a modern state, as the expression of a nation that was united but also pluralist, whereas the adherents of the League refused to accept these new forms of power, finding them in conflict with the tradition of a restrained monarchy that respected the ancient liberties of the towns.

As in Spain, several Jesuits in France were caught up in the difficult upheavals we have just been sketching.[7] They were divided. Some, like E. Auger,[8] were for the king; others, such as C. Matthieu, were for the League. Acquaviva's attitude was firm: he asked all concerned to desist from their involvement. Those on the League's side complied immediately with the General's request, but the king opposed Auger's departure until Maggio's visitation in 1587-1588. The arrival of Henri IV divided the Jesuits again: should they take his side or range themselves under the banners of the League? And then, in this latter case, should they follow the extremists or the moderates? Odon Pigenat, the provincial, accepted the presidency of the council of the extremist faction, but neither his consultors nor the provincial congregation held in July 1590 followed him. Following the king's conversion to Catholicism, matters became still more complicated. The Jesuits were pressed to swear allegiance. Their acceptance of this in principle, which was strongly criticized by Acquaviva, halted the process started against them.

However, an assassination attempt against the king, in which the Jesuits were falsely suspected of being implicated, revived the whole conflict. They were expelled by the Parliament of Paris on 8 January 1595—an unfortunate event, which did not prevent some of them from obtaining absolution for the king from the Pope. Nevertheless, eight years would be necessary, and all the energy both of Maggio, once more Visitor, and of P. Coton, before the king recalled the Jesuits to France. This took place through the Edict of Rouen, approved by Parliament on 2 January 1604. From then on, there would be no more, or almost no more, misunderstandings between the king and the Society.

Finding God in Jesuit Companions

Acquaviva Responds to the Situation in France. It was amidst these complex and conflictual events that Acquaviva wrote his major letters on Jesuit identity and spirituality. On 19 May 1586, he wrote to the whole Society concerning 'zeal for personal perfection and the practice of fraternal charity'. His concern was:

> ... to exclude, to restrain ... national antipathies and other plagues of that kind, as if the conservation and prosperity of the Society depended only ... on this union of hearts.[9]

Commenting on Ignatius's constitution about detachment and the finding of God in all things, he reminded his readers,

> ... how far they stray from the right path, who let themselves be led away from that bond and union of hearts and minds that should exist among us—led away by some kind of private communion, whether of race or kinship, or of similarity of nature and culture, of race or country.[10]

One cannot but link this letter to one received from A. Georges, the rector of the college in Paris, the Collège de Clermont, dated 20 January 1586. It is the end, Georges writes, of 'the apostolic community of love'. The companions have been divided into two factions ever since Auger arrived in Paris. The seven Jesuits supporting Auger are almost all French, while Matthieu's supporters come from a wide variety of nationalities. At the moment when the letter was written, Matthieu, H. Samier and P. Pépin had been removed from Paris, and it seems that it was A. Saffores who was leading the 'ultramontanes' against the 'Gallicans'. Moreover, those who, by virtue of their office, could not openly belong to one faction, seemed to be following Auger.[11] Thus Pigenat, Georges and J. Tyrie were favourable to him, while by contrast, C. Dupuy, the superior of the professed house, was openly hostile.

Such tensions made community life very difficult. When, in June 1587, Maggio made a visitation of the professed house in Paris, then a community of sixteen, he had to take drastic action:

> Ours should take the greatest care and work with all possible diligence not to get involved, under any pretext, in things foreign to their profession, especially

> the political affairs and dissensions troubling this kingdom. They should make no allusion to these in conversation, whether among themselves or with outsiders, and especially not in sermons for the people. Rather, being content to occupy themselves zealously regarding their perfection, they should use all their strength in helping others following the spirit of their vocation. In this way our life will be in conformity with our name; in this way people, judging us by our good works, will have no just cause for complaint about us, and will glorify our Father who is in heaven. If anyone acts differently, he is to be punished, seriously and severely.[12]

The Assistants' Opinions. Union of hearts was a subject to which Acquaviva and his assistants frequently had to return.[13] An anonymous manuscript, De visitatione,[14] encourages Visitors to establish uniformity within the Society, and to promote, following the *Constitutions*,[15] both charity among its members and the union of the different provinces with its head. Further, at Acquaviva's instigation, or that of Jiménez his secretary, the general assistants were invited to write reports on this question. There exist two texts entitled *De animarum unione*, one attributed to Maggio and the other to Rodrigues.[16] But the most interesting text is *De unione animarum in societate* by Hoffaeus.[17] This text, dating from 1589-1590, underlines tensions between the Portuguese and Castilians, between the Spanish and the French, between the French and the Germans, and between the Germans and the Poles. Hoffaeus notes the mutual aspersions being cast, and the use of such words as 'brutish', 'stupid' and 'barbarian'. One should remember that the third General Congregation said that there should be more mutual respect—extending to tolerance regarding the different languages and dialects spoken among the Portuguese and the Castilians, the French and those from Lorraine, those from northern and southern Germany. Hoffaeus went on to evoke three causes of division. In countries south of the Alps, where bastardy was considered a disgrace, it was difficult to entrust certain tasks to bastard children, or even to have them live together with legitimate children.[18] In Poland, there was too often a strong animosity between Jesuits of noble birth and those who were not. The issue in Spain about converts from Judaism was dealt with at greater length. Hoffaeus was quite clear, and he clearly had at the back of his mind the Spanish 'troublemakers', who were accused of being Moors or Jews:

> Converts are generally suspect if not hated, and are difficult to bring into union with old Christians. It would have been a better remedy not to have admitted such people; but since they have been admitted, they must be confined to humbler duties and in odd jobs in the schools, and not promoted to any position of government. If we seriously want solid union in the Society, these converts must certainly neither be admitted nor put in charge of others, since it all too clear how much up till now the converts have disturbed the Society—and that they will, without any doubt, continue to disturb it all the more, the more in number and power they become, and the more they are able to threaten the

> general superior. There are quite enough other things harming our union. What is the point of receiving converts to increase our problems—especially since we have no need of them, neither for the increase and conservation of the body of the Society, nor for any office of government? It might be argued that we cannot reject noble converts, and that we must take care lest their families take serious offence at being unjustly maligned. But why should we not rather fear the harm we may be doing the whole Society, the offence and sadness we cause to so many good Fathers—just to avoid offending a very small number of noble converts? And why should we not fear offending many more noble people, indeed princes, who are plainly offended by us because of this type of person, and are speaking of our Society, with a sense of scandal, as a Jewish synagogue? In the absence of other more cogent arguments, is this not enough? I see this as the only difficulty preventing Your Paternity from overcoming all the other problems—I am convinced.[19]

This passage concludes Hoffaeus's account of 'problems disturbing union among seculars, and which we have in common with them'. He then suggests some remedies for the mistakes committed by superiors and subjects, either separately or jointly. To the former, he recommends that they admit people to the Society wisely, and that they should avoid both domineering styles of government and favouritism. The latter, he says, should never murmur against the superior, and they should avoid dissensions among themselves. All are reminded of the demands of the spiritual and interior life.[20]

The Fifth General Congregation. The Fifth General Congregation (1593-1594), convoked at the request of Pope Clement VIII under pressure from the Spanish troublemakers, responded to these political realities. It set up a commission to examine the complaints sent to the Pope and the *postulata* addressed to the Congregation.[21] The commission's judgment was that there was nothing with which Fr General could be reproached. The Congregation also rejected initiatives originating from the Spanish ambassador to Rome to have the *Constitutions* modified, and in general, it forbade Jesuits to engage in any form of political activity, recommending that people tempted in that direction should be moved (D 79). It demanded that Jesuits not get mixed up in the world of princes and in secular affairs (D 47-48), and that they never have recourse to outside influence or intervention. More specifically, the delegates challenged those Jesuits who were a cause of division (D 15) and they spent much time on the Spanish 'troublemakers' (D 54-55), who were to be chastised and from whom, as from a plague, the Society had to be separated.

However, the delegates wanted to go to what they saw as the root of the matter. They knew that twenty-five of the twenty-seven Jesuits who had composed memoranda against the *Constitutions* were of Jewish or Muslim origin,[22] and decided that they would no longer admit Jewish or Muslim converts into the Society. Moreover, though they were aware that the impediment they were introducing was not 'essential', they decreed that not even Fr General could dispense from it (D 52).[23]

Continuing Tribulations. Philip II was pleased with the decrees, and responded favourably to the request addressed to him not to give ear to the Society's detractors (D 21). But this was still not a definitive peace. The troublemakers looked for other means of removing Acquaviva, or at least of diminishing his powers. In 1598, Philip III, who had succeeded his father, wrote to the Pope, under the influence of Fernando Mendoza, a Jesuit with a taste for politics, to ask him to send Acquaviva on mission to Spain. Acquaviva's Curia recognized the trap, but Clement VIII was not opposed to the idea.

If one is aware of this context, Acquaviva's letter dated 29 July 1602 to the whole Society 'on recourse to God in tribulations and persecutions' takes on fresh significance:

> We, who can behold from here, as from a watchtower, the state of our whole Order at a glance, can easily observe—though obstacles have never been lacking to us from one quarter or another—that there are in the various Provinces tribulations and persecutions at once more general and more lasting, caused by people of many and diverse kinds.[24]

Acquaviva recommended that everyone examine his conscience:

> We are accused of getting too mixed up in secular affairs; of having too much to do with the people of the world and too many occupations dissipating us; of being too free in our doctrine and too fond of novelty, self-interested and avaricious, jealous of our honour and our public reputations; and finally of speaking about and judging too easily other people's characters and actions.[25]

He then invited Jesuits at large to make the Spiritual Exercises, and suggested that superiors make sure that Ignatius's guidelines concerning 'the benevolence of outsiders, especially important ones, towards the Society' be applied. Finally he exhorted all to unity and fraternal charity.

The Original Spirit

The 'Mystical Crisis'. Half a century after the death of Ignatius of Loyola, against the backdrop of the tensions just evoked, there was a major change which was to find its full flowering in France in the early 17th century, in the circle of Louis Lallemant, in Brittany, in Aquitaine and in Canada. At the time, some of these 'spirituals' were accused of introducing into the Society doctrines contrary to its spirit, and of promoting, 'in order to find God in all things', a strange conception of 'the world' and some strange 'mystical' experiences. However, these deviationists had no aim other than 'preaching', 'conversing' and 'giving the Exercises'—the classic triad from the *Formula of the Institute*. But equally they did set these ministries in contrast to other forms of apostolate that they judged too 'worldly', too perilous to 'purity of heart'; and they considered the movements of the Spirit, the source and the locus of Ignatian discernment, as 'extraordinary graces'.

In the 1630s two opposing camps formed. Both claimed to have Ignatian experiences, but they used the same words to mean different things. Something had changed the Jesuits' awareness of the society in which they lived and the routes by which they were meant to find God. They could not but envisage their religious situation in ways conditioned by the reassessment they were making of the Society they had entered and by the problems raised by the 'modern' world—problems that were making themselves felt in different ways across Europe but which touched everyone one way or another. This 'crisis', which reaches a climax in a man like Jean Joseph Surin, is a continuation of what one can see also in the Acquaviva period.

The problem posed is a general one: that of finding a new way of living 'spiritually' in the 'opaque' world where mission takes place. Inevitably, some will insist on the apostolic maxim of 'leaving God in order to find God',[26] while others will stress 'docility to the movements of the Spirit'.[27] Both these options are present at the end of the sixteenth century. Some perceive the secularization of society at large[28] as requiring their ministries to become specializations more and more autonomous from religion. The others are those who, from Balthasar Alvarez to Jean Joseph Surin, from Achille Gagliardi to Louis Lallemant, bring mystical answers to these same problems.

The Role of the Generals. Between these two opposing currents just described, the Society's government is a third element, seeking to balance the positions. But its role varies with the years. With Mercurian, its main concern is to restrain 'mystical' excesses; by contrast, with Acquaviva, its thrust is to resist 'political' claims. Inevitably, these shifts give particular, changing nuances to the idea of 'union of hearts'. Acquaviva's letter of 1590[29] on prayer and penance illustrates the point.

There were differences of opinion regarding contemplation and penances even among the people close to Acquaviva.[30] Among the assistants, Maggio and Alarcón insisted on long prayers and mortifications, while Hoffaeus and Rodrigues held that the true thought of Ignatius was, given the Society's purpose, not to devote oneself to either. For these latter, contemplation was foreign to the Society's vocation, because, unlike meditation, it did not prepare a person for apostolic action. Acquaviva's hope was that the letter would put an end to the debate:

> One would not be expressing oneself accurately were one to say, 'I love God in order to do something agreeable to him'. To be exact, one has to say, 'I love God, and I am impelled to undertake and accomplish this deed by the stimulus of that love'.[31]

The letter did not, in fact, resolve the disagreement between the assistants.[32] In one of his memoranda, sent to Acquaviva some months after the letter was sent,[33] Hoffaeus took issue with those who placed great importance on the contemplative life. Regarding the amount of time for prayer and matters connected with penance, Hoffaeus defended the view of Mercurian. Hoffaeus was relieved of his post as assistant in 1591, but his target was not so much Acquaviva as Maggio, in particular Maggio's memorandum *De*

naevis Societatis et remediis,[34] and in general his whole personal style. When he had been vice-superior of the professed house in Rome, he had, Hoffaeus reminds us, been suspected of promoting 'novelties', and of spreading a spirit that was alien to the Society.[35]

In the following years, and even immediately following the Fifth General Congregation, the situation in the provinces remained tense. Maggio became Visitor in Austria and Hoffaeus in Germany. Both made it clear that they saw dangers in a life too centred on activity (*effusio ad exteriora*), and wanted life within the houses to be better structured, but they each maintained their own personal stress as they dealt with the bonds of fraternal charity. Maggio castigated the growing imbalance between 'spiritual exercises' and apostolic tasks; Hoffaeus never tired of pointing out the negligence of superiors who were more interested in efficient management than religious formation, and of insisting that the healing of the body depends on that of the head.[36]

Pierre Coton and the 1605 Survey. Finally, in 1605, it was decided to make a general survey. Its purpose was to allow the latent questions to circulate, and to bring up to date the language in which spiritual questions or aspirations were being expressed. There were to be provincial congregations throughout the Society, and each was to send a report on the 'deficiencies' it could see, on their causes, and on the remedies to be applied.[37] Of course the different headings proposed for examination (fraternal charity, interior formation, government, etc.) were respected to different extents in the various provinces. Thus the report from Lyon (Richeome) was more institutional than those from Paris (Charlet) or from Bordeaux, which were more spiritual. But undoubtedly the most interesting is that from Pierre Coton, sent as a personal submission.[38]

Coton was at the time court preacher for Henri IV, and in his text, he says, he will confine himself to what he has seen in the professed house in Paris, where he has been living since July 1604.[39] Of this house he says, 'I think I have to say that most take very little care of the interior man'. He denounces the political activism, and the lack of spiritual formation, while conversely showing concern regarding the question of people acting on their own.[40] He recommends that people should live 'in the presence of God', be attentive to 'the motions of the heart', and to regard the *affectus* as more important than the *effectus*. What matters, he says,

> ... is not to start from exterior realities and move towards interior ones, but to start from the interior and move to the exterior ... to obey not the call of the object but that of God.[41]

Finally, Coton saw the essential as lying not in how much gets done, but in the disposition of the subject. What mattered was not a change in what people were doing, but a renewal of hearts. Thus the only motivation for any reform had to be that of a greater attention, in prayer, to the movement (*motus* and/or *motio*) which came from above, to the interior force which gives meaning to daily activity. On this subject, Coton wrote at length.[42] He spoke of a 'spiritual lust' which perverts love of God into love of

self, and of a 'mercenary spirit' which uses God for self-glorification or glorification of one's friends. Against this, he set another spirit, which 'desires God for God's own sake', which desires to relish (*frui*) God and not to use (*uti*) God. Spiritual lust is much more crucial than carnal lust, as Acquaviva on several occasions said.[43] If one reads the material on tepidity in personal charity in this light,[44] the text takes on a curious profundity:

> To have a pure intention: in other words, to have only the glory of God before one's eyes and to seek this alone. Then it becomes easy to love and esteem those who help us cultivate and promote this glory, while ours becomes of little importance so long as Christ is proclaimed.

These little touches bring out what was lacking in the 'spiritual administration'[45] over which Acquaviva had been presiding since his election. On many points, Coton concurred with what Maggio had written in 1585, and was echoing the Italian 'spirituals', notably Gagliardi.[46]

Conclusion

It may be that the 1605 survey, in keeping with the nature of the genre, painted too negative a picture. Be that as it may, it certainly allows us to stress how difficult it is to speak, not only about 'vocation to the Society', but even about 'the spirit of our institute' or about our 'ways of proceeding'. We read in the *Constitutions*:

> Thus charity will come to further this union between superiors and subjects, and in general all goodness and virtues through which one proceeds in conformity with the spirit. Consequently there will be also total contempt of temporal things, in regard to which self-love, the chief enemy of this union and universal good, frequently induces disorder.[47]

In itself the text is clear, but we cannot read it today as it was read by Jesuits of Acquaviva's time.

Like them, we stand, undoubtedly, at a threshold. Like them, we are looking for new balances between an 'interior' and an 'exterior'. Like them, we want to be 'friends in the Lord'. But these realities have changed, even if we speak of them in Ignatius's words. Four centuries separate us. Moreover, between us and the first companions stands not only Acquaviva but also Roothaan, and also Arrupe. Like Maggio and Hoffaeus, we have been shaped by the *Exercises* and the *Constitutions*, but differently; like Mendoza, Auger and Matthieu, we are influenced by politics, but differently. All a historian does is to underline discrepancies such as these, and thereby put our present questions in some perspective.

NOTES

This translation has been made from a shortened version of the original text.

1 John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993).
2 ARSJ *Tol* 1 f.17, cited in Ignacio Iparraguirre, 'Élaboration de la spiritualité des jésuites 1556-1606', in *Les jésuites, Spiritualité et activités: Jalons d'une histoire* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1974), 40.
3 Philippe Lécrivain, 'De l'Espagne des trois religions à la très catholique Espagne', in *L'Unique et ses témoins* (Paris: Médiasèvres, 1996), 99 ff.
4 M. Escamilla-Colin, *Crimes et châtiments dans l'Espagne inquisitoriale: Essai de typologie délictive et punitive sous le dernier Habsbourg et le premier Bourbon* (Berg-International, 1992); *Chrétiens, musulmans et juifs dans l'Espagne médiévale: De la convergence à l'expulsion*, edited by Ron Barkaaï (Paris: Cerf, 1994).
5 On all this, see Antonio Astráin, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España*, vols 3 and 4 (Madrid, 1909).
6 See J.M. Constant, *La ligue* (Paris: Fayard, 1996), at the end of which there is an excellent chapter reviewing recent research on the subject. The League was a complex political movement of opposition to Henri III and Henri IV.
7 A. Lynn Martin, *Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians* (Geneva, 1973)—chapter 15, 'The Apostolic Community of Love', 177-187, is particularly relevant to our topic. Henri Fouqueray, *Histoire de la Compagnie en France des origins à la suppression (1528-1762)*, vols 2-3 (Paris, 1913 and 1922) also gives all the necessary information.
8 J. Dorigny, *La vie du P. Auger*, new edition (Avignon, 1828).
9 Acquaviva's letters to the whole Society have been collected in *Epistulae Praepositorum Generalium*, vol 1 (Brussels, 1909 [Ghent, 1847]), 74-359; the quotation here comes from 164. Some of these texts are translated into French in *Lettres choisies des Généraux aux Pères et Frères de la Compagnie de Jésus*, vol 1 (Lyon, 1878).
10 *Epistulae Praepositorum Generalium*, 1.165. Compare *Constitutions* III.1.26 [288]. The text refers to this as the 17th rule of the *Summary*; in fact it is the 18th.
11 Auger was especially criticized for having tolerated Henri III's having written to Acquaviva and Sixtus V to try to obtain substantial modifications of the institute: 1. solemn profession in the Society to happen as with other orders, immediately after the novitiate; 2. certain privileges to become inapplicable in France; 3. the government of colleges and houses to be entrusted only to French subjects; 4. the Society to have at court an ecclesiastical protector who would answer for it and to whom its members could, if need arose, have recourse.
12 *Ordinationes factae a P. L. Maggio ... pro domo professa Parisiensi cum illam visitasset mense june 1587* (Paris, BN, *Galliarum visitationes*, n 56).
13 See Sacchini, *Historia Societatis Jesu* V.1 (Rome, 1649), *passim*.
14 Rome, BN, *Fondo Gesuitico*, 1149.
15 See *Constitutions*, VIII, 1 [655 ff].
16 ARSJ *Instit.* 178 ff. 154-161r, 162-164.
17 Ibid., 165-168. This text has been edited by Burkhart Schneider, in 'Denk schrift des Hoffaeus De Unione animorum', *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, 29 (1960), 85-98. It is this edition which is followed here.
18 In 1588 Sixtus V had prohibited the admission of men with illegitimate parentage into the Society.

19 Schneider, 'Denkschrift', 93.
20 Compare *Constitutions*, VIII.1 [655 ff].
21 According to the letter of convocation, the goal of the General Congregation was 'to strengthen the body of the Society and to restore certain provinces to tranquillity'. The numbering of the decrees follows that given in *For Matters of Greater Moment: The First Thirty Jesuit General Congregations--A Brief History and a Translation of the Decrees*, edited by John W. Padberg, Martin D. O'Keefe and John L. McCarthy (St Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994).
22 William V. Bangert, *A History of the Society of Jesus* (St Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1972), 100.
23 This decision, which was contrary to the Ignatian spirit, cannot have been an easy one to take. Following formal appeals, the decree was once again confirmed (D 53). The 6th General Congregation (1608) came back to this decree, interpreting it and attenuating it (D 28), but it was only in 1946 that it was finally abrogated.
24 *Epistulae Praepositorum Generalium*, 1.283.
25 *Epistulae Praepositorum Generalium*, 1.285.
26 Fr Favard's translation of Ribadaneira's *Vita Ignatii Loyolae* (MHSJ FN 4.870-872) included the following: 'it cannot but be good sometimes to leave God in himself in order to find him in our neighbour' (*La vie du R.P. Ignace de Loyola* [Avignon, 1599], 563). Much later, Surin would criticize certain religious who had 'an insatiable appetite for learning' and 'found it very difficult to deal with God', but who affirmed that 'all their work culminated in God, in teaching others, and gaining souls for our Lord, and that they were leaving God for God'. (Letter 547, 12 October 1664, to Fr L. Frizon, in *Correspondance*, edited by Michel de Certeau (Paris: Desclée, 1965), 1577-1582.
27 Louis Lallemant, *Doctrine spirituelle* (Paris: Désclée, 1959), 171 ff.
28 R. Mandru, *Introduction à la France moderne* (Paris, 1961), 267.
29 Coemans has shown (*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, 4 [1935], 125-126) that the dating of this letter to 1599 is an error.
30 Sacchini, *Historia*, V.1, 495.
31 *Epistulae Praepositorum Generalium*, 1.254.
32 Burkhart Schneider, 'Der Konflikt zwischen Claudius Aquaviva und Paul Hoffaeus', *Archivum historicum Societatis Jesu*, 26 (1957), 3-56.
33 *De impedimentis quae obstant institutioni futurorum Superiorum* (ARSJ *Congr.* 20a, 285-287), edited in part in Schneider, 'Der Konflikt', 46-48.
34 On 27 September 1585, Acquaviva had asked Maggio to present him a dossier on the difficulties sustained by the Society. The work was completed by the end of November 1585, and submitted on 24 January 1586. This memorandum (ARSJ *Inst.* 107, ff. 1-38) is in three parts. In the first, Maggio analyses the Society's shortcomings in general, those of superiors and of others in office; in the second, he analyses the reasons for these—'too much discharge outwards', and not enough 'interior life'; in the third, he suggests some remedies, among which we find the life of prayer.
35 Schneider, 'Der Konflikt', p 26, n 80.
36 *De creandis idoneis superioribus* (ARSJ *Congr.* 20a, pp 289-295), edited in part in Schneider, 'Der Konflikt', 48-51. See also *Brevis tractatus de adhibendo remediis iis malis quae aut jam in Societate irrepere aut in eadem irrepere in posterum possent* (ARSJ *Inst.* 186d, ff 42-52).

37 *De detrimentis Societatis* (ARSJ *Hist. Soc*, 137).
38 Ibid., ff. 132-139, 140-149. The second appears to be a clarification of the first. Michel de Certeau edited large extracts from this memorandum: 'Crise sociale et Réformisme spirituel au début du XVII° siècle', *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, 41 (1965), 347-353.
39 J.M. Prat, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France au temps du P. Coton, 1564-1626*, vol 3 (Lyon, 1876).
40 The heading *De cura spiritualium internaque cultura*.
41 The heading *Ministeria zelusque animarum utrum langueant vel ef florescant*.
42 The heading *De studio orationis*.
43 Astráin, *Historia*, vol 6 (Madrid, 1920), 144.
44 The heading *Utrum fraterna charitas intepescat* (used at the colloquium for group work).
45 On this see the three seminal essays in Pedro de Leturia, *Estudios ignacianos*, ed. Ignacio Iparraguirre (Rome: Jesuit Historical Institute, 1957), 2.189-378.
46 In fact, Coton's report served as a sketch for a subsequent book, *L'interieure occupation*, dated 1608. One expression sums up the experience and intention of this French Gagliardi, more attractive but less profound than the Italian: *interna cultura*. Gagliardi and his *Breve compendio* had a very great influence in pious circles in Paris at the beginning of the 17th century, for example with Mme Accarie, the initiator of the Carmelite reform, and her cousin Bérulle, to whom, moreover, Maggio had given the Exercises in 1602.
47 *Constitutions* VIII.1.8 [671.3-4].