

ANGELS BLACK AND WHITE: LOYOLA'S SPIRITUAL DISCERNMENT IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE*

MARJORIE O'ROURKE BOYLE

Toronto, Canada

ALTHOUGH PAUL was rapt to the third heaven, he still requested his manuscripts when he returned to earth (2 Tim 4:13). So Erasmus reminded the barbarous theologians who resisted culture that the Spirit does not overthrow nature but rather increases its industry, promotes its study, and sustains its intellectual endeavor. "I am not influenced at all," he declared in his humanist manifesto *Antibarbari* (1520), "by the instances current among the common people, about a dove being seen at the ear of a speaker or writer, or a book sent down from heaven in a dream. These may be fictions, invented in good faith for the sake of giving authority to documents, or they may be true—some may argue about it, I do not."¹

The enlightenment of Iñigo López de Loyola on the banks of the river Cardoner in about his thirtieth year (1521–22)² has traditionally been interpreted as a unique, personal illumination. Intimated in his analysis of spiritual conflict during convalescence,³ and perfected in his asceticism during the retreat at Manresa,⁴ was the distinctive spirituality which he forged from this singular crucible: the discernment of spirits.⁵ By the date of *la ilustración tan grande*, Loyola probably had in writing at least some reflective notes. Jesuit scholarship has been divided about this, with some contention that, except for the appended rules, the manuscript of the *Ejercicios espirituales* was completed before he departed Manresa at the beginning of 1523 for his pilgrimage to Palestine.⁶ A contrary

* EDITOR'S NOTE.—This and other studies, especially *Rhetoric and Reform*, were sponsored by a fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation.

¹ Erasmus, *Antibarbari*, ed. Kasimierz Kumaniecki, in *Opera omnia* (Amsterdam: North Holland, 1971-) 1/1, 134, ll. 13–30; tr. Margaret Mann Phillips in *The Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1978) 23 (ed. Craig R. Thompson) 118. Editions abbreviated ASD and CWE.

² *Acta P. Ignatii* 3.30 in *Fontes narrativi de S. Ignatio de Loyola* (MHSI 66; 4 vols.; Rome: Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu, 1943–65) 1, 404–7.

³ *Acta* 1.1–12 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 364–79.

⁴ *Acta* 2.17–3.31 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 388–407.

⁵ *Exercitia spiritualia* (MHSI 100; Rome: Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu, 1969) 1, 314–36.

⁶ A. Codina, S.J., *Los orígenes de los Ejercicios espirituales de San Ignacio de Loyola* (Barcelona: Balmes, 1926) 5–72. Other influential studies of its redaction, however, have been Paul Dudon, S.J., *Saint Ignace de Loyola* (2nd ed.; Paris: Beauchesne, 1934) 275–90;

consensus has been forming, however, that he had then only the rudiments of the *Exercises*, for directing the penitents who sought his counsel. The text was only given a definite literary form when as a student in Paris (1528–35) he commissioned the small company of men who had gathered around him to direct others in the exercises. Until then his notes sufficed for personal devotions and pastoral ministrations. At Cardoner, it has been argued, Loyola received an apostolic vocation, but not the formal *Exercises*, nor the Jesuit Constitutions, or even the notion of establishing a religious community.⁷ The piety that supposed the *Exercises* were dictated to him on the spot by the Blessed Virgin Mary herself⁸ has thus yielded to an acknowledgment of Loyola's own testimony that "the Exercises were not composed all at the same time, but that it seemed to him that some things which he used to observe in his soul and found advantageous could be useful also to others, and so he put them into writing. . . ."⁹

Despite the apparent hiatus of a decade between his decisive enlightenment and the literary composition of the *Exercises*, there has been resistance toward acknowledging any significant historical influence on their formation. In the foreword to the manual, as ratified papally in 1548, Loyola's secretary Juan de Polanco had asserted that its teaching was derived "not so much from books as from the anointing of the Holy Spirit and from interior experience."¹⁰ In the tradition that he drew his ideas and ideals "from the most intimate depths of spiritual and mystical experience,"¹¹ his originality has been defended. The manifest parallels between Loyola's rules for the discernment of spirits and patristic and medieval asceticism have been decided "links which transcend historical development."¹² Their coincidence has been described as a "parallel development based on identical ascetic and mystical experience, over and

Pedro Leturia, S.J., "Génesis de los Ejercicios de S. Ignacio y su influjo en la fundación de la Compañía de Jesús (1521–1540)," *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 10 (1941) 16–59; H. Pinard de la Boullaye, S.J., *Les étapes de rédaction des exercices de S. Ignace* (7th ed. rev.; Paris: Beauchesne, 1950).

⁷ Leturia, "Génesis" 30, 34–35; José Calveras, S.J., "La ilustración del Cardoner y el instituto de la Compañía de Jesús según el P. Nadal," *AHSI* 25 (1956) 27–54; Leonardo R. Silos, S.J., "Cardoner in the Life of Saint Ignatius of Loyola," *AHSI* 33 (1964) 3–43.

⁸ Dudon, *Saint Ignace de Loyola* 274–75.

⁹ *Acta* 11.99 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 502–5; cf. *Acta* 7.67 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 457–58. The earliest extant manuscript of the complete *Exercises* is dated 1541.

¹⁰ "Praefatiuncula editioni primae vulgatae versionis Exercitorum praemissa," in *Exercitia spiritualia* (MHSI 100; Rome: Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu, 1969) 1, 79.

¹¹ Hugo Rahner, S.J., *Ignatius the Theologian* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968) 34; tr. Michael Barry from *Ignatius von Loyola als Mensch und Theologe* (Freiburg: Herder, 1964).

¹² *Ibid.* 136.

above the process of historical tradition."¹³ Although it has been thought "quite out of place to go hunting down sources in the spirit of the schools,"¹⁴ it has been judged salutary, nevertheless, to demonstrate that "everything which proceeded from the sources of his mystical experience coalesced into a work which not only fits naturally into the general line of ascetical tradition but which, on account of its genuine spiritual vitality, positively demands to be 'justified' in terms of historical tradition."¹⁵ Like the argument for his inspiration as not so much from literature as from unction and experience, this repeats early Jesuit apologetics. Obligated by accusations that the founder was an illuminist, his Society, especially the second generation, had sought to establish the conformity of his spirituality with the orthodox tradition. Diligently they composed commentaries on the *Exercises* which marshaled the patristic and medieval scholarship at their command.¹⁶ Loyola himself, in formulating the Constitutions, was constrained to order his insights juridically within an institutional Church. He therefore searched the asceticism of the Fathers and of the founders of religious communities for precedents which would prove his own spirituality as orthodox.¹⁷ Yet this resort has been dismissed as mere exercise. Because of his "distinct spiritual identity," it has been argued, "the question of historical sources has less importance with Ignatius than with any other saint—with the mystic's sureness of aim he could go to the sources and find confirmation of what, with a certain obscure clarity, he already knew."¹⁸

Research even in this apologetic mode, however, has disclosed parallels so precise between the diverse operations of the good and evil spirits in the ascetical literature and in Loyola's manual that lists have been compiled. He was in the tradition, it has been ascertained, of the *Shepherd of Hermas*; of Origen's *De principiis*, which also borrowed from the *Epistle of Barnabas*; of Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*, the classic biography of the first Christian hermit; of Diadochus of Photike's *De perfectione spirituali capita centum*; of the *Collationes* of John Cassian and the *Scala* of John Climacus; and through a range of medieval authors to Jean Gerson's *De probatione spirituum* and *De distinctione verarum visionum a falsis*.¹⁹ The effect of this research, however, has been a yet more

¹³ *Ibid.* 152.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 34.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 136–37. Rahner described even the first attempt, Dávila's reference to the *Collationes* of John Cassian, as one comparing "the Jesuit tradition derived from Ignatius' *purely personal experience* with the fundamental ideas of the discernment of spirits in the early Church" (153; italics mine).

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 35–47.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 46–47.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 166–80. For a survey of the traditions, see Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J., "On 'Discernment of Spirits' in the Early Church," *TS* 41 (1980) 505–29.

tenacious argument for the transcendency rather than the historicity of Loyola's experience. "The great figures in the realm of the spirit have undergone the same experiences, and the words they have chosen are often pregnant and strikingly similar—no proof is needed to show that here is a particularly vivid example of a link transcending all historical cause and effect."²⁰ In so appealing to "truths outside the historical process,"²¹ however, this account itself seems illuminist: a hagiography established on transcendental theological principles and transcendental Jungian archetypes.²²

The state of the question as to whether Loyola was enlightened within or without the historical process recalls that of Luther studies earlier in this century, when scholars similarly acclaimed the originality of his spiritual insight. "It was Luther's genius," it was typically argued, "that penetrated the maze of medieval theology to rediscover Paul's meaning of 'justification.'"²³ Historical research on the texts and contexts of his formation has so upset that judgment, however, that the ascendant argument is now that the Reformation did not originate in Luther's sudden illumination but in his daily office.²⁴ It was in "meditating day and night" on the phrase *iustitia Dei* with a battery of commentaries open on his table that Luther achieved his ingenious resolution to the terrors of conscience. As he acknowledged, this enlightenment was owed to "the mercy of God,"²⁵ but such grace did not preclude studious application. Or as Erasmus had elaborated his doubts about popular notions of inspiration, effective theology resulted from the engagement of native ability in study. "Many people possess brains and talents without effort, for they are a gift of nature," he wrote, "but no one gets virtue and learning that way."²⁶ With the waning of the Romantic equation of creativity with originality, historians have been more inclined to focus on the intrinsic merit of Luther's doctrine rather than on its singularity, and even to argue for his recovery of tradition rather than

²⁰ Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian* 169.

²¹ *Ibid.* 35.

²² For the essentialist anthropology which established Rahner's ahistorical argument, see his *Greek Myths and Christian Mystery* (London: Burns and Oates, 1963) 14; tr. Brian Battershaw from *Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung* (Zurich: Rhein, 1957).

²³ Hans von Schubert, "Reformation und Humanismus," *Luther Jahrbuch* 8 (1926) 9.

²⁴ Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970) 41; tr. from *Luther: Einführung in sein Denken* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1964). But for the importance of the distinct moment of illumination in his conversion, see my "Stoic Luther: Paradoxical Sin and Necessity," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 73 (1982) 69–93.

²⁵ Luther, *Vorrede zum ersten Bande der Gesamtausgaben seiner lateinischen Schriften*, in *Werke* (58 vols.; Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1883–1948) 54, 185, l. 14–186, l. 16. Edition abbreviated WA.

²⁶ Erasmus, *Antibarbari*, ASD 1/1, 134, ll. 13–30; tr. Phillips, CWE 23, 118.

his rebellion against it. Another salient factor in this interpretive development has been the shift, especially in German theology as influenced by the emphasis on *Sitz im Leben* in biblical criticism and existentialist philosophy, from metaphysics to history as the field of divine activity. Relinquishing an extrinsicist theory of revelation, in which God intrudes on an alien universe, theologians—and with some distinction, Jesuit theologians—have analyzed His creative presence within it. Yet, clinging to the original apologetics of the Society, the influential exposition of Loyola himself as a theologian has insisted on his transcendental enlightenment.

Contradicting this theological argument, Jesuit historical method has acknowledged and detailed the influence on his *Exercises* of the devotional *Flos sanctorum* and the *Vita Christi Cartujani*, which he perused during convalescence.²⁷ His declaration of reverence for the *Imitatio Christi*, which Loyola attributed to Gerson, has been recognized.²⁸ Other works of the *devotio moderna*, such as the *Spiritual Ascent* of Gerard of Zutphen and the *Rosetum* of Mombaer, have been suggested as also influential.²⁹ So have the *Ejercitatorio de la vida espiritual* of García Ximenes de Cisneros, to which Loyola was introduced at Montserrat,³⁰ and the *Miroir de personnes illustres* and *Arte de servir a Dios* of Alonso de Madrid.³¹ What of the traditional texts, however, on the discernment of spirits? Did Loyola glean nothing from the *Flos sanctorum*, particularly the hermetical lives as influenced by Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*, or nothing from that biography itself, which was incorporated in an abbreviated form?³² What of Mandates 3-6 of the *Shepherd of Hermas*,³³ the first Christian formulation of the rules for the discernment of spirits, with its antithesis between the affections of joy and melancholy which would be so marked in Ignatian spirituality? This treatise on second repentance,

²⁷ Leturia, "El influjo de S. Onofre en S. Ignacio a base de un texto inédito de Nadal," *Manresa* 2 (1926) 224-38; idem, "El reino de Cristo y los prólogos del *Flos sanctorum* de Loyola," *Manresa* 4 (1928) 334-49; idem, "La conversión de S. Ignacio: Nuevos datos y ensayo de síntesis," *AHSI* 5 (1936) 1-35; idem, *Iñigo de Loyola* (Syracuse: Le Moyne College, 1949; rpt. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1965) 83-97; tr. Aloysius J. Owen from *El gentilhomme Iñigo López de Loyola en su patria y en su siglo* (Montevideo: Mosca, 1938).

²⁸ Leturia, "Génesis" 25; Luis Gonçalves de Câmara, *Memoriale seu diarium* 97-98 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 584.

²⁹ Leturia, "La 'Devotio moderna' en el Montserrat de San Ignacio," *Razón y fe* 111 (1936) 371-86; but cf. Dudon, *Saint Ignace de Loyola* 283.

³⁰ Leturia, *Iñigo de Loyola* 149-53.

³¹ Dudon, *Saint Ignace de Loyola* 268-70; Leturia, "Génesis" 33-34.

³² *La plus ancienne version latine de la vie de S. Antoine par S. Athanase*, ed. H. Hoppenbrouwers (Nijmegen: Dekker and van de Begt, 1960).

³³ *Der Hirt des Hermas* 36.3-5, ed. Molly Whittaker (GCS 48; Berlin: Akademie, 1956).

an immensely popular work in antiquity, retained its quasi-canonical status even in the sixteenth century, as circulated in an *editio princeps* of 1513 by the humanist Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples.³⁴ What of Origen, who adopted the same rule, and whose works were enjoying a revival?³⁵ Loyola recalled the illumination at the Cardoner as one which endowed him with understanding and knowledge "as much concerning spiritual matters as matters of faith and of literature (*letras*)."³⁶ What was he enlightened about literature in that experience, and to what literature did he refer? Although these questions have apparently not been posed in scholarship, some reference to the traditional texts is not improbable.

As documented, moreover, upon his return from the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, the spiritual recruit decided from February or March 1524 to matriculate in the Estudio General of Barcelona. He also engaged Jerónimo Ardevol, master of grammar, for private instruction in Latin. His texts were the *Doctrinale puerorum* of Alexandre de Ville-Dieu; the *Disticha moralia* of Cato, as bound with a *Contemptus mundi* attributed to St. Bernard, although more likely the labor of Bernard of Morlaix; later the *Introductiones in latinam grammaticam* of Antonio Nebrija; and when he had mastered the rudiments, Virgil's *Aeneid*.³⁷ According to his first biographer, Pedro de Ribadeneira, it was during this period that his confessor and others urged him to read Erasmus' manual of spiritual militancy, *Enchiridion militis christiani* (1503).³⁸ More probably this

³⁴ *Hermæ liber unus in Liber trium virorum et trium spiritualium virginum*, ed. Lefèvre (Paris: Henri Estienne for himself and Jean de Brie, May 30, 1513). There was also an edition by Nicolaus Gerbel (Strasbourg, 1522). Although there has been no study of its fortune, Sir Roger Mynors, who is preparing the critical edition of the vulgate, has suggested in correspondence that it was fairly well known in the sixteenth century. For the first analysis of its influence, see my "Luther's Rider-Gods: From the Steppe to the Tower," in progress. For its quasi-canonical status, see Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 4.20.2; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1.17,29; 2.1.9,12; Origen, *De principiis* 1.3.3; 2.15; 4.2.4; *Commentariorum in epistolam b. Pauli ad Romanos [libri]* at 16.14; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.8.

³⁵ E.g., *Une controverse sur Origène à la Renaissance: Jean Pic de la Mirandola et Pierre Garcia*, ed. Henri Crouzel (Paris: J. Vrin, 1977); Erasmus' posthumous edition of 1536.

³⁶ *Acta* 3.30 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 404-7.

³⁷ Cándido de Dalmases, S.J., "Los estudios de S. Ignacio en Barcelona (1524-1526)," *AHSI* 10 (1941) 283-93; Miquel Battlori, S.J., "Sobre l'humanisme a Barcelona durant els estudis de sant Ignasi: 1524-1526. Nebrija i Erasme," *Quaderni ibero-americani* 3 (1955-56) 219-31, rpt. as "Humanisme i erasmisme a Barcelona 1524-1526," in his *Vuit segles de cultura catalana a Europa: Assaigs dispersos* (Barcelona: Selecta, 1956) 85-100. The mention of "major proverbs and general epistles" Dalmases conjectures to be works of Seneca, while Battlori thinks at least the latter referred to Loyola's own practice in the epistolary form. I would suggest that Erasmus' *Adagia* and his *De conscribendis epistolis* may have been used.

³⁸ Ribadeneira, *Vita Ignatii Loyola* 1.13.63 in *Fontes narrativi* 4, 172-75; Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae* 5 in *Chronicon* (MHSI; 2 vols.; Madrid: Monumenta Historica Societatis

episode occurred at his next destination, Alcalá, to whose university Ardevol advised him to progress for the course of liberal arts, once he had adequately learned Latin.³⁹ There Loyola was in the frequent company of ardent Erasmians, particularly Juan de Vergara, who was endeavoring to attract the archhumanist to that seat,⁴⁰ and Manuel de Miona, another professor who was also his confessor. The book had just been published in 1526 in a Castilian version by Miguel de Eguía, another friend of Loyola's who would later, as would Miona, join his Society.⁴¹ Loyola's reaction, according to the earliest Jesuit biographies, was this: "Ignatius nevertheless observed that he began to grow tepid in the fervor of his devotions and piety from this reading, and thus he cast the book away, and afterwards conversant no more with the spirit of Erasmus, he forbade anyone in the Society to read a book of this author."⁴²

The authenticity of such accounts, dating to an era when some literature of Erasmus had already been assigned to indices of forbidden or excised books,⁴³ has been questioned. The discrepancy between the reports of Loyola's hostility to Erasmus' *Enchiridion* and the discovery of patent parallels to it in his own exercises has fomented controversy.⁴⁴ This has been more contentious than conscientious, however, with every partisan polemic of the Counter Reformation rehearsed in emotional display.⁴⁵ Although scholars knowledgeable about Erasmus have rarely

Iesu, 1894) 1, 33; Cámara, *Memoriale seu diarium* 245, cf. 98 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 669 and cf. 585.

³⁹ *Acta* 3.24 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 92-95. Mark Rotsaert, "Les premiers contacts de saint Ignace avec l'erasmisme espagnol," *Revue d'histoire de la spiritualité* 49 (1973) 425-60; Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmus et l'Espagne* (Paris: E. Droz, 1937) 229-30; Dudon, *Saint Ignace de Loyola* 144.

⁴⁰ For their correspondence see the index to *Erasmi epistolae*, ed. P. S. Allen et al. (12 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1906-58) vol. 12.

⁴¹ Bataillon, *Erasmus et l'Espagne* 205-31.

⁴² Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae* 5 in *Chronicon* 1, 33: cf. n. 38.

⁴³ See Paul and Marcella Grendler, "The Survival of Erasmus in Italy," *Erasmus in English* 8 (1976) 2-12.

⁴⁴ The literature is reviewed in Rotsaert, "Les premiers contacts," 443, n. 1, who adduces further parallels, 461-64. So does Terence O'Reilly, "Saint Ignatius Loyola and Spanish Erasmianism," *AHSI* 43 (1974) 301-31, although his more recent article, "Erasmus, Ignatius Loyola, and Orthodoxy," *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1979) 115-27, is not current with the Erasmus scholarship. For a recapitulation of previous research from a perspective sympathetic to Erasmus, see John C. Olin, "Erasmus and St. Ignatius Loyola," in *Luther, Erasmus, and the Reformation*, ed. Olin et al. (New York: Fordham University Press, 1969) 114-33; rpt. in his *Six Essays and a Translation of Erasmus' Letter to Carondelet, 1523* (New York: Fordham, 1979) 75-92.

⁴⁵ The single book on the subject, Ricardo García Villoslada, *Loyola y Erasmo: Dos almas, dos épocas* (Madrid: Taurus, 1965), is obsolete on Erasmus. So is the criticism of James Broderick, S.J., *Saint Ignatius Loyola: The Pilgrim Years 1491-1538* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1956) 157-58, although the commonplaces have been rehearsed in

entered this fray, it has been suggested that Loyola may have owed some inspiration for his rules for the discernment of spirits to Erasmus' prefatory letter to the *Paraphrasis in evangelium Matthaei* (1522).⁴⁶ Composed for laymen as an aid to reading the Gospel, it was dedicated to Charles V and published by Loyola's friend Eguía at Alcalá during his study there in 1525.⁴⁷ Both occasion and opportunity to examine it were available, therefore, to Loyola. In its dedication Erasmus broached the pastoral problem. "It is said that the discernment of spirits is difficult, and the angel of Satan sometimes transforms himself into an angel of light. I acknowledge that, and for that reason I do not wish judgment to be headlong," he counseled. "The most certain suffrage for each man is the testimony of his conscience. Next is his agreement with Scripture and the life of Christ." He added the rule, "Wherever discord is, there is the devil."⁴⁸

This was not the only instance of Erasmus' concern with the discernment of spirits, however, nor its most significant formulation.⁴⁹ The Pauline pericope in which the Apostle voiced his apprehension lest the Corinthians be seduced from faith by deceivers, like Satan transfiguring

psychohistorical dress in Nelson W. Minnich and W. W. Meissner, M.D., S.J., "The Character of Erasmus," *American Historical Review* 83 (1978) 598-624. The Jesuit attitude toward Erasmus has not been entirely recidivist, however. Appreciation is owed to the scholarship of Georges Chantraine, S.J., "*Mystère*" et "*Philosophie du Christ*" selon Erasme (Namur: Secretariat des publications facultés universitaires; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1971); idem, *Erasme et Luther: Libre et serf arbitre. Etude historique et théologique* (Paris: Lethielleux; Le Sycomore: Presses Universitaires de Namur, 1980), and several articles, recently "Erasme et Saint Basile," *Irénikon* 52 (1979) 451-90. See also John W. O'Malley, S.J., "Erasmus and Luther: Continuity and Discontinuity as Key to Their Conflict," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 5 (1974) 47-65. O'Malley is also editing the volume of devotional literature for *The Collected Works of Erasmus*. My own scholarship on Erasmus as an evangelical humanist who masterfully appropriated the arts of discourse for a theological renaissance is substantially revisionist: *Rhetoric and Reform: Erasmus' Civil Dispute with Luther* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1983); *Christening Pagan Mysteries: Erasmus in Pursuit of Wisdom* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1981); *Erasmus on Language and Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1977); the four volumes of his controversies with Protestant reformers, ed. with Charles Trinkaus, for *The Collected Works of Erasmus*; and many articles.

⁴⁶ A. H. T. Levi, "Erasmus, the Early Jesuits and the Classics," in *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 1500-1700: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at King's College, Cambridge, April 1974*, ed. R. R. Bolgar (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1976) 225-27.

⁴⁷ Bataillon, *Erasme et l'Espagne* 174-76.

⁴⁸ Erasmus, "Pio Lectori," in *evangelium Matthaei paraphrasis*, in *Opera omnia*, ed. J. Clericus (11 vols.; Leiden, 1703-6) 7, no pagination but 2, 4. Edition abbreviated LB.

⁴⁹ The earliest occurrence which I have noted is Erasmus, *Liber quo respondet Annotationibus Eduardi Lei* (1520), LB 10, 284B. See my "Edward Lee," in *Biographical Register*, ed. Peter G. Bietenholz, for CWE (Toronto: University of Toronto, forthcoming).

himself into an angel of light under pretext of piety (2 Cor 11:3–15), was thematic in Erasmus' apologetics with Protestant reformers. As analyzed in my *Rhetoric and Reform*, he announced in the very prologue of his disputation with Luther the singular problem which informed Ignatian spirituality.⁵⁰ Doubting the wisdom of private judgment, Erasmus argued in *De libero arbitrio, diatribē sive collatio* (1524) for the discernment of spirits by an ecclesiastical consensus on Scripture. "If Paul in his age, in which the gift of the Spirit was in full force, orders spirits to be tested whether they be of God, what ought to be done in this carnal age?" he asked. "How then shall we prove the Spirit?"⁵¹ His argument was a sophisticated conflation of the spiritual question of the discernment of spirits with the philosophical question of the criterion of truth, in which he deliberated with a classical Skepticism.⁵² As historically formulated in the confrontation of Skeptic and Stoic epistemology, the criterion of truth had been defined as "the thing in view of which we assert that these things exist and those do not exist, and that these are true and those are false."⁵³ Although Erasmus declined to discern the spirit of Luther personally,⁵⁴ he did address the issue of his dissent theologically. Shall the Spirit be proved by learning or by sanctity? On both sides of the dispute were men; on both, scholars; on both, sinners. On the side of moral freedom of choice, however, he observed "the whole choir of the saints."⁵⁵ When Erasmus proceeded to ascertain whether Luther and his party were saints, he was thwarted. "If you ask from them a worthy life in the Spirit," he complained, "they respond that they are justified by faith, not works. If you inquire after miracles, they say those have ceased for a long time now, and there is no longer any need of this work in such a great light of Scripture." Yet, Erasmus noticed, none of the dissenters could cure a lame horse, nor did they manifest the apostolic simplicity which would suffice in place of such miracles.⁵⁶

This frustration of the traditional rule of discerning spirits from life resulted from Luther's conviction of a justification by faith which obviated verification by works. He thus inverted and subverted the classical and Catholic criterion of consensus by declaring rather that witness to the bondage of the will was the norm by which the saints themselves

⁵⁰ The documentation and analysis of the following is abridged from my *Rhetoric and Reform* 133–42.

⁵¹ Erasmus, *De libero arbitrio*, ed. Johannes von Walter (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1910) 15, ll. 21–23. Hereafter referred to as *Diatriba*, and edition abbreviated as W.

⁵² Boyle, *Rhetoric and Reform*.

⁵³ Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus mathematicos* 7.29; Loeb tr.

⁵⁴ Erasmus, *Diatriba*, W 17, ll. 7–8; *Hyperaspistes*, LB 10, 1317A, 1269D.

⁵⁵ Erasmus, *Diatriba*, W 15, l. 24–16, l. 2.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 17, ll. 12–20.

were to be decided.⁵⁷ His response, *De servo arbitrio* (1525), provoked an enlargement and clarification of the issue in Erasmus' defense, *Hyperaspistes diatribae adversus servum arbitrium Martini Lutheri* (1526, 1527). There Erasmus instructed that since, according to Paul, there were "imposters of the Spirit" and "the angel of Satan may transfigure himself into an angel of light," the man who believed himself to act in a good spirit might in fact be erring.⁵⁸ As he would also expostulate against the Protestant preachers of Strasbourg, heretics were wont to simulate religion. Arius spoke scarcely less religiously than Augustine, he reminded. Manichaeus mimicked piety not only in his speech but in the prodigious severity of his life.⁵⁹ "Where is therefore," Erasmus inquired, "a certain criterion by which in the Church we may by all means prove or disprove dogmas from sacred Literature, a rule which is absolutely certain, a spiritual light clearer than the sun?"⁶⁰ His resolution of this question was that discernment should not be entrusted to private individuals, as he supposed Luther advocated, but to the consensus of pious and learned Christians.

But even so if we grant [he conceded] the possibility that a general council may be corrupt, so that either there is no one who is moved by the Spirit of God, or if anyone is, that he is not heeded, but that the decree of the senate is formed from the opinion of evil men, nevertheless more probably is the Spirit of God there than in private conventicles, in which for the most part the spirit of Satan is detected. If the Church of God cannot be manifested, and nevertheless it is necessary that there be some certain criteria, it is safer in my opinion to follow public authority than the opinion of this or that man, who having contemned all men boasts of his own conscience and spirit.

Although Erasmus admitted that he had not deliberated "whether whatever the saints taught ought to be believed, or that whatever the Church defines is indubitable, yet," he concluded, "certain things being equal, I have wished to be seen as more probable what is approved by such men and the public authority of the Church than what this or that man produces concerning his own view."⁶¹

With humanist conviction that the spirit of a man was most surely displayed in his tongue,⁶² Erasmus pursued Luther relentlessly with the demand: "Show us the spirit speaking in you."⁶³ "If you appeal this case

⁵⁷ Luther, *De servo arbitrio*, ed. Otto Clemen, in *Luthers Werke in Auswahl* (6 vols.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1960) 4, 140, ll. 26-30. Edition abbreviated C.

⁵⁸ Erasmus, *Hyperaspistes*, LB 10, 1309D.

⁵⁹ Erasmus, *Epistola ad fratres Germaniae inferioris* (1530), LB 10, 1594A.

⁶⁰ Erasmus, *Hyperaspistes*, LB 10, 1299D.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 1297C-D.

⁶² Erasmus, *Lingua, sive de usu et abusu* (1525), ed. F. Schalk, ASD 4/1, 364, l. 594. See my *Erasmus on Language and Method in Theology* 38-57.

⁶³ Erasmus, *Hyperaspistes*, LB 10, 1305E, 1308A.

to the higher court of the Spirit," he insisted, "again, I demand an evident sign."⁶⁴ Luther's own reformatory admonition had been to "test everything" (1 Thess 5:21), to "let two or three prophets speak and let the others judge" (1 Cor 14:29). Citing his favorite verse, which cursed even the angel from heaven who preached a new gospel (Gal 1:8),⁶⁵ Erasmus inquired: "What angel taught Luther?"⁶⁶ What sign did Luther, "a man of unknown spirit,"⁶⁷ give so that Christians should follow his singular dissent rather than the communal consent?⁶⁸ Applying to Luther's literature the traditional rules for the discernment of spirits, Erasmus calculated the evidence. Luther's speech, he observed, was noisy, arrogant, discordant, and mendacious.⁶⁹ Erasmus therefore presumed "to lay bare what monster you conceal in your heart, and what spirit your writings breathe upon us."⁷⁰ Summoning as witness the spirit which Luther so often flaunted at him,⁷¹ he gravely doubted its veracity.⁷² As he declared, "Truly, however much you will arrogate the Spirit to yourself, you have not persuaded me."⁷³ Delineating an antithesis between the Spirit of God and the spirit of Satan,⁷⁴ Erasmus concluded: "I have come to know a certain man to whom I may not believe present the Spirit which he arrogates to himself, since I have obtained knowledge of him with absolutely certain proofs to be at once very mendacious and pompous, and insatiably evil-tongued."⁷⁵ He convicted Luther, therefore, by the testimony of his own mouth, not only because he departed singularly from the ecclesiastical consensus, but also because he did so with the signs which traditionally betrayed the presence of the evil spirit.⁷⁶

Since Erasmus' *Diatriba (De libero arbitrio)* was published at Alcalá by Loyola's friend Eguía in 1525 during his studies there, he had the opportunity to read and discuss its acutely anticipated response to Luther's dissent. The university was, moreover, not only the seat of

⁶⁴ Ibid. 1305F.

⁶⁵ Luther, *Assertio omnium articulorum per bullam Leonis X. novissimam damnatorum* (1520), in WA 7, 99, ll. 25–27; *Verhandlungen mit D. Martin Luther auf dem Reichstage zu Worms* (1521), WA 7, 848, ll. 9–10; and his argument from 1 Cor 14: 29, *De servo arbitrio*, C 99, ll. 31–34.

⁶⁶ Erasmus, *Hyperaspistes*, LB 10, 1379B.

⁶⁷ Ibid. 1303E.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 1316A.

⁶⁹ Extensively documented in my *Rhetoric and Reform* 136–42.

⁷⁰ Erasmus, *Hyperaspistes*, LB 10, 1261A.

⁷¹ Ibid. 1261A–B.

⁷² Ibid. 1317A.

⁷³ Ibid. 1268B.

⁷⁴ Ibid. 1273F, 1285A, 1292B, 1299B, 1316A, 1352E; 1268B,C,D, 1316A; 1255B, 1292B; 1261D; 1309A; 1261D; 1319C–D; 1273D; 1471D.

⁷⁵ Ibid. 1299B.

⁷⁶ See my *Erasmus on Language and Method in Theology* 38–57 and *Rhetoric and Reform* 136–42.

sympathetic humanists but of inimical scholastics, especially Diego López de Zuñiga and Sancho Carranza, who during that decade embroiled Erasmus in controversies.⁷⁷ The debate among the faculty must have been spirited, and Loyola could hardly have been deaf to its reverberations. He himself was then laboring over the logical *Summulae* of Domingo de Soto, the physics of Albertus Magnus, and, inevitably, the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard,⁷⁸ which endeavor would have equipped him with some theology. This was not the sum of his learning, however. After a brief period in Salamanca, which proved no haven from the Inquisition, Loyola determined upon his release from prison to matriculate at Paris.⁷⁹ A consistent charge against him had been proselytizing without credentials. As the Dominican friar who interrogated him and his companions argued, “‘You are not educated men,’ says the friar, ‘yet you speak about virtues and vices; and concerning this no one is able to speak except in one of two ways: either through literature or through the Holy Spirit.’”⁸⁰ To be impaled on the latter horn of that dilemma would have exposed Loyola to the accusation of illuminism. The Church, already fractured by Luther’s arrogation of the Spirit, was alert to any suspiciously enthusiastic boasts.

To acquire the accreditation of letters, therefore, Loyola enrolled as an external student at the austere Collège de Montaigu in February 1528.⁸¹ Under the nose of Noël Beda, an antagonist of that former student Erasmus who had deplored its policies so astringently in his *Colloquia*,⁸²

⁷⁷ Erasmus, *Apologia respondens ad ea quae in Novo Testamento taxaverat Jacobus Lopis Stunica*, LB 9, 283B–356C; *Apologia adversus libellum Jacobi Stunicae cui titulum fecit, Blasphemiae et impietates Erasmi*, 355C–392C; *Epistola apologetica adversus Stunicam*, 391C–400E; *Apologia de tribus locis quos ut recte taxatos a Stunica defenderat Sanctius Caranza Theologus*, 401A–432E; cf. *Apologia adversus articulos aliquot, per monachos quosdam in Hispaniis exhibitos*, 1015C–1094A. See also Bataillon, *Erasme et l’Espagne* 123–56, 273–76.

⁷⁸ Acta 6.57 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 440–41.

⁷⁹ Acta 7 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 452–65.

⁸⁰ Acta 7.65 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 454–55.

⁸¹ Acta 8 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 464–81. I. Rodriguez-Grahit, “Ignace de Loyola et le Collège Montaigu: L’Influence de Standonk sur Ignace,” *Bibliothèque d’humanisme et renaissance* 20 (1958) 388–401; Robert Rouquette, “Ignace de Loyola dans le Paris intellectuel du XVI^e siècle,” *Etudes* 290 (1956) 18–40; Victoriano Larrañaga, “Los estudios superiores de san Ignacio en Paris, Bolonia y Venecia,” *Razón y fe* 153 (1956) 221–34; Henri Bernard-Maitre, “Les fondateurs de la Compagnie de Jésus et l’humanisme parisien de la Renaissance (1525–1536),” *Nouvelle revue théologique* 72 (1950) 811–83; Gustave Neyron, “Saint Ignace de Loyola en présence des idées de son temps,” *Revue apologétique* 53 (1931) 129–53.

⁸² Erasmus, *Colloquia*, ed. Leon-E. Halkin et al., ASD 1/3, 531, l. 1318–532, l. 1378. For a history of the reputation of this work with the Paris theologians, see Franz Bierlaire, *Les colloques d’Erasme: Réforme des études, réforme des moeurs et réforme de l’église au XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1978) 212–66.

he applied himself to the regimen of grammar. By October 1529 Loyola was pursuing the course of nominalist philosophy at the more liberal Collège de Sainte-Barbe, and he passed the baccalaureate examination at the end of three and a half years. After further examination he gained a licentiate and finally a master of arts in philosophy in March 1533, delivering his inaugural lecture two years later to the month. During that interim he studied theology at the Dominican convent of Saint-Jacques, where the mandatory reading of the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard had been replaced notably by that of the *Summa theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas.⁸³ His biographers attested that Loyola was unattracted to study, which cost him tremendous effort of will. Did Master Ignatius imprint nothing of this arduous learning on the formal composition of his *Exercises*, more than a decade after the initial insight achieved in solitary communion with God and self?

Although it has been argued that it is "perfectly clear how meaningless it can be to enquire about sources in regard to a work of such original inspiration,"⁸⁴ again historical research has proved the appended rules for thinking with the Church to be derivative. Those eighteen points were definitely composed during Loyola's sojourn in Paris.⁸⁵ Rules 1-8, 10-11, 13-17 paralleled the canons of the Council of Sens, convened in 1528 to confirm and elaborate the decisions of the theological faculty against Luther in 1521, and also some subsequent arguments, especially those promoted by Josse Clichtove.⁸⁶ The eleventh of these rules avowed Loyola's debt to his theological education:

To praise positive and scholastic teaching. For thus as it is more characteristic of the positive doctors, such as St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory, and so on, that they move the affections to a wholehearted love and service of God our Lord; so it is more characteristic of the scholastics, such as St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, the Master of the *Sentences*, and so on, to define or clarify for our times concerning those matters necessary for eternal salvation, and moreover to impugn and clarify all errors and fallacies. Because the scholastic doctors are more modern, not only do they profit by the true knowledge of the sacred Scripture and of the positive and holy doctors, but, while being themselves also illumined and enlightened by divine virtue, they have the assistance of the councils, canons, and decrees of our holy mother the Church.⁸⁷

⁸³ M.-D. Chenu, "L'Humanisme et la réforme au collège de Saint-Jacques de Paris," *Archives d'histoire dominicaine* 1 (1946) 130-54.

⁸⁴ Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian* 47.

⁸⁵ *Exercitia spiritualia* 1, 404-16.

⁸⁶ Dudon, *Saint Ignace de Loyola* 627-33.

⁸⁷ *Exercitia spiritualia* 1, 410-11. For an introduction see Leturia, "Sentido verdadero en la Iglesia militante," *Manresa* 14 (1942) 23-35, 118-31; *Gregorianum* 23 (1942) 137-68; Joaquin Salaverri, "Motivación histórica y significación teológica del ignaciano 'sentir con la Iglesia,'" *Estudios eclesiásticos* 31 (1957) 139-71; Pinard de la Boullaye, "Sentir, sentimiento, sentido dans le style de Saint Ignace," *AHSI* 25 (1956) 416-30.

Loyola's spiritual affinity was for scholasticism, for with the discipline of logic its doctors were able, as he himself stated, "to give precision to and to clarify" the truths necessary for salvation. At the Cardoner he had experienced "a great clarity in his understanding,"⁸⁸ and the dynamic of his spirituality tended ever toward discernment and enlightenment. The Fathers, whom he termed positive theologians, were rhetorical rather than dialectical in method. Their efficacy was proper to the aim of that discursive discipline, which was, in Loyola's summation, "to move the affections." Ever since Plato's critique of sophistry in *Gorgias*, however, rhetoric had been censured for an inability to attain truth. As Loyola himself had experienced, the evil spirit could "move the affections" as readily as the good one. How in such emotional confusion was certitude to be achieved? It was to resolve this quandary, one which had buffeted him with scrupulosity, that he counseled the advantage of scholastic theology. Not only would it guarantee with dialectical precision the correct understanding of Scripture; it would also judge positive theology. A devout Christian, therefore, should not read Basil or Hilary firsthand in humanist editions, but only as selectively cited and corrected in scholastic commentaries. The implication of this Ignatian rule for thinking with the Church was that the ancient texts were to be interpreted by scholastic method, in repudiation of evangelical humanism. Although Loyola may have derived certain topics from Erasmus, he roundly rejected his rhetorical argumentation of them. However many substantive parallels may be discovered between those reformers, Loyola's distaste for the humanist was correctly and cogently reported by his early Jesuit biographers. As a positive (rhetorical) theologian, Erasmus failed to provide him the clarity and certitude he demanded. Only scholastic dialectic could intellectually guarantee the truth. Epistemologically, Loyola was allied with Luther's norm: "absolute certainty for establishing consciences."⁸⁹

Loyola's own rule for achieving this certainty was the thirteenth: "To be entirely right on the mark, we ought always to hold fast the belief that the white object which I see is black, if the hierarchical Church should decide it so."⁹⁰ While he remarked his private visions sufficient for faith and even for the witness of martyrdom should Scripture not exist,⁹¹ he submitted his personal perceptions to the public discernment of the Church. He declared this with confidence, "believing that between

⁸⁸ *Acta* 3.30 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 404-7.

⁸⁹ Luther, *De servo arbitrio*, C 195, l. 40; 248, ll. 1-2. My documentation and analysis of Luther's Stoic epistemology, especially in the context of the history of medicine, is important also to the interpretation of Loyola.

⁹⁰ *Exercitia spiritualia* 1, 410-13.

⁹¹ *Acta* 3.29 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 404-5.

our Lord, the bridegroom, and the Church, his bride, is the same Spirit which governs and directs for the health of our souls. For by the same Spirit and our Lord, who gave the Ten Commandments, is directed and governed our holy mother the Church."⁹² Loyola was convinced that every good impulse, whether personal or ecclesiastical, derived from the same undivided Spirit of truth. Therefore there could be no conflict between one's experience, as properly discerned, and the institutional faith. Had not his own release by the Inquisition proved that? As his memoirs related, when he had challenged his examiners to judge his teaching, " 'whether this is true or not, determine it; if it is not true condemn it,' " the decision had been that "in the end they left without condemning anything."⁹³ Loyola's rule of positing certainty in the hierarchical Church some may praise as saintly confidence in the providence of God, others deplore as naive trust in the responsibility of men. Intellectually, it begged the question which was being contested historically. Disputing on behalf of the ecclesiastical consensus on Scripture in the antagonism between Protestant reform and Catholic resistance, Erasmus had extracted the discernment of spirits from its ascetical context and fused it to the epistemological problem of the criterion of truth. He had elevated the question from a private to a public matter, restoring its Pauline status. As in the ancient church at Corinth, the discernment of spirits was again an ecclesiastical issue, with the integrity of the community threatened by a seditious arrogation of the Spirit. Loyola's relinquishing of judgment to the Church itself was circular. What if the Church was itself prompted, in some instance, by the spirit of evil in disguise as an angel of light, so that its perception was distorted? How was the Christian uncertain about his own state to test the spirit of another? Erasmus had articulated the criterion of truth as "the inviolable authority of Scripture and the precepts of the Church."⁹⁴ Luther had asserted: "All spirits are to be tested at the bar of Scripture in the presence of the Church."⁹⁵ Scripture was egregiously absent from Loyola's rule.

This historical context established the meaning of his statement and it furnishes the perspective for its interpretation; for the metaphor of Loyola's thirteenth rule was derived from the classical argument about the criterion between the Skeptics and the Stoics, as revived in the Catholic-Protestant polemic. An empiricist psychology which sought the criterion of truth in sensory impressions had occasioned in the Hellenistic age the competing epistemologies of Stoicism and Skepticism. The Stoics

⁹² *Exercitia spiritualia* 1, 412-13.

⁹³ *Acta* 7.68 in *Fontes narrativi* 1, 458-61.

⁹⁴ Erasmus, *Diatriba*, W 3, ll. 15-20.

⁹⁵ Luther, *De servo arbitrio*, C 141, l. 32-142, l. 11.

defined the criterion as a kataleptic impression (*phantasia katalēptikē*), that is, one whose intrinsic certainty authorized assent even as it compelled assent. This quality was termed "clarity" (*enargeia*), and it yielded a proposition that required no evidence beyond the unquestionable experience of the percipient. Challenging this theory, the Sceptics of the New Academy argued that a false impression might by that criterion be mistaken for a true one. They undermined the Stoic argument by indicating four such perceptual errors: hallucinations, dreams, illusions, and sensory powers limited in range and discrimination. A man while still asleep might cry out in terror, apparently unaware of any difference between the impression of his dream and his perception while awake. Yet the dreamed impression conveyed the same clarity and compulsion, they reasoned, with which the Stoics designated the criterion of truth. Since false impressions, arising from such perceptual errors, could be just as clear and forceful as true impressions, they argued that clarity and force could not constitute the criterion of truth. And since, therefore, the concept of a kataleptic impression provided no certainty, the Sceptics concluded that the reasonable resort was the calculation of probability.⁹⁶

Perceptual error was famously addressed in the snow-is-black argument. The Sceptical question, as Cicero phrased it instructively for the understanding of Loyola's rule, was this: "How can it be said distinctly that any thing is white, when it may happen that what is black appears white?"⁹⁷ In historical perspective, Loyola's rule thus responded to the classical problem of the criterion which was in dispute between Erasmus and Luther, as arguing respectively for Sceptical and Stoic theories. "To be entirely right on the mark," Loyola declared, "we ought always to hold fast the belief that the white object which I see is black, if the hierarchical Church determines it so."⁹⁸ Rule thirteen was precisely the Ignatian formulation of the criterion, which he declared to be the decision of the hierarchical Church. It was articulated not in a spiritual vacuum but in a historical ferment which compelled him to formulate a resolution not only to the private but to the public conscience. While the adequacy of the rule may prove theologically debatable, no longer should it be maintained that it had "nothing to do with apologetics or anti-Protestantism. . . ."⁹⁹ The revival of the problem of the criterion was Erasmus' response to Luther's dissent, as he shifted the issue from the scholastic disputation on free will to the humanist inquiry: How was truth itself to

⁹⁶ Abridged from my *Rhetoric and Reform* 48–50.

⁹⁷ Cicero, *Academica* 2.31.100; Sextus Empiricus, *Hypotyposes* 1.33, 2.244. For revision of the history of early modern Scepticism, see my *Rhetoric and Reform*.

⁹⁸ See n. 89 above.

⁹⁹ Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian* 219.

be decided?¹⁰⁰ Loyola, who had the occasion and the ability to read his *Diatriba* and to debate it in the company of sympathizers and scoffers alike, accepted the validity of that strategy, although he proposed a different answer.

Reflecting on Erasmus four centuries later, Alfred North Whitehead commented: "His ideas were the right ones, and could have provided a much happier solution for the development of Christendom than the one which came. . . . The view of Erasmus was that of sensible and enlightened people, and if it could have been effectuated by an able leader there never need have been an Ignatius Loyola and a Council of Trent."¹⁰¹ But there were. What then is to be concluded about the "utterly unliturgical Ignatius"?¹⁰² He is a fiction, invented from the premise that among the saints there is "an affinity which reaches beyond the conditions of historical process, so that they have no need to back up everything they say with an appeal to literary sources—in other words, there is a reality of mystical interconnections between saints who, however remote from one another in time, were once permitted a glimpse into the luminous darkness of God."¹⁰³ Loyola's faith, however, was in the experience of God in personal history. Romantic appeals to transcendence not only contradict his spirit but confound the discipline of writing a veracious account of the Counter Reformation if its saints are to be granted immunity from historical investigation. That elitism has distorted the perception of prominent Catholic figures, as in the gratuitous judgment that Loyola "plumbed life's depths, whereas such people as Erasmus and Vives merely floated on the surface."¹⁰⁴ Loyola himself may prove more significantly intellectual in historical perspective, although an alternative to the hagiographical tradition will only be constructed arduously.¹⁰⁵ Like his own labors at learning, the introduction of historical method to the discernment of Catholicism in the sixteenth century remains largely an uphill struggle.

¹⁰⁰ See my *Rhetoric and Reform*. For analysis of the disputed scholastic question, however, see my "Erasmus and the 'Modern' Question: Was He Semi-Pelagian?" *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 75 (1984) in press.

¹⁰¹ *Dialogues of Alfred North Whitehead*, as recorded by Lucien Price (London: Max Reinhardt, 1954) 232.

¹⁰² Rahner, *Ignatius the Theologian* 165.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* 51–52.

¹⁰⁴ Broderick, *Saint Ignatius Loyola* 267.

¹⁰⁵ For an outline of the relevant contexts and factors, see John W. O'Malley, S.J., "The Jesuits, St. Ignatius, and the Counter Reformation: Some Recent Studies and Their Implications for Today," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 14 (1982).