SPIRITUAL GOVERNMENT: FROM LIBERTY TO FREEDOM

By DAVID L. FLEMING

ST IGNATIUS LOYOLA'S great gift to an understanding of government, traced throughout the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus,* is his structuring of the human reality of growth in freedom within a community context. Many commentators on the *Spiritual Exercises* have noted that a personal growth in spiritual freedom is a central part of the dynamic of the retreat movement. In a similar way, the notion of freedom is central to the idea of Ignatian government—so much so that traditionally his description of government itself gains the mysterious qualifying title of 'spiritual'.[1]

I. Thesis

Despite many disclaimers over the centuries, Ignatius has been pictured both by his devotees and by his critics as a military man. The description does not come only from his personal history as a young courtier, a wounded *caballero* in a minor battle between French and Spanish forces at Pamplona. The understanding of Ignatius as a military man is based more on the organization of the Company of Jesus and on his great stress on the centrality of obedience for its members.

But Ignatius was not a military man, nor was he a theologian, although his academic training in this area may merit him a greater claim for proficiency in theological matters over military expertise. Yet his governmental structure is better understood when it is put into a theological context. For Ignatius was gifted with extraordinary mystical experiences, experiences particularly at Manresa by which he described himself as being taught by God as if he were a school boy. As Ignatius says about himself in his Autobiography:

> Whether this was on account of his coarseness or his dense intelligence or because he had no one to teach him or because of

> the strong desire God himself had given him to serve him, he clearly believed and has always believed that God treated him in this way.[2]

These experiences hold the key for understanding the method he brings to the human conversion experience reflected in the *Spiritual Exercises* and to the human governmental structures he outlines in the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus.*

From his own mystical experience, Ignatius reflected how God works with the human person. God creates out of love, which means that God creates freely, and not out of some sense of necessity or duty. It is the nature of a lover to want to share gifts with the one who is loved. But the very nature of the love-relationship is one of *freedom.* God can only wait for the response of love in return from the one upon whom he showers his gifts. This is the God pictured both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament—one who continues to invite, to call, to gift and to wait. It is the God whom Ignatius portrays both in The Principle and Foundation which opens the *Exercises* and even more tellingly in the Contemplation to Gain Love which is its close.

Ignatius saw the gift of freedom in the human person as central to the reciprocal response of love to God. It is in the attempt to respond in love to the God who creates and sustains us that we begin to discover the criteria for ordering our lives. This ordering or reordering of our lives captures one way of giving expression to the movement which Ignatius sets down in his book of the *Exercises.* The 'doing God's will' must be based on the harmony of two lovers who want to share the gifts that each one has.

Of course, as Ignatius realized, what do we as human beings possess that we have not been given by God in our very creation? Certain gifts, such as physical endowments, athletic prowess, intellectual potential and artistic abilities, can be wonderfully developed and shared with others in an act of love. But one gift above all others is identified by Ignatius as the gift God waits for, as precious above all others. It is the offering of one's liberty that remains key to the total relationship between human beings and God. In Ignatius's way of understanding, it is precisely in the giving over of our little liberty to God in a love act that we begin to experience the actuality of human freedom.

It is as if human liberty were only a potential, similar to physical gifts, or athletic, intellectual and artistic capabilities. But whereas

these latter gifts can be developed by one's own efforts and used and shared with other human beings, liberty remains only potential until a person is willing to give it over to God. The Christian paradox of freedom is reflected in the fact that the more we try to exercise our autonomy and to power our way to self-identity the more we move away from realizing personal freedom and selfhood. This paradox Ignatius expresses in the prayer, 'Take, Lord, and receive all my liberty, my memory, my understanding, and my entire will—all that I have and call my own'.[3] It becomes the prayer of the free person, as portrayed in the *Spiritual Exercises*.

Ignatius boldly chooses this model of God-and-human relationship as his model for the relationships in human government in Jesuit religious life. It is a model which demands Christian faith; it does not claim to make logical sense, or even that it would be able to be adapted to a secular structure. It is a model which focuses on God's providence, not just as a global pattern of divine care and concern, but as an individually centred care and concern for each person and a particular call to enter into a working relationship with God to help in making the Kingdom present.[4] This model understands God's providence, not as if it were a plan on some eternally set 'automatic pilot', but as God's continually working with the data of physical happenings and human choices—choices which are sometimes well-made and at other times just stupid or thoughtless and even sinful and deliberately evil. In our world of instant communication and of television bringing images of life so different from our own life situations into our living rooms, we are all the more aware of how events and choices affect the whole context of people's lives, directly and indirectly, often for generations. In this view, God is seen as a labouring God, always incorporating the happenstance and the human action into the movement of salvation. We are invited to labour with God, especially in responding to and taking on our own responsibility in following Jesus as together we enter into God's saving action, as pictured in the Kingdom exercise of the *Spiritual Exercises*, with its desire for the grace 'not to be deaf to his call, but ready and diligent to fulfill his most holy will'.[5]

When Ignatius sets down the governmental structures in the *Constitutions*, he portrays the human superior on the model of this provident God. At times, Ignatius explicitly uses the language of the superior being seen 'as one who holds the place of Christ our Lord',[6] or being obeyed 'as if it were coming from Christ our

Lord'.[7] In using such expressions, Ignatius does not intend to see the superior as endowed with the qualities of God. But it is true that Ignatius has a deep appreciation for grace building on nature, and the one prudently chosen as superior for human gifts may expect the divine enhancement of those gifts in what we traditionally call 'the grace of office'.

Ignatius had total confidence in Christ's promise of 'another Paraclete', who would remain with us to instill in us ways of knowing and of acting in the way of the Lord Jesus. For Ignatius, this was the only 'way of proceeding'. He uses the phrase, for example, 'the unction of the Holy Spirit' that will give wisdom to the scholastics-in-training about the manner of acting proper to a member of the Society,[8] and again in reference to teaching superiors how to distribute workers in the vineyard.[9] Similar phrases about the Spirit are used to emphasize the presence and power of the Spirit in the election of the superior general,[10] in urging on those who have a vocation to this life,[11] and in the dismissing of a professed member.[12] When individual superiors would write about specific decisions, Ignatius as superior general often tried to confirm them in their own gifts and in their own reliance upon the Spirit who would move them to what was to be done in particular circumstances. A wonderfully concrete example of this attitude is found in Ignatius's letter to P. Ribadeneira on February 4, 1556:

> As for the instructions you are asking for, it would seem from here that you ought to ask God our Lord for them; and since people there are informed about the situation and see from close at hand what is needed, do as they will feel most advisable for the objectives that we here want for the divine glory and that Your Reverence knows very well. Even the University of Salamanca, they say, cannot teach discretion, and it can be learned even less from such instructions. May the Holy Spirit grant it to you, though, and supply whatever is lacking, as he always does in our affairs.[13]

The superior, then, was not to rely on his own insights and gifts, but rather in his role as superior he was to 'act like' this provident God. The first and most necessary part of his relationship as superior is not only his union with God, but also his particular and individual love for each person under his care.[14] The superior likewise must continue to labour with the circumstances and the people in furthering projects and plans. A superior's decision is

never made in the abstract, apart from the input of people involved or in some kind of eternal 'once-and-for-all-time'. All of these aspects model the ways of acting of the provident God.

Ignatius was also aware that the provident God is present in many various forms throughout creation. The Spirit is reflected working in a kaleidoscope of patterns in the situations upon which our decisions are meant to bear. The superior, then, is aware not only of the Spirit working with him, but also how the same Spirit must be listened to in the people involved and consulted, in the history and circumstances which are a given, and in prescriptions and laws already set down to guide our actions in Church and State.

Just as a provident God weaves together a tapestry of his Kingdom out of the circumstances and choices of our human world, so the superior in acting like God must continue to weave together the various manifestations of the Spirit in order to arrive at a decision which is properly ordered in freedom and so in love. It is in this process of listening to the various manifestations of the Spirit that the superior realizes that he too is one under obedience. In the picture of the superior which Ignatius draws, for all his responsibility of acting like the provident God, the superior has always before his consciousness that he is not God. He could attempt only to act in ways that were after the manner of this provident God. The fact that the Spirit was so omnipresent in the world necessitates a superior of great faith and of ready obedience who can search for and listen to God's Spirit not only moving in self, but in others and in the world. Only if this kind of obedience is present in the superior is there given a basic essential of spiritual government.

For Ignatius, then, spiritual government is not an abstract conception. Spiritual government is just as much a reality as God's providence in our everyday life. Spiritual government is not some kind of extraordinary moment of decision-making; it is meant to be the ordinary structure of interaction within the religious group described in the *Constitutions*. Obviously the whole group of people have to accept the reality of spiritual government for it to function.

If superiors alone were to understand their governance in terms of the care of the provident God, then the reciprocal relationship of subject to superior would flounder and fail, destroying with it the very role of superior, no matter how well-intentioned the person was. For the subjects of an Ignatian superior also must see

themselves caught up in a particular incarnational instance of God's providence, found within a particular governmental structure. The subjects must be aware of their own gifting of the Spirit, and so their first obedience (i.e. listening to) is always and necessarily to God. And their responsibility, then, in obedience is to manifest to the superior what spiritual movement is present to their awareness. The manifestation of conscience, then, does not fixate on some kind of nakedness of self-disclosure, but rather its purpose is focused outward towards God's call and direction both within this subject and potentially within the life of the group. It is in freely giving over this gift of God's Spirit in themselves that subjects become ready to realize true freedom in accepting and acting out the superior's final decision in regard to themselves and their works.[15]

The subject, too, enters into the way of acting of the provident God by his awareness not only of the movement of the Spirit within himself but also in the circumstances or life situation in which he finds himself. He, too, remains aware of the complexifying of the Spirit's action, and so knows the call to a freedom beyond the limits of his own understanding and judgment.[16] Ignatius was not making a call to some sort of desert asceticism in his demand for an obedience of understanding and judgment, although truly an asceticism is effectively the result. But his call stems from his theology of how God acts in our world, grounded in his own mystical experience.

The great respect a superior has for each of his subjects is more deeply founded than simply on the value and dignity of each human person. Each person is truly a temple of the Spirit, and in each person the Spirit moves not only for the good of the individual but also for the greater good. Ignatius viewed the ordering of a greater good on a hierarchical model. In the personal conversion experience outlined in the dynamic of the *Exercises*, as Jesus Christ is chosen as the supreme value of our lives, then everything else is relative in value and takes its rank in terms of its relating us to and moving us toward Jesus. Every individual maintains throughout his life his responsibility to continue to choose and to order the values and direction of his life in terms of following Christ.

These same individuals live in community, beyond the ordinary natural grouping of family, reflected both in Church and State groupings such as civic and neighbourhood organizations, unions and fraternal associations, diocesan and parish units, and priestly

and religious communities. For Ignatius, what orders the values and directions of a group's life and its work together is modelled again in an hierarchical way, with the image of a provident God located in the decisions made by a superior in his proper role of oversight or supervision. For Ignatius, the importance of the obedience of the group called the Society of Jesus was in its obedience to the Church (this 'least Society' to the whole Body of Christ) and so to the pope, who in his own role of spiritual government holds the responsibility and the grace of office to oversee the mission of the Church in manifesting the Kingdom.[17] Although this hierarchical principle in Ignatius is mystically based on a provident God, there is no mystical illusion about the pope or any superior having extraordinary gifts of leadership or insight just because of election or appointment to office. It is rather the practical and mundane expectation that a person in this position, with the contacts and resources available to him, has access to a larger vision and a greater sense of the mission need. Such a person, with natural gifts and grace of office included, obviously most closely models the vision of a provident God.

For Ignatius, granted all the limitations and fallibilities in any human person, there still remains incarnate in the superior the more effective and efficient way of discovering where God may be leading us.[18] It is in this light that Ignatius calls for every act of obedience to be truly an act of freedom, the act of a free person responding to God's lead and love, which gets clothed often in the messy and limited ways of human interaction and life situations.

Ignatius deliberately chose the hierarchical model of government over the more common capitular model. It was not that he personally was against a more representative type of governing structure. On the contrary, it is evident throughout the *Constitutions* that he shows a great respect for the importance of the insight, wisdom and grace of each individual member of the Society. He was also aware that God worked with other models of government since he knew that these chapter or council models are far more common than a hierarchical one in religious-life groupings within the Church. It was not even that he tried to imitate the hierarchical model of the Church itself so that the Society of Jesus could have its 'black pope' as its counterpart of the 'white pope', with all the strengths and weaknesses of its authority lines. Ignatius seems always to return to his mystical understandings which are only slowly and laboriously spelled out in the legacy which he leaves to

the Church and to the Society of Jesus. It is always to the model of a provident God that we are led as we examine any of the aspects of Ignatian spiritual government. For in this model Ignatius sensed a way of enhancing the liberty potential within the individual and within the group so that human freedom would be realized in the structure of government itself.

II. Synthesis

1. Ignatius is fundamentally a practical man, not a theoretician. His spiritually is an experiential one that is based more on reflective awareness of God's presence, absence and action in everyday life and consequently our response to God's lead (i.e. obedience) than it is taken up with set prayers and ascetical practices. From the major mystical experiences at Manresa, Ignatius had a sense of how God works with his world, 'the plan he was pleased to decree in Christ, to be carried out in the fullness of time: namely, to bring all things in the heavens and on earth into one under Christ's headship' (Eph 1, 9-10). As Ignatius reflected on his own experience and then observed God's working with so many others in the course of his spiritual conversations with them, he developed a greater and greater sense of how God collaborates with human beings in their growth in Christ. His *Spiritual Exercises* captures a way of how God works with us and how we work with God for the growth direction of our Christian lives. It was in the light of his reflections on how God works with his world and how God works with individuals that Ignatius caught ahold of a pattern for how God works also with groups. The ways of working with the provident God, along with the call to growth in personal freedom, mark the underlying pattern that flows through the chapters of the *Constitutions*. Spiritual government is all of a piece with Ignatius's views on how God works with his world, how God works with individuals, and how God works with groups.

2. Spiritual government demands a balance of elements for its proper functioning. This balance is personalized as the Holy Spirit. The Spirit working in each individual—both superiors and subjects—and the Spirit working through events and circumstances must be recognized and cooperated with for a proper balance to be achieved. This proper balance is identified with the phrase 'finding and doing the will of God'.

Within each individual, the special quality of Ignatian indifference is a prerequisite. Indifference, as Ignatius uses the term in

the Principle and Foundation, defines the interior attitude of balance, a readiness to incline where God's Spirit leads.[19] Indifference is more correctly seen as 'potential balance' since it represents more the 'standing on the threshold', with all our natural desires and perhaps even the graced ones held in check until the lead of God is made clear. Balance, like freedom, is realized in the actual acceptance and carrying out of the divine direction in our life decisions and actions. The Ignatian picture is drawn in the description of the Third Class of Men in the *Exercises*.[20]

The stance of one who is waiting at the threshold is one of listening. Obedience (*ob-audire*, i.e. to listen carefully) is another element necessary for the indifferent person to know how to come to a decision or how to take action. This obedience to God—the mark of the person of faith—is basic to the movement from the liberty potential in human beings to the actuality of freedom. In a paradox come alive in Christianity, we see that freedom flows from obedience—a person listening and responding to God in all the ways that balance the movement of the Spirit for the direction of our lives in Christ.

Another element which is tied into the 'finding and doing God's will' is discernment. Discernment leans upon the prerequisite of Ignatian indifference and obedience and freedom as we have described them. But discernment highlights another side of obedience. In order for there to be discernment, there must be some kind of authority. Discernment finds the standard (i.e. the authority) outside one's self in the process of coming to a decision and action. Discernment, then, looks toward another source, an authority, someone other than self as providing the criterion of judgment. The authority for everyone ultimately is God. Jesus Christ is the acknowledged standard of human living for all Christians. But when discernment is taken into the decisions and directions of a group, the authority is ordinarily centred in the human superior. For in the Ignatian faith view,

> there is greater security if they go from obedience to their superiors rather than through their own decision (even if they were capable of making it), and not as men sent by him whom they have in place of Christ to direct them as the interpreter of his divine will.[21]

In the context of the total balance which the Spirit provides, the superior holds the responsibility to be the 'ultimate discerner'. In

Ignatian government, then, no one is excused from the necessity of growing in indifference, in maintaining a ready obedience which allows for freedom, and in acknowledging authority for the functioning of discernment.

3. How are people related to one another in this Ignatian structure of spiritual government? In the *Constitutions*, we see that the most fundamental relationship is expressed as 'companions in the same Society'. As Ignatius reflects only once—but once was enough to establish this foundational truth—there can be no substitute for the one necessary relationship of love among the members, that 'interior law of charity and love which the Holy Spirit writes and engraves upon hearts'.[22] And yet there is always present an inequality among these same members joined in love. First, there is the difference found in terms of the incorporation into the body of the Society of Jesus. Ignatius describes four groupings within the Society: 1) all those who live under obedience to its superior general, thereby including novices and those in probation; 2) not only the professed and formed coadjutors, but also approved scholastics; 3) the professed and the formed coadjutors; and finally 4) 'the most precise meaning of this name, the Society, comprehends only the professed'.[23] Secondly, there are the differences between subjects and superiors in terms of their responsibilities.[24] Thirdly, there are the differences among superiors themselves, 'that all may have full power for good and that, if they do poorly, they may be kept under complete control'.[25] This order of subordinates finds its origin in the manifest gifts of the Spirit, even as the Pauline letters have given witness.[26] For Ignatius, the communication of graces for the life and work of the Society also flows from the observance of the Spirit-given inequalities. 'For the more the subjects are dependent upon their superiors, the better will the love, obedience and union among them be preserved.'[27]

A basic element of this dependence between superiors and subjects on all levels throughout the body of the Society receives the name, *manifestation of conscience*. For Ignatius, this sharing of one's self, one's spiritual movements and inclinations, one's temptations and occasions of sin, is situated within the spirit of reverence and love of the subject for the superior as one who, in Christ, represents God's provident care. Ignatius calls for a readiness to manifest one's conscience to the superior from individuals within all the various groupings of members, yearly or oftener,

> desiring [the superiors] to be informed about everything, in order that the superiors may be the better able to direct them in everything along the path of salvation and perfection.[28]

Earlier in the General Examen, Ignatius had more explicitly tied the importance of the manifestation to the superior's being able to fit the mission or the particular task and its environment to the individual person.[29] The manifestation of conscience reflects a dependency of superior and subject in reciprocal ways: 1) if the superior is to act in the way of a provident God, he is totally dependent in his governance and decision-making in regard to individuals and also groups upon this kind of knowledge of their interior; 2) the subjects in giving over the gift of the Spirit's movements within them have placed themselves in a position of dependence at the paradoxical level where it means more freedom for them. The manifestation of conscience takes a central role in the governmental structure of Ignatius because it is the crucial blending point of the Spirit present and working in both subject and superior. Overall we can say that for Ignatius the inequality of members is a gift of the Spirit resulting in the ever-deepening union which also the Spirit alone can give.

4. Because of the total reliance which Ignatius had in the ways in which God's providence works in the sending of another Paraclete, he did not accept only a single model or relationship within the governmental structure itself. What may be most apparent at first reading of the description of Ignatian government is its hierarchical structure. But two other relational aspects are woven throughout the description we find in the *Constitutions*. Within all the various superior-subject relationships, Ignatius lays great stress on the necessity for consultation.[30] Often it is only through the blending issuing from the consultative model that a truly free decision is reached by the superior and so entered into by another individual or by a whole group. In addition, there is always present the collaborative relationship of all the members, both subjects and superiors, since all are engaged in working within the same scope of Jesuit vocation.[31] Ignatius remains consistent in adopting the ways of acting of the provident God as he includes the consultative and collaborative models of relationship, along with the predominant hierarchical one—all unified in his schema of government by the gifting of the one Spirit.

III. A personal reflection

What has been my own experience as a Jesuit—as a subject for the greater part of my life in the Society, but also as a local superior, as a rector of a larger community, and as a provincial?

Spiritual government demands spiritual people. We could set up some impossibly high ideal for this kind of government, in a way similar to the ideal retreatant of the *Exercises*. But whether in the *Exercises* or in the Society of Jesus, we are working as ordinary people with our graces and our defects, in the face of which God continues to call, to inspire, to motivate and to bring to completion. The most important aspect of our Christian lives as individuals or as a group is caught in the word *direction*. It is the focus of the daily examination of conscience (today more popularly called 'the examen of consciousness'); it is at the root of the healthy life of an apostolic group. Where am I (are we) going?

My own sense of Ignatian government, then, focuses first of all on the directive function of the superior. I want to dispose myself and the group for the direction of God in the community life and in the apostolic work. I know my responsibility as superior to give direction both to individuals and to the group. Only one direction is given for my life and my work: the mysterious phrase, *will of God*, expressed in my uniting myself to Christ and to doing what he did for the inbreaking of the Kingdom into our human world. For myself as well as for the individuals for whom I am superior and for the group, this simple direction takes on enormous complexity. I am caught in the same complexity that God allowed himself to be caught in through his creating us human beings—waiting on human freedom.

It is so hard for me, for us, to act freely. One of my primary responsibilities as a superior is to try to establish a climate in which human liberty can grow toward greater freedom. It is the unitive function of the Ignatian superior. I try to establish a relationship of love and care as the context of this community's life and work. The collaboration of all is essential for such an atmosphere to take place. Yet it has been my experience that key individuals seem always to be gifted by the Spirit for making it happen within the group.

Because freedom—like prayer, like celibacy, like poverty, like obedience—is not something I have or possess but rather is something toward which I continue to progress, I have another responsibility as superior to set a tone of a continuing formation for

individuals and for the group. In personal conversation, in community meetings, in encouraging spiritual direction and other kinds of personal growth opportunities, in setting up conferences or in supporting educational programmes, I try to fulfill this formative role of a superior in the Ignatian model.

Finally, a mistaken sense of freedom or the lack of freedom in individuals or in cliques within a community can lead to the breakdown of the community life and its works. This is the place for the administrative function of a superior. Too often, I believe, the governmental structure is seen only or at least predominantly in terms of administration; but in the spiritual government approach of Ignatius, the administrative function is no more central than the unitive or formative. In this regard, I know the importance for an administrator to see, for *super-vision* describes the very functioning of the administrator. How does one come to see? Consultation, perhaps reading or personal insertion (for example, especially in situations of poverty and prejudice), always reflection and prayer. Of course, my ability to see is to a great extent proportionate to my ability to be free. I also know that administration is measured by delegation, and delegation, too, tests my own freedom and the freedom of those who are delegated. Ignatius appears to stress delegation for the very purpose of enhancing personal freedom in superior and subject alike.

Spiritual government, then, as I have experienced it, involves people in the great enterprise of God's salvation in Christ. It truly is spiritual because the Spirit is the unifying point of human government functioning in the manner of divine providence. It is spiritual because it focuses primarily on the development of that most spiritual part of us human beings—our freedom. It is government because, again like God's own working with a people, it looks to the life and direction of a group—a group trying to do as Jesus did—proclaim and celebrate the Kingdom of God. For me, then, spiritual government is best summed up in the movement from liberty to freedom in Christ.

NOTES

[1] Some recent studies bearing on the notion of Ignatian government and providing background for this article are: Clancy, T.: *An introduction to Jesuit life. The Constitutions and history through 435 years* (St Louis, 1976); Futrell, J.: *Making an apostolic community of love. The role of the superior according to St Ignatius of Loyola* (St Louis, 1970); Lewis, J.: *Le*

gouvernement spirituel selon Saint Ignace de Loyola (Montreal, 1961); O'Gorman, T.: *Jesuit obedience from life to law. The development of the Ignatian idea of obedience in the Jesuit Constitutions 1539–1556* (Manila, 1971); *Obedience: Christian, religious, Jesuit.* A CIS publication. (Rome, 1979).

[2] O'Callaghan, J.: *The autobiography of St Ignatius Loyola* (New York, 1974), p 37.

[3] Fleming, D.: *The Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius. A literal translation and a contemporary reading* (St Louis, 1978), 234.

[4] Ganss, G.: *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* (St Louis, 1970), 134. Ignatius succinctly states here, '. . . the gentle arrangement of Divine Providence requires cooperation from his creatures . . .'

[5] Exx 91.

[6] *Constitutions* 424.

[7] *Ibid.*, 85.

[8] *Ibid.*, 414.

[9] *Ibid.*, 624.

[10] *Ibid.*, 697, 698, 700, and 701.

[11] *Ibid.*, 4.

[12] *Ibid.*, 219.

[13] *Monumenta Ignatiana*, Epp X, 636. Cited by Mario Gioia, 'Obedience as St Ignatius understood it' in *Obedience: Christian, religious, Jesuit* (Rome, 1979), p 73.

[14] *Constitutions* 667.

[15] *Ibid.*, 624. In the context of sending Jesuits out on mission, Ignatius begins: 'Although it is the supreme providence and direction of the Holy Spirit that must efficiently guide us to bring deliberations to right conclusions in everything . . .' Cf also 551.

[16] *Ibid.*, 547. 'They should keep in view God our Creator and Lord, for whom such obedience is practised, and they should endeavour to proceed in a spirit of love and not as men troubled by fear.' The Ignatian idea of *representation* is always made with this same attitude of reverence and love. Cf 131, 292, 293, and 543.

[17] *Ibid.*, 4. Ignatius esteemed the obedience to the Vicar of Christ as giving a 'surer direction of the Holy Spirit'.

[18] *Ibid.*, 547. '. . . we ought to be firmly convinced that everyone of those who live under obedience ought to allow himself to be carried and directed by Divine Providence through the agency of the Superior . . .'

[19] Exx 23.

[20] *Ibid.*, 155.

[21] *Constitutions* 619.

[22] *Ibid.*, 134.

[23] *Ibid.*, 511. Cf also the distinctions made in 10–15.

[24] *Ibid.*, 424, 551, and 92 as a few instances of the Ignatian sense of differing responsibilities.

[25] *Ibid.*, 820–821. Cf 423–424, 666.

[26] St Paul's descriptions of gifts and their proper subordination is touched on in 1 Cor 12, Rom 12, and Eph 4.

[27] *Constitutions* 666. Cf also 551.

[28] *Ibid.*, 551. Ignatius spells out more fully the advantages of the manifestations of conscience in 91, 92, and 97.

[29] *Ibid.*, 92.

[30] *Ibid.*, 810. 'In particular, [superiors] should have persons designated to give counsels, with whom they should consult on the matters of importance which arise. But after these consultors have been heard, the decision should remain with the superiors.' Cf also 211, 667, and 804.

[31] Although more limited in scope, the notion of coadjutors, both spiritual and temporal, is based on a collaborative model within the very structure of the Society makeup. Cf 112–120.