years later, priced and marketed surely for libraries only. But it does include an extra essay, one that is in some ways the most interesting in the whole book, perhaps because it is not an introduction. J. Leon Hooper gives us a dense account of how John Courtney Murray’s thought changed over the course of his career. Earlier more defensive approaches to tradition gave way to nine important articles on post-Reformation Catholic approaches to church and state. By 1954, Murray had arrived at a position that provoked Rome into silencing him: it is “society,” rather than a monarch or governor, that is the “moral or religious agent of a people,” and US history had shown that a people, led by Protestants, had reached a right conclusion on religious liberty that Roman Catholics should follow (71). Later, a reading of Lonergan enabled Murray to recognize historical consciousness, and to move decisively beyond the conventional theology of timeless Scholastic categories that had marked his teaching as a dogmatician.

The translation work was difficult—German philosophical idiom, particularly when the original is not well written, does not go easily into English. A less literal approach, together with firmer editing, might have made some of the essays read better as introductions. Moreover, there are silly errors of proofreading inexcusable in such an expensive volume. There is some useful material here—but, at least in the English version, the attempt to make research competence available to a wider readership succeeds only very partially.

Philip Endean, S.J.
Jesuit Faculties in Paris (Centre Sèvres)
philip.endean@centrestevres.com
DOI:10.1163/22141332-00603006-19

Paul C. DeCelles and M. F. Sparrow


This text adds to a long list of monographs published since the Second Vatican Council (VC2), intended for directors of The Spiritual Exercises (SpExx) of St. Ignatius of Loyola. Unlike previous commentaries, the authors of Burning with Love for God self-identify as “members of the People of Praise, a charismatic, ecumenical covenant community” who are “profoundly shaped by the Exercises, as well as by the Cursillo” (8). While my spiritual and academic background leads me to disagree with some aspects of their presentation, I recommend this unique, yet wholly orthodox, approach to the SpExx. Those outside
the charismatic community will benefit from reviewing the SpExx from this perspective.

“Most people who have made the Exercises would probably say that the heart of the Exercises is love” (11). In describing the SpExx, commentators offer various universalizing categories, such as freedom, liberality, or disponability; however, none would argue against love serving as its ground, path, and goal. Inspired by the Jesuit, Jules Toner, our authors ground their approach to the SpExx by mapping out three developmental stages of love that characterize human, spiritual relationships: implemental love (“I love you for what you offer”), semipersonal love (“I love you for who you are”), and personal love (“I love you!”). Although each form of love is good in itself, only personal love leads to intimate friendship, i.e., “living the life of one another in common” (18). During one’s path through the retreat experience and the life-long process of spiritual discernment thereafter, our authors assert that the goal of the SpExx is to offer essential tools for deepening and broadening one’s friendship (personal love) with God. “The love that is forged [...] opens the door to a life of decision-making in union with the Lord” (303).

Significantly, the authors return to these love categories at three important junctures in their explication of the SpExx. In the first instance, our authors take sides in the longstanding interpretive dispute regarding “natural consolations” versus “spiritual consolations.” Whereas some commentators maintain that all consolations share a common spiritual origin, our authors argue that “it’s possible to be deeply moved in situations that don’t involve a personal or semipersonal encounter with God” (143). Such “natural consolations” (presumably common within implemental love) differ significantly from “spiritual consolations,” which indicate a direct encounter with God and offer important data for discerning spirits. The distinction has implications for Second Week Discernment, when an exercitant wrestles with the possibility that a spiritual consolation originates from an evil spirit (the Enemy). According to our authors, consolations with a prior cause occur for those at the semipersonal level of love, whereas “what we call personal encounters correspond to what Ignatius calls consolations without a preceding cause” (225). The distinction is important, because in the former instance the Enemy may appear as an angel of light and thereby deceive us, whereas in the instance of a consolation without prior cause, we are assured that its source (although not its afterglow) necessarily is divine. Our authors rightly advise the retreat director that before deciding whether an exercitant’s Second Week consolation is with or without prior cause, the director must locate their exercitant on the love map, because only exercitants at the personal love (friendship) stage experience consolations without prior cause, whereas consolations with prior cause are mostly
for those at the stage of semipersonal love. I am not entirely persuaded by such an exclusionary approach to consolations without prior cause; however, there's no gainsaying that the love map again provides helpful guidance.

A second recourse to the love map occurs within the treatment of the graces particular to Weeks 2–4 of the SpExx. “Broadly speaking, the exercitant begins with an implemental love of the Lord and during the course of the Exercises he [or she] takes steps toward a fully personal love of [the] Lord” (196). In other words, each week’s graces lead the exercitant to increasingly know, love, and desire to serve the Lord.

Introducing the dispositions appropriate for undertaking an Election provides a third recourse to the love classifications: “it turns out that Ignatius’s presentation of the three kinds of humility maps onto our discussion of three types of love” (262). Exercitants at the implemental love stage affiliate with the first kind of humility: avoiding mortal sin; those of semipersonal love are drawn to the second kind of humility: avoiding venial sin; and those at personal love/friendship with God are drawn to the most perfect humility, living the Christ-life. Stated succinctly, “the exercitant can aspire to be good, to be very good, or to be a friend of Jesus” (269). As the above three examples show, our authors’ organizing principle of a three-fold love typology provides a helpful infrastructure for supporting a retreat director’s appropriation of the dynamics of the SpExx.

This said, some of the authors’ choices and perspectives give me pause. Significantly, the authors’ bibliographical choices disappoint me. On the one hand, they rightly privilege Puhl’s now classic translation of the SpExx (1951) and frequently reference Palmer’s translation of The Early Jesuit Manuscript Directories. Among post VC2 Ignatian scholars, Toner (1991; 2003) and Ivens (1998) frequently appear, along with three references to Ganss (1992), and singular references to Green (1984), Longsdale (2000), and Wolff (1997), among others. On the other hand, I mark a surprising preference for older resources, e.g., the Mullan (1914) and Rickaby (1923) translations of the SpExx, Iparraguirre (1959) on directing the SpExx and Purcell’s The First Jesuit (1956). Notably absent translations include Fleming (1978), Ganss (1992), Tetlow (2009), Barry (2009), and Gallagher (2005–8).

A second concern involves an undervaluing of psychological categories of understanding. For example, in the midst of an otherwise fine description of First Week sin, the authors discourage relating “to the Lord as a personal counselor,” instead preferring the traditional “Lord and Savior” (112). In their explanation of the Kingdom Meditation, they lament “today’s therapeutic culture” that deafens us to Ignatius’s call to “fear and distrust and anxiety” (162). During Third Week suffering with Christ on the cross, the exercitant is warned against
experiencing the sorrow “of an empathetic therapist,” but instead to embrace the sorrow that is “theirs together on account of their love” (213). Their concerns regarding disposition seem spot-on, but why disparage psychological categories? Similarly, in their discussion of the Examen, I’m disappointed by the absence of Aschenbrenner’s now classic text, “Consciousness Examen” (1972).

A third concern involves the authors’ decision to avoid the common usage of “discerning God’s will,” preferring instead “Ignatius’s teaching on making decisions or choices” (23). They eschew what they tag the “command and obey” model of discernment, wherein we assume that God has a specific intention in mind for a retreatant, who must then follow a process of discerning what, in fact, is God’s will for them (35). Instead, the authors prefer to ground decision making within one’s personal love and friendship relationship with God. It “boils down to this: be one with your Lord in whatever way you can, and then act out of that union” (38). Here, the love map denies the possibility of God desiring a particular will for a person.

Were there more space, I would unfold additional concerns, including the authors’ embrace of gender-exclusive pronouns throughout, with only the rare appearance of a female pronoun or case study; not distinguishing between Ignatian meditation and contemplation (89); and repeated emphasis upon maintaining a “countercultural” reverential tone when addressing God the Father or Christ on the cross during colloquies (97–98; 106; 207; 282). Again, these are more matters of tone, rather than insight; however, each is lamentable.
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As indicated in the full title of this book, relations between Pope Paul VI and the Jesuits were both “intense” and “complicated.” The pope greatly admired the Jesuits but, as the author gently suggests, may have failed to understand them. At one point, he became convinced that they were changing in a way that he mistrusted, and relations became very critical.