

## Human Relationships in Saint Teresa of Avila

Human Relationships are the guarantee of authenticity in the teaching of Teresa of Avila. They are the measure of one's progress and the true test of the love of God.

The point is made most clearly in chapter 3 of the *Fifth Dwelling Places*,<sup>1</sup> where Teresa connects mystical union with mature fraternal love. She first makes a sharp distinction between the psychological experience and the spiritual reality of this state. There is, on the one hand, the empirical awareness of God, the felt sense of his presence within, the experience that leaves no shadow of doubt that God is within and the soul is in God. Teresa calls this "delightful union." It is an altered state of consciousness. This psychological experience, however, is the lesser part; it may in fact be absent in the union. The heart of the gift is conformity of wills, the surrender of the whole person to God, unrestricted and unconditional love. This spiritual reality is an "altered trait of life,"<sup>2</sup> a state of new being, a transformation of the person caused by the in-breaking of God. "This union with God's will," writes Teresa, "is the union I have desired all my life; it is the union I ask the Lord for always and the one that is clearest and safest" (5 DP 3.5).

Is there any test for this spiritual reality? Obviously it will not be feelings or emotions, which are part of only the one phenomenological form of mystical union. Feelings are a poor index of things spiritual, because they follow their own laws and are not necessarily coordinate with the depth experience. Thus it is not a question of being "so conformed to the will of God that if my father or brother dies I don't feel it, or that if there are trials or sickness I suffer happily" (5 DP 3.7).<sup>3</sup> The best test for the conformity of wills is the prosaic one of fraternal charity; horizontal relationships are credible indicators

of the vertical relationship with God. Her mind is that "we cannot know whether or not we love God, although there are strong indications for recognizing that we do love Him; but we can know whether we love our neighbor" (5 DP 3.8).

But here again it is not a question of feelings. Human love is primarily a matter of deeds, not feelings, and the deeds in question are the gospel fruits which tell the good tree from the bad one. Such fruits are more easily discernible in the area of fraternal charity than in the love of God, because they are visible, tangible and verifiable. Feelings, she seems to say, are a distraction, beside the point, almost a counter-indication in the matter of supernatural charity. They move on a different plane; they easily skew a relationship; they have value only if they are inserted into the movement of grace. This is a superficial and simplistic evaluation for her nuanced teaching, which will be examined in the body of this essay. But it is a strong impression from a cursory reading of her texts.

Such an attitude is the antithesis of contemporary culture. Robert Bellah's critique of the North American scene, for example, finds that human love is simply equated with the feelings.<sup>4</sup> This equation is an instance of both the individualism and the psychologism that dominate the American scene. The private psyche is the key to truth and goodness, and it functions well when the emotions are in good working order. Thus Bellah calls the popular concept of love as feeling "therapeutic love;" it is part of the health model that has engaged the American imagination for the past fifty years. True love is emotional love, full of positive feelings about the self and the other. "Healthy" relationships are good loves; they thrive on the mutual expression and acceptance of feelings. I feel good about you

and you about me, so we relate well, we share freely, intimately, and joyfully. And that is what human love is all about. Christian love, on the other hand, is self-sacrifice, surrender, and pursuit of the supernatural good of the other.

Teresa represents the classic spiritual tradition both in the supreme importance she gives to fraternal charity and to the down-playing of the feelings and affective states. How does her teaching relate to the therapeutic love of our culture? What have these two loves in common? Where do they intersect, if at all? These are important questions for the Christian community, which must constantly relate its traditions to the cultures where it lives. The spiritual tradition needs to understand and critique the culture, and the culture raises its own questions to that teaching. This interfacing can benefit both sides, offering evaluation, clarification and adaptation to more traditional views and to bringing the wisdom of the past to current trends and fashions. This effort in the present case can contribute to a more holistic and realistic charity. The failure to interface the health model and the spiritual tradition would be a serious loss on both sides.<sup>5</sup>

The present article examines the teaching of Saint Teresa of Avila on fraternal charity, especially in the famous chapters (four to seven) on the topic in *The Way of Perfection*, with an eye to the popular therapeutic notion of human love. Teresa is herself a woman of strong feelings, and she writes out of a vibrant femininity and a passionate culture.<sup>6</sup> The spiritual perspectives of the period, however, tended to be dualistic. Writers did not favor the body or the emotions, and they were comfortable with an otherworldly, eschatological approach that found expression in neoplatonic, stoic and Augustinian categories. Teresa's language betrays a suspicion about emotions and sees the body as the adversary of the soul, so that her teaching about human love sometimes

sounds abstract and negative. The one love that receives her unqualified approval is "spiritual love," a term which connotes not a disembodied love but actually for Teresa means a fully mature, whole and integrated relationship. She knows that love is a matter of the heart, and the heart includes the whole person, as she states eloquently in the following passage:

It will seem to you that such persons [who love with spiritual love] do not love anyone but God. I say, yes, they do love, with a greater and genuine love, and with passion and with a more beneficial love; in short it is love ... (W 6.7).

This observation is enough to reassure readers who suspect the saint of over-spiritualizing human love. It is but one piece of a beautiful synthesis on human love that keeps intact her deserved reputation for expressing a fullness of humanity in her life and teaching.

Our inquiry will examine her framework for relating grace and nature, the will and the feelings, spirit and body in human loves. She appreciates affectivity, and she recognizes that the feelings are always involved in love. But these emotions can hinder or help in the service of friendship and community, depending on whether they are acting independently and at cross-purposes to theological charity or are integrated into that higher movement. She presents heuristic distinctions that allow us to maintain what is best in the older, perhaps safer view of the role of the feelings without the loss of what is life-giving in contemporary culture.

## 1. Two kinds of fraternal charity

Teresa distinguishes perfect and imperfect fraternal love on the basis of sensuality (*sensualidad*), a word she uses for the bodily and psychic component of human acts. It is a neutral word, as are its synonyms in her usage like tenderness, passion and even weakness (W 4:12-13; 6:2 and passim). All these words describe the element of human

affectivity and sexuality as a pervasive quality in love.

Imperfect charity is “good” and “licit” love, but it is imperfect because it is “mixed with sensuality” (W 4:12); perfect love is “not affected by any passion” (W 4:13). This may seem like a repudiation of a natural component. But her mind is that the natural conditions of sensuality and passion are not disorders in themselves. They render love imperfect if they move the person in their own direction and are not ordered and integrated into the movement of grace. Any natural independent motivation is a threat to grace. Tenderness left to itself misleads. It nurtures empathy and sensitivity, Teresa observes, but it fails in the one orientation that makes sense to her, the supernatural one. Hence tenderness needs to be monitored and guided by the higher law of universal and transcendent charity after the example of Jesus himself (W 7:5). Sensuality and passion are all human love, in perfect no less than imperfect love. What makes the difference in the evaluation of the two is the role affectivity plays. If the affectivity is a separate, non-integrated, and partial cause of the love, the love is imperfect. It is “sensible-spiritual,” a love with a double source in nature and grace. If the instincts, feelings and emotions are integrated in the movement of the spirit, as in spiritual love, there is a wholeness and simplicity as well as utter freedom in the choice of the other that bespeak graced transcendence. This is the love of saintly souls, contemplatives who live out of their own emptiness and divine fullness (W 6:1).

In a subtle paragraph (W 6:8) Teresa identifies this perfect love as loving the soul of another as opposed to the body. She explains that this soul-love touches the invisible, graced potential of the other; it touches lesser qualities like the euphoria of an attractive relationship by inclusion and in a secondary fashion. The good vibes of being loved by the other person or the natural graces

of the friend do not figure into the motivation of spiritual love; they are caught up and appreciated and loved in the sweep of pure love. Spiritual love embraces the whole person giving and receiving love; it moves beyond partial goods to touch the supernatural destiny of the other and does not “stop” till it reaches the very heights of absolute Good (W 6:4). The partial goods seem to get lost in Carmelite spirituality, but this is only in appearance and in the context of God compared with his creatures. The goods are not lost at all; they are simply given their place in the whole scheme of things; the love for them is purified and enhanced because creation is now apprehended and loved as the world of God.<sup>7</sup>

Abstract charity that sees through others so that God alone is loved in the other makes objects out of people. This is dehumanized love, a caricature that is foreign to the experience and the teaching of this most human of saints. Spiritual love is every bit as affectionate, indeed more passionate than the extravagances of romantic love, as the text cited above (W 6:7) indicates.

## 2. Sensible-spiritual love

In sensible-spiritual love the bodily or psychological factor might be a family relationship or good looks or sexual attraction; the spiritual element is the grace of God. The distinctive note here is that the two sources pull independently, to some extent in separate directions. The natural goods are an integral part of spiritual love. It is the gift of the whole self freely shared, and it incorporates the feelings and affections in concrete, down-to-earth ways in a splendid symphony of love. Developmentally the mixed love is prior to the pure love. Beginnings are self-centered, and so infatuation is a propaedeutic to a more authentic, contemplative love.<sup>8</sup> In the concrete it is often difficult to tell one from the other, as Teresa herself laments: “I don’t think I know which love is spiritual, or when sensual love is mixed with spiritual love” (W

6:2). Her incisive critique of instances of both loves, however, belies this theoretical demurrer.

There are dangers in imperfectly integrated human love, as in the case of an immature or “vain” attraction between a nun and the confessor (W 4:13-5:7). The errant affection very easily becomes dominant, so that the love is “excessive love” or “loving too much,” phrases which for Teresa mean dependent love, or in our time codependency.<sup>9</sup> Her own youthful encounter with the priest at Becedas is a case in point. This relationship was potentially explosive but actually salutary for both parties, largely because of Teresa’s sagacity (L 5).

Splintered, fragmented, unfree, and possessive love, all of which might describe sensible-spiritual love, makes it a hazard, even a liability. In Teresa’s opinion this love deflects energy from the love of God, takes away autonomy, and allows the unmoored emotions to control the choices. Note, it is imperfect, not because it is warm, tender, or affectionate, but because it is not truly whole, free, and fully personal.

Signs and expressions of affection will vary with persons, times, and place. Sound moral principles are guides here as everywhere but in the matrix of the culture. Teresa’s strictures against affectionate terms of address among the nuns may strike the modern reader as unnecessarily harsh. Tender words of endearment, she says, “like ‘my life’, ‘my soul’, ‘my only good’,” words, I suppose, that are the equivalent of darling, sweetheart, or honey in our usage, are to be reserved for Christ the Spouse (W 7:8). However one regards this opinion of Teresa, it is obviously culturally conditioned. What was inappropriate for a little group of Castilian nuns in the sixteenth century may be acceptable for some emancipated and liberated circles of the twentieth century. In principle any affection ordered by wisdom and

prudence is acceptable, and the culture makes a difference.

Contemporary Christians tend to foster warm, expressive relationships, with visible demonstrations of affection; these stand in contrast to Victorian- or Castilian- propriety, distance and formality. Current culture appreciates the importance of touch as well as tangible expressions of giving and receiving love. But people today need not fear the teaching of Saint Teresa. Her principles are broad enough to allow a variety of concrete expressions. Actually we are in her debt for her addressing what was then the taboo subject of human love and providing an analysis that helps to transcend any one culture at least in principle.

Teresa sometimes asks the psychological question, such as the value of the experience of being loved. Her view is that only the experience of God’s love is of real value, whether at prayer or mediated through a friend of God who is solicitous for one’s spiritual good (W 7:4). Human love in itself, separated from the larger context of God, is unimportant, even unacceptable to this *hidalga*, who for twenty years struggled to put her own friendships in order and eventually was gifted with the experience and understanding that only spiritual love is adequate. Her own attitudes toward friendship pass through stages that mirror her personal journey in detachment and prayer; she moves from paralyzing attachments to seeing affection as “all straw; it’s all air and without substance, so that the wind carries it away” (W 6:7). The judgement, of course, regards non-integrated affection, standing over against the love of God.

Integrated love is more than acceptable: it benefits others “by doctrine or prayer” (W 6:5) and it prevents ennui, boredom in oneself (W 6:7). She thus maintains a pragmatic, supernatural perspective, not unaware of the psychological value of being loved, for “our nature is such

that if we are not loved we soon grow weary” (W 6:7), but she was concerned only about the theological implications.

So, for example, when she deals with human sexuality, she does so in its reference to God:

[Perfect souls] are not content with loving something as wretched as these bodies, however beautiful they may be, however attractive. Yes, it pleases them to see such bodies and they praise the Creator. But, no, they do not stop there. I mean stop in such a way that they were loving something of no substance, loving a shadow. They would feel chagrin, and they wouldn’t have the courage, without great shame, to tell God that they love Him (W 6:4).

Her world-view is theological and moral and does not recognize the secular autonomy of creation. Secularity is a modern concept; it is not a value for Teresa. But to her credit she does not negate, but only prescind from the goodness of created reality in itself. The body is not to be loved outside the horizon of God. That is to “stop” in the creature and thereby misrepresent the creature. The truth and value of any created entity lies precisely in its total reality, which is preeminently its relation to God. This relationship determines the worth of anything finite and allows any authentically human value to be repossessed in spiritual love.<sup>10</sup>

### 3. Particular friendships

Teresa is not teaching a disincarnate spirituality, as if to affirm only the God-dimension in relationships and to deny biological, psychological or social factors. She loves the concrete person in his or her singularity. The universal love of charity governs but also integrates the real but secondary considerations of blood, nationality, common interests, and other qualities. This is surely her true mind. Her “spiritual love” is not antiseptic, cold well-wishing, or a pure will act.

Not so long ago her teaching on fraternal charity was widely interpreted,

especially in religious life circles, to mean a colorless benevolence. Particular friendships describe friendship as such, since they are always based on particular qualities and exist between particular persons. Friendship was frowned upon by the Eastern Church as divisive of community, but encouraged, when “rightly ordered,” in the West, notably by Augustine, as part of the journey into God.<sup>11</sup> The Eastern view reasserted itself and became paradigmatic for religious life in the later middle ages. Particular friendships came to mean any close relationship. They included not only truly destructive relationships based on excessive dependency or inappropriate physical sexuality—relationships which Teresa rightly branded as carnal and illicit (W 7:2)—but any relationship based on personal attraction. According to this doctrine as commonly received in the first half of this century everyone was to be loved equally and abstractly, with universal, theological charity; one was to go to God “without human interference.”<sup>12</sup>

The truth of the matter is that Teresa is a strong proponent of intimate friendships that are the result of personal attraction and preferences, provided these particular friendships are founded in spiritual love. They must never compromise the primacy of the spiritual dimension. This means that the ultimate rule for the love is God; the human contours of the love are not to displace or weaken this essential orientation, But the place of God in the love is only the ultimate orientation, not its penultimate reality. The latter quality embraces all the particular considerations which make each human love different, even unique; the resulting particular friendships do not threaten universal charity, since the greater love of God is never subordinated to the lesser human attraction.<sup>13</sup>

Giving primacy to spiritual love, which subordinates the particular qualities of the love, is the only acceptable choice for Teresa’s disciples, even if they must struggle

and sometimes fail on this high road of faith (W 6:7; see W 7:7 in Escorial edition). This is hewing to the narrow middle road of the *nadas* of Saint John of the Cross' "Mount of Perfection," striving to eschew the imperfect ways of sensible-spiritual love that wander to either side of the mountain. The important thing is the mind-set and basic option. One may execute the option imperfectly with failures and constant new beginnings. But in principle one is fitting one's life into God rather than settling for fitting God into one's life. This is the call of spiritual love in Teresa's sense.

#### 4. Genesis and development of spiritual love

The decisive consideration for spiritual love is its grounding. It originates in the experience of God's love freely received and deeply experienced in contemplation. The spiritual quality of all graced love for others, imperfect as well as perfect, has its source in God's prior, gracious love (1 Jn 4:10-11). The perfect form, spiritual love, is nurtured in the high ground of contemplation. Teresa makes this connection in a key text that roots spiritual love in an enlightened detachment that is the fruit of prayer, and indeed of the gift of contemplation:

Now it seems to me that those whom God brings to a certain clear knowledge love very differently than do those who have not reached it. This clear knowledge is about the nature of the world, that there is another world, about the difference between the one and the other, that the one is eternal and the other a dream; or about the nature of loving the Creator and loving the creature (and this is seen through experience, which is entirely different from merely thinking about it or believing it) ... (W 6:3).

The experiential conditioning of detachment and insight come from God in prayer, Teresa goes on to say, and in this text she does not specify the kind of prayer. In her system the level of detachment and the degrees of prayer are correlatives; this scale

measures the love of God and, as in this text, the love of neighbor. The perfect love at issue in this quotation would suggest contemplation as its counterpart. This conjecture is confirmed in the *Interior Castle*, where she explicitly attributes the same theological structure to the prayer of quiet, the first fully infused contemplation, as she had previously given spiritual love in the Way of Perfection.

Teresa contrasts the discursive prayer of the first three dwelling places with the contemplation that characterizes the *Fourth Dwelling Places*. Discursive prayer or meditation has a double source of nature and grace, contemplation a single source in God. The prayer of beginners is thus the counterpart of sensible spiritual love, and contemplation is related to spiritual love.

The categories of this discussion are *contentos*, the well-known sensible consolations of beginning prayer, translated by Kavanaugh as "consolations," and *gustos*, which are infused consolations, identified with the prayer of quiet, and called "spiritual delights" in our translation. Consolations, Teresa says, are the result of human efforts, whereas spiritual delights are pure gift, unattainable by one's own efforts under grace.

Consolations have the familiar double source; phenomenologically they start in the self and end in God (4 DP 1:4), being experienced first as one's own immanent activity before one is caught up in God. The joy follows the dynamic of any ordinary human experience such as winning a prize or turning up a lost friend. The good feelings, Teresa opines, come from "the passions, from sensuality, and from human nature" (4 DP 1:5). The sign of their imperfect integration in the movement of grace is the fact that they easily get out of hand. "My experience ... is that if I began to weep over the Passion I didn't know how to stop until I got a severe headache" (4 DP 1:6). Thus, the consolations are "mixed with our own passions," (4 DP 2:1), hence imperfectly ordered to God.

*Gustos*, or spiritual delights, have the one source in God, who moves the whole person from deep in the center of the soul (4 DP 2:5). The totality or perfection of this act or state is relative, giving rise to different contemplative experiences and the variety of the later mansions in the castle. In principle any grace of contemplation lifts up the whole person, the grace overflowing into all the dwelling places of the soul (4 DP 2:4) and causing the senses and faculties, that are “the people of the castle” (4 DP 3:2), to be mesmerized by the divine in-breaking, “absorbed and looking as though in wonder at what they see” (4 DP 2:6). This supernatural action may last for only a brief time in the prayer, so that it becomes important to distinguish the pure action of God and the resonances of personal additions in the afterglow.<sup>14</sup>

The fact that the same dynamic is at work in prayer and in fraternal charity allows a legitimate transposition of Teresa’s extensive treatment of prayer to the subject of human relationships. What contributes to one of these two hinges of the Christian life nourishes the other as well. The key Teresian disciplines for growth in prayer are fraternal charity, detachment and humility (W 4:4); including the practice of prayer there are thus four constituent elements for a vibrant spiritual life, all four contributing to the advancement of each element, in our case, fraternal charity. These four aspects are both outcomes and means of spiritual growth, and they can be structured in different configurations according to specific goals. The spirituality of Teresa centers around prayer; there seems to be no reason why this central function could not be the fraternal charity with a variant organization of the other three elements. This re-structuring would illustrate the unity of divine and human love in her synthesis.

Teresa’s analysis of the two loves is a strong affirmation of the faith dimensions of

Christian community. She retrieves the topic from what is often a unilateral attention to anthropological considerations about relationships. The immediate dynamics of human behavior are important considerations, and Teresa’s synthesis leaves room for them. But she places the ultimate foundation of Christian relationships where it belongs, namely, in the gift of God’s self-communication, a reality easily associated with prayer and no less really connected with human love. Friendship and community are as much gifts of grace as are the graces of prayer.

In both areas of prayer and human love the ultimate concern is the already present God within. In prayer the goal is to allow the indwelling Presence to transform the person; in human love the objective is to let the divine love which has been received find expression in symbolic ways. Teresa’s program fits into these profound orientations. Her disciples need to be in touch with the truth about themselves and to be vulnerable to the divine initiative. This is the work of humility and detachment. It is self-knowledge before God, which in turn facilitates the discernment that recognizes and fosters the choice of what is of the Spirit in prayer and life.<sup>15</sup> In this, framework the psychological work and social formation takes place, with enlightened understanding and greater realism and honesty. Behavioral sciences work with the flesh and blood that fill out the skeleton that is the supernatural structure of the Christian life.

## 5. Teresa’s relevance for today

The therapeutic model of relationships and community, which was noted earlier in this paper, tends to leave aside the distinctive element of Christian love, which is grace. This model does not deny grace, but it follows a different agenda. Self-interest controls its process, not grace as such, even anonymous grace. At best therapeutic relationships are sensible-spiritual love.

Therapeutic communities are the work of human hands; they move on the human potential level. Theologically they are self-serving groups, often their own *raison d'être* with no broader or higher reference. Christian relationships, on the other hand, are intentional communities for service; they are other-centered and by design they move into the service of others.

Christian charity is action more than feelings or words, but above all it is grace. The fact that this gift thrives in detachment and humility has been too little noticed in contemporary writing. One popular American author, who writes beautifully about community, recognizes the essential role of these two virtues in the formation of community. This is the well-known M. Scott Peck.<sup>16</sup> In fresh modern language he describes two stages in the process of finding community as the chaos of facing the truth about self and others and the emptiness of experiencing the human inability to create community. Surrender to this reality opens the way to authentic community. It is easy to find the themes of humility and detachment here. Peck makes no appeal to the Christian spiritual tradition as such. He argues from his long years as a professional psychotherapist and accumulated wisdom of the centuries. For him as for Teresa community is primarily a spiritual problem.

There need be no dichotomy between the psychological and the spiritual, between the enlightened application of human sciences and the spiritual disciplines. There need not be

even separation between the levels of nature and grace. The model of the two-story universe has given way in Christian theology to the one level of graced nature. The past thirty years have witnessed an immensely fruitful marriage between human development and spirituality. In singling out Teresa for her teaching on the centrality of God in human relationships we are not turning the clock back to a pre-Vatican II, other-worldly, non-incarnational spirituality. Physical and mental health concepts have become established markers in contemporary spirituality. Teresa of Avila would approve of these developments. Authentic human relationships are graced experiences flowing out of the divine Presence within them but incorporated and incarnated in human forms. The laws of human growth and participation in the divine life (2 Pt 1:4) are not in competition; they are collaborators, not enemies. Together they “form that perfect man [sic] who is Christ come to full stature” (Eph 4:13).

Teresa’s real contribution is to define the parameters of the struggle to become loving people. She recalls the perennial inner laws of spiritual love, the challenge to integrate the human with the divine. She roots the whole venture of human relationships in the gracious gift of God and in human freedom. The two qualities call for the grateful recognition and acceptance of communion in Christ and the “determined determination” to let it happen in Christian life. On both counts Teresa offers perennial wisdom.

<sup>1</sup> References to Teresa of Avila’s works are to *The Collected Works of St. Teresa of Avila*, translated by Kieran Kavanaugh and Otilio Rodriguez (Washington: ICS Publications, 1976-1985). The following abbreviations are used: L, *Life*; W, *Way of Perfection*; DP, *Dwelling Places*, or *Interior Castle*. The numbers refer to chapter and paragraph, with the numeral before DP indicating the dwelling place cited.

<sup>2</sup> Philip Novak uses the terms altered state of consciousness and an altered trait of life to make distinctions similar to those of Teresa in his “Spiritual Disciplines and Psychological Dream-Work,” in *Studia Mystica* 3:1 (1980) 52. Rowan Williams has some helpful historical notes along the lines of this distinction in his review article, “Butler’s ‘Western Mysticism’: Toward an Assessment,” in *The Downside Review* 102 (1984) 197-215.

- 
- <sup>3</sup> John of the Cross states the lack of congruence between feelings and spiritual experience in categorical terms: “Neither is the sublime communication nor the sensible awareness of his nearness a sure testimony of his gracious presence, nor is dryness and the lack of these a reflection of his absence.” *Spiritual Canticle*, 1.3.
- <sup>4</sup> Robert N. Bellah et al., *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*, Berkeley 1985, chs 4 and 5, esp. 90-93, 121-138.
- <sup>5</sup> Thomas McKenna, “Providence as Courage for Renewal,” in *Spirituality Today* 41 (1989) 101-111.
- <sup>6</sup> Otger Steggink, “La integración de la afectividad en la vida espiritual de Santa Teresa de Avila,” in *Carmelus* 18 (1971) 122-141. The author quotes a striking observation of Dominique Deneuve, *Santa Teresa de Jesús y la mujer*, Barcelona 1966, 155, who points out that even in her mature, purified loves, the Saint “cuando ama, lo hace a través de su corazón de mujer;” *ibid.*, 134.
- <sup>7</sup> Saint John of the Cross states this law of re-possession in the *Ascent of Mount Carmel*, 3.20.2. Louis Dupré’s philosophical interpretation, which follows Georges Morel, can be found in *The Other Dimension: A Search for the Meaning of Religious Attitudes*, Garden City 1972, 523-526.
- <sup>8</sup> Thomas Tyrrell, *Urgent Longings*, Whitsenville 1980.
- <sup>9</sup> Robin Norwood, *Women Who Love Too Much*, New York 1985.
- <sup>10</sup> See n.7 above.
- <sup>11</sup> Elizabeth Zarelm Turner, “Love, Marriage, and Friendship”, in *Men and Women: Sexual Ethics in Turbulent Times*, ed. Philip Turner, Cambridge MA 1989, 161-163.
- <sup>12</sup> Mary Elizabeth Kenel, “A Celibate’s Sexuality and Intimacy,” in *Human Development*, 7:1 (1986) 14.
- <sup>13</sup> This position does not agree with the interpretation of the teaching of Saint John of the Cross given by David Sanderlin, “Charity in the Dark Night,” in *Carmelus* 36 (1989) 10-43. Sanderlin holds that Christian love is detachment; its only motive is God, not any affections or desires whatsoever; pure love is *agape* without any mixture of *eros*. Such an interpretation of Saint John of the Cross would be opposed to this analysis of Teresa.
- <sup>14</sup> *Gustos* are in the same category of graces as Saint Ignatius’ “consolation without any previous cause,” which are directly caused by God. This completely divine, infused grace, however, needs to be carefully distinguished from its “after-effects,” which can be the personal intervention of the subject. See *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, tr. Louis J. Puhl, Chicago 1951, nn.330 and 336.
- <sup>15</sup> The relationship between humility, detachment (interpreted as integration), self-knowledge and discernment is developed by the author of this article in *Silent Presence: Discernment as Process and Problem*, Denville 1981, 41-49.
- <sup>16</sup> M. Scott Peck, *The Different Drum: Community Making and Peace*, New York 1987, 90-103.