

to thirty-nine in less than a decade. The Society's numerical growth outdistanced its infrastructure. The late 16th century was an era of rules as generals, especially Claudio Acquaviva (General 1581–1615), formulated regulations and guidelines for nearly everything. The colleges were no exception. For nearly fifty years, Jesuits discussed, tested, revised, and reviewed what would be promulgated in 1599 as the *Ratio Studiorum*. Although few schools implemented the *Ratio* completely, it retained an honored place in the Society's tradition as late as General Congregation Thirty (1957).

But times change: the *Ratio* lost its luster. Contrary to the Ciceronian *exceptio probat regulam*, the exception proves the rule—the exceptions, the modifications, and the omissions undermined the *Ratio*. But if the *Ratio* did not define Jesuit pedagogy, what did? In 1967, Robert Henle, SJ, future president of Georgetown University, wrote

There is no way in which Jesuit education can be defined as a set of specific traits. I myself have made various attempts so to define it, but I finally became convinced that the effort was futile. I think we must say that *Jesuit education is education given by Jesuits* [italics Henle's]. Jesuit education cannot be described in a set of specific educational traits, specific subjects, procedures or methods; it can be described in terms of Jesuits, in terms of Jesuit character. (1967)

As the number of Jesuits involved in secondary and tertiary education has declined, is Jesuit education on the brink of extinction? Anyone employed by a Jesuit college or university since 1967 has endured apparently endless and often meaningless discussions over Jesuit identity. Twentieth-century formulations such as “men and women for others,” and “*cura personalis*,” occasionally passed off as original Ignatian insights, are cited as defining traits, yet they hardly distinguish Jesuit academies from other religious or secular institutions. Traditional Ignatian insights and Jesuit principles become sound-bites as we are told that “magis matters” and are encouraged to “find our magis.” This collection, if properly used, could restore meaningful content to Jesuit expressions and aid quests for definition. This edition, we are told, is the first volume in a new series, “Sources for the History of Jesuit Pedagogy.” May we expect others? May I suggest possible topics? How did the Society adapt its pedagogy and curriculum to colleges in more religiously diversified countries? How were Muslims treated in the Baghdad College? Why did the Society establish in 1951 a college in Nepal where conversion to Christianity was forbidden? Meanwhile these translations should nourish our discussions.

Thomas M. McCoog, SJ
Fordham University

The Catholic Enlightenment. The Forgotten History of a Global Movement. By Ulrich L. Lehner. New York: Oxford University, 2016. Pp. 272. \$29.95.

Lehner proposes to introduce readers to the complex reception of the reforms of Catholicism in the aftermath of the Council of Trent through the prism of the Catholic

Enlightenment. As the author mentions, contemporary historians consider the Enlightenment as cultural movement that is marked by diversity and by the different confessional contexts, which need to lead to a better understanding of the relationship between faith and reason. “Common to all was the conviction that new discoveries in science and philosophy should renew the faith” (2). This book has two important premises: a narrative of the Enlightenment must consider its diversity worldwide, and it should demystify some common prejudices about Catholicism in its relationship to the Enlightenment.

Although the first chapter contains a mosaic of the diversity of issues at stake within the Catholic Enlightenment, L. presents these debates in their national contexts and centered particularly in Europe. Each chapter develops a set of questions that marked modern Catholicism. The second chapter reveals the development and affirmation of the notion of toleration regarding religious difference. The contexts of France, the German States, Austria, and Poland, still holding the memory of the wars and polemics triggered by the Reformation, are examples presented by L. to show the importance of the Catholic sovereigns and the public opinion of other Catholic thinkers and members of the clergy who developed a sense of “civil toleration and theological tolerance” (73), even against the Roman Curia (67–72).

The third chapter explores the Catholic Enlightenment women, a scholarship still underdeveloped as L. affirms (103), and shows that some seeds of the emancipation of women in contemporary societies were already present within bright scientists such as Caterina Bassi and Maria Agnesi (78–80). L. highlights the debates about the freedom to marry (80–83), as well as the new religious orders whose identity is given by the purpose of working for the implementation of the Tridentine reform (96–102). This third chapter also demystifies some common accusations about Catholicism reducing women just to their procreative function or to their domestic role. L. shows that those were the understandings of the “secularized” Enlightenment thinkers (89–96). It is the fourth chapter, however, that gives more justice to the subtitle of the book and reveals to us one of the purposes of the author when he refers to the Catholic Enlightenment: namely that “historians have hardly acknowledged the Argentinian, Brazilian, Indian and Mexican Catholic Enlightenments because they challenge the prevailing Eurocentrist Enlightenment narrative” (123). The fourth chapter shows that the Catholic Enlightenment was not just a European movement or even the replication of European ideas in other parts of the modern world. It was a creative and dynamic implementation of the modern ideas and science in the European colonies of Americas in articulating faith and reason, as well as the dialogical attitude of the Jesuit missionaries in China with their accommodation missionary strategy and Figurist theology (116–18). L. also treats the specific case of India with the debates about derogation of any racial and ethnic discrimination in the access to religious life (121), religious toleration (122), and even the first attempt of independent revolt led by some local Catholic priests (122–23).

In the fifth chapter, L. demystifies the idea present in many of the Enlightenment thinkers that Catholicism was based on superstitions and also promoted them. The reception of the Council of Trent, with its liturgical renewal and inspiration (130–5),

the development of rational criteria to define and recognize in the church the sainthood of someone (127–30), the more rational approach regarding the devil almost making him being forgotten (140), and the critique of beliefs in witchcraft and vampires (148–50), show how the Catholic thinkers of the Enlightenment tried to adjust and reconcile the supernatural elements of the Christian faith with modern science and philosophy. The sixth chapter invites the reader to realize the paradigm shift of the saints canonized in the 18th century: they were engaged with the Tridentine Reform in its multiple dimensions and the resistance to the “secular mainstream Enlightenment” (154). The seventh chapter proposes a look into the various experiences with slavery in the Catholic countries. The conclusion shows, by analyzing the events of the French Revolution and the engagement of many of the French Catholic Enlighteners, how the Catholic Enlightenment died and allowed a stronger affirmation of the moral and ecclesial authority of the bishop of Rome.

This is a stimulating book for theologians and historians because, as the author affirms, “The Catholic Enlightenment illustrates where the dialogue of the church with modern thought was most fruitful, and where it failed, and can thus serve as lesson and potential guide for twenty-first century theology in its continuing dialogue with modernity” (218).

João Eleutério
University of Saint Joseph, Macau

Jonathan Edwards among the Theologians. By Oliver D. Crisp. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015. Pp. xx + 198. \$25.

Often hailed as “America’s Theologian” Jonathan Edwards (1703–58) is considered among leading modern Christian thinkers. Yet, unfortunately, many are not familiar with his important theological work. This volume is an excellent introduction to Edwards’s thought as it explores his positions on key subjects in Christian theology, such as: the doctrine of God, creation, the Trinity, free will and original sin, atonement, preaching, and other subjects. Since the late 1940s there has been new interest in Edwards and C. observes that he is one of the most widely read major theologians (15). In nine essays C. brings Edwards into conversation with other leading Christian theologians and also treats subjects where there is debate, disagreement, and enduring questions.

In “Anselm and Edwards on the Doctrine of God” C. explores similarities and differences in the accounts of both thinkers noting their respective Augustinian heritage. For C., Edwards “is in one respect a theologian immersed in the classical doctrine of God that owes so much to Anselm” (17). Yet, he does more than merely transmit “classical theism” but rather is “a constructive theologian indebted to a tradition” (17) and one who demonstrates sensitivity and creativity in relation to early Enlightenment philosophy. C. directs attention to Edwards’s relationship to the Reformed theological tradition and explores how Edwards sought “to reconfigure the