

defenders of clerical marriage claim that unmarried priests were in some cases engaged in lascivious activities with nuns?

In her conclusion T. alludes very briefly to the 16th century and to the Jesuits as reimagining clerical masculinity. Such a topic regarding the Society of Jesus is surely tantalizing and more, but it is not one explored in this book, a volume well worth the attention of students and scholars of church history, of gender studies, of the history of England and France, and of the history of mentalities.

Thomas Worcester, SJ
College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, MA

Jesuit Pedagogy, 1540–1616. A Reader. Edited by Christiano Casalini and Claude Pavor, SJ. Sources for the History of Jesuit Pedagogy. Chestnut Hill, MA: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2016. Pp. xix + 346. \$45.

In 1956 the Hungarian Jesuit László Lukács was commissioned to investigate why and how the Society of Jesus became involved in education. The initial results of his research were two lengthy Latin articles for the *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* in 1960 and 1961. An edited translation by George E. Ganss, SJ, was reprinted in Thomas H. Clancy's *An Introduction to Jesuit Life* (1976). Lukács then assiduously edited seven volumes, the *Monumenta Paedagogica*, for the series *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*. In them, he traced the evolution of, and reaction to, the definitive 1599 edition of the *Ratio Studiorum*, the universal template for Jesuit education. Pavor had earlier provided the English-speaking world with the first complete translation: *The Ratio Studiorum: The Official Plan for Jesuit Education* (2005). Here the two editors have selected and translated representative texts organized according to four topics: "Inspirations," for example, Juan de Polanco's report on the importance of humanistic studies for younger Jesuits (1547); "Administration," for example, the constitutions of the college at Messina (1548); "Formation," for example, Claudio Acquaviva's statement on uniformity of doctrine (1613); and "Teaching Practices," for example, Juan Maldonado's instruction on teaching theology (ca. 1573). The last two are especially fascinating: Maldonado argued for considerable freedom in theological instruction whereas Acquaviva preferred a strict uniformity based on Thomas Aquinas.

The introduction is a clear, concise presentation of late medieval–early modern pedagogy, and the gradual involvement of the Society in this ministry. Especially helpful is the timeline that coordinates the edited documents with decisive events in the early Society's preferential option for education. Ignatius's decision in 1548 to open a school in Messina for lay students radically altered the young Society's direction and self-understanding. Instead of well-trained, flexible, mobile Jesuits surviving on alms in professed houses, they, still well-trained, became Europe's schoolmasters, living in colleges supported by regular income, harnessed to classrooms and academic calendars. Probably no decision was as seismic in the pre-Suppression Society. By Ignatius's death in 1556, the Society operated thirty-three schools with six more scheduled to open—from none

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