Cristiano Casalini, ed.

Jesuit Philosophy on the Eve of Modernity. Leiden: Brill, 2019. Modernity through the Prism of Jesuit History, 20. Pp. ix and 463. Hb. \$178.00.

This book, edited by Cristiano Casalini, focuses on a topic who has been studied partially in many research papers; however, it explores it according to a general overview, which has been less studied by scholars. Until now, there has been no attempt to offer a comprehensive and systematic overview of Jesuit philosophy in the early modernity. For this reason, the project of studying Jesuit philosophy led by Casalini in this collective work, does not try to consider them as heterogeneous pieces to be assembled in a complex mosaic difficult to understand, nor merely subjected to the authority of Aquinas or Aristotle, or as an eclectic mix of Thomists and Scotists. These attempts to understand Jesuit philosophy, or others that are often claimed to have been precursors of later developments in modern philosophy or modern legal and political institutions, without being groundless, nevertheless suffer from not inquiring their own and specific character. Therefore, these collective characterizations appear today as little nuanced and precise. Here, for a change, the authors try to find out a common horizon among the different Jesuit philosophers. It is thus a question of not losing sight of the internal point of view of Jesuit historiography and, applied to the philosophical context, focus on the internal point of view of Jesuit philosophy.

This is not an easy task, although it is necessary to understand the concerns that guide Jesuit philosophy in the specific ecclesial context from which it is nurtured and developed, and therefore, also from the institution that brings them together in the church itself, the Society of Jesus. In this context, the book has two main fields of interest, historiographic and philosophical. What joins both research fields is the hermeneutic approach that guides the work. The general research question is how the practice and teaching of philosophy are modulated from the very institution of the Society of Jesus.

At the historiographical level, this question is addressed by proposing at part 1 (*Landscape*) the study of the philosophical teaching at Jesuit colleges and universities in terms of development of the philosophical curriculum, especially from the pedagogical framework of the *Ratio studiorum*, and the development and integration in that framework of philosophical disciplines such as logic, natural philosophy, and metaphysics. Continuing with that topic, this part also focuses on the relationship between the practice and teaching of philosophy and the institutional philosophical matrix in a normative sense. In other words, what was the orientation given by the Constitutions, and how was the control and guidance of the philosophical practice given by the religious superiors, and especially by the superior general, called to take care of

the *uniformitas et soliditas doctrinae*. Since this is a very sensitive issue because it poses a threat to freedom of thought, in this institutional context, according to Sander, “quality control” is sought in its own way (which is not strange either to the current practice nowadays, for example, with the practice of peer-review).

Landscape offers us an apt study about the connections between the Jesuit philosophy and the Society’s pedagogical and constitutional canon. It also provides us with a relevant analysis of the practice of Jesuit philosophy and the overseeing governmental practices put in place by the Society’s authorities. Along these lines, in the future it might be pertinent to begin studies about another structural aspect of the Jesuit philosophical practice, such as the connection between the spiritual canon, that is, the one built upon the *Spiritual Exercises* and its relevance for the philosophical developments and the pedagogical practice itself. A historiographical approach to this question could study the connection between the transmission and the experience of the Jesuit spirituality that nourishes as an ascetic practice the formation of the sensibility of the philosophers as Jesuits, considering it according to the evolution of different historical accents of this spirituality and its possible correlation with Jesuit philosophical practices. The three structural elements indicated would allow a more robust historiographical approach to the Jesuit philosophy “from within.”

Part 2 (*Disciplines*) begins with three contributions related to the theory of knowledge, with a renewed view of philosophy against counter-reformist stereotypes typical of the *black legend*, where the role of rhetoric for the philosophical formation itself is reevaluated. The analysis of the pedagogical use of rhetoric is not strange to the characteristic Jesuit way of proceeding. The “rhetorical adaptation” to which the Constitutions continually invite the Society’s mode of government or social intervention, adjusting to differences according to people, times and places, opens the philosophical understanding of a “multidimensional” idea of truth, where several partial truths could coexist and even interact, according to Régent-Susini.

Ashworth offers a broad presentation of various Jesuit contributions that had a big impact on the development of logic. Heider offers a comparative view of different theories of knowledge constructed by authors of three generations of Jesuit philosophers. A second section considers the dialogue between natural philosophy and theology on issues such as empty space and transubstantiation; and third, the development of moral philosophy and theology, focusing specially on the Jesuit contribution to the development of moral science, but in turn, the evolution of approaches in moral orientation from

probate to probabilism, as well as the development of an ethical politics in order to the moral and political perfection of the rulers by the stimulation and care of the appropriate virtues.

Part 3 completes the historiographical vision of the work with five studies that offer a global presentation of philosophical personalities from the first period of the Jesuit order, located according to the university institution where they were most significant. Francisco de Toledo and Benet Perera, in the context of the Roman College; Luis de Molina, Madrid; Pedro da Fonseca and Francisco Suárez, Coimbra. Part 4 analyses the impact (in terms of presence and continuity) that Jesuit philosophy had in central modern authors such as René Descartes and John Locke, even considering the essential differences that can also be recognized between these paradigms.

Thus, according with the historiographical point of view, it is offered here a rich image of the presence of the institutional context proper to the Society of Jesus in the development of Jesuit philosophy in the first century of its existence; as well as a systematic presentation of its contribution to various philosophical disciplines; a panoramic study of the five mentioned Jesuit authors; and a demonstration of the influence of that thought in other modern authors. As it is pointed out by Casalini, we need to deepen other approaches, maybe more specific, regarding the progress of Jesuit philosophy, which did not consist in a simple repetition of the contributions of the pioneers, and which, in turn, was also exercised in other non-European contexts.

At the philosophical level, we are confronted by the presentation of the “distinctiveness” of Jesuit philosophy with a relevant question for philosophical reflection: the character that philosophical production acquires when it is considered as produced in a specific cultural matrix. Nowadays, the exercise of Jesuit philosophy should not be seen separately or fragmented. On the one hand, philosophy is mediated by a cultural context; on the other hand, philosophy is fertilized by a spiritual practice which is guided by the Jesuit spiritual tradition. How does the configuration of philosophy affect its dialogue with theology or with its own spiritual tradition practiced by the same Jesuits? How can we understand nowadays the intellectual and existential integration of knowledge that *de facto* occurred in these authors, that we could recognize as “transdisciplinary” exercises? As the *Spiritual Exercises* represent and presuppose a certain anthropology, cosmology, ethics, and epistemology, they open a field of possibilities from which we have to understand their own philosophical developments, and the answers and evolutions that were to be produced by Jesuit philosophy in the succeeding historical and cultural contexts.

Juan Antonio Senent de Frutos

Universidad Loyola Andalucía

jasenent@uloyola.es

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00603006-17

Jordan Hillebert, ed.

T&T Clark Companion to Henri de Lubac. New York: Bloomsbury/T&T Clark, 2017.

Pp. xx + 492. Ebook, \$136.80.

Newcomers to the study of Henri de Lubac will be able to pass for experts after reading this excellent collection of essays, and experts will find their understanding enriched by fresh and challenging insights. This book succeeds in the two ways that a companion volume should: it introduces, and it elevates. While drawing in the uninitiated, it also advances the scholarly conversation. Although this is a pricey volume, which may not be affordable for many individuals and perhaps not even for some smaller academic libraries with limited resources, those that can afford it or manage some access to it can rest assured that it is of the highest quality.

The first five chapters, gathered together under the heading, “Henri de Lubac in Context,” go far beyond the standard biographical sketches or bibliographic summaries that one might expect to find in such a section. They situate de Lubac within a detailed historical picture of significant shifts and tensions in French Catholic theology, philosophy, and politics from the start of the nineteenth century through the end of the twentieth. Jordan Hillebert contends that the post-conciliar, anti-Joachimite de Lubac, who is sometimes deemed more “conservative” because he bemoans the putative emergence of a new age of the spirit disconnected from ecclesial tradition, is engaged in defending the same paradoxical relationship between natural desire and supernatural grace that he had defended in his earlier, ostensibly more “progressive” work. Tracey Rowland sensitively treats de Lubac’s conflict with “neo-scholasticism of the strict observance,” not as a story of heroes and villains, but as a story of different theological dispositions and personalities, which continues in Anglophone theology today. Francesca Aran Murphy makes the intriguing case that, notwithstanding his love for patristics, de Lubac can be read as a genuine if unconventional (because Blondelian) Thomist. Jacob W. Wood illuminates the nineteenth century pre-history of *ressourcement*, arguing persuasively that Dom Prosper Guéranger, Jean-Baptiste Lacordaire, and August Gratry anticipated the main contours of de Lubac’s so-called “new theology.” And Aaron