In a chapter entitled “Songs without Words,” John Griffiths considers the repertory of solo instrumental music from the last third of the sixteenth century. Close to thirty solo instrumental publications transmit about 370 individual motets in a variety of tablatures almost always shorn of their texts and intended for performance in domestic contexts far removed from the liturgy. Here, the motet is reincarnated as a purely musical work for harp, lute, or keyboard and in which the addition of one or more voices would have been entirely optional.

Mapping the Motet is a splendid contribution to our understanding of early modern sacred music. It broadens and extends our knowledge of one of the most neglected yet imaginative musical genres of the period.

Michael Noone

Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

michael.noone@bc.edu

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00703008-12

Claude Pavur, S.J.

In the School of Ignatius: Studious Zeal and Devoted Learning. IJS Studies. Research on Jesuits and the Society of Jesus, 1. Chestnut Hill, MA: Institute of Jesuit Sources, Boston College, 2019. Pp. x + 174. Pb, \$25.00.

From before the foundation of the first Jesuit school—either in Goa in 1543, Gandía in 1545, or Messina in 1548, and each has supporters—to today, Jesuits have intensely discussed such questions as, what is Jesuit education? How should it be accomplished? This book offers the answers of one Jesuit. Claude Pavur is an associate editor at the Institute for Advanced Jesuit Studies at Boston College; the translator and editor of the admirable and immensely useful side-by-side bilingual Latin and English edition of the *Ratio studiorum* of 1599 (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005); editor and translator of Pedro de Ribadeneyra's *Life of Ignatius Loyola* (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2014; first version 1572); and co-editor and co-translator of *Jesuit Pedagogy, 1540–1616: A Reader* (Chestnut Hill, MA, Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2016). The book also has an appreciative forward by Professor Cristiano Casalini, Pavur's colleague at Boston College.

The argument of the book is that the best Jesuit education today in the USA can be achieved if Jesuit undergraduate colleges will adopt a modernized version of the 1599 *Ratio studiorum* (hereafter RS) curriculum. For purposes of identification, the RS is the short document first published in 1599 that outlines

the curriculum of Jesuit education to be followed by both Jesuit and non-Jesuit students in all Jesuit schools, while allowing limited modifications. It begins with learning Latin grammar and culminates in Scholastic theology. The RS offers detailed rules and procedures to be followed by Jesuit provincial superiors, prefects of studies, teachers in the classroom, and students. It dominated Jesuit education into the 1960s. It also greatly influenced the educational programs of other Catholic religious orders and schools as well, a fact often overlooked.

The book has two themes. Pavur argues strongly that the RS is a foundational document for the Society of Jesus. By foundational he means that it is one of the principle documents mostly produced by the Society during the lifetime of Ignatius of Loyola (c.1491–1556) that articulated the purposes and goals of the Society and ways of achieving them. They expressed the will of the founder of the Society and his closest fellow Jesuits. Accepted foundational documents include the *Formula of the Institute* (1540), the autobiography of Ignatius, the *Spiritual Exercises*, and the Constitutions of the Society, written by Ignatius with the help of other Jesuits over many years and adopted by the Society in 1558. Pavur argues that the RS must be added to the foundational documents because “it emanates from deep in the very *core concept* of the Society of Jesus, from its earliest history, from its spirituality; the *Ratio* helps to constitute, perpetuate, make effective the Jesuit order itself. Apart from the document and all that it represents and implies, the Society simply *cannot be what it is*” (ix). To establish the RS as a foundational document, Pavur reviews some of Ignatius’s own educational experiences and key documents. Pavur knows the sources well.

The second theme is Pavur’s argument that Jesuit undergraduate colleges today should adopt a modernized version of the RS because its values are still relevant. He courageously proposes a version for Jesuit undergraduate colleges in the USA (and presumably Canada). His adaptation consists of a mandatory curriculum (without electives) for the first two years of undergraduate study of five parts, consisting of sixty credit hours. Part A is the study of heritage or culture in the broadest sense taught by means of five heritage courses (Greco-Roman heritage, Judeo-Christian heritage including reading the Bible, medieval heritage, modern heritage, and world heritage. Part B consisted of three courses (nine credit hours): English literature, composition and rhetoric, and contemporary issues including poverty relief, ecology, inequality, entertainment, etc. Part C consists of four two-credit-hour courses in American history and government, economics, “ethics and the blessed life,” and computers and the digital age. Part D consists of eleven one-hour courses (meeting once a week) including philosophy of science, chemistry, physics, biology, mathematics,

health and medicine, law and legal systems, and more. Part E consists of twelve credit hours of foreign-language study including “the fundamentals of Latin and/or Greek.” In their third and fourth years the students will concentrate on advanced courses in their major field(s) and any other advanced courses they choose, including philosophy and theology. Overall, Pavur’s proposed core curriculum is somewhat similar to the core curricula of the two liberal arts colleges (neither a Jesuit college) I attended as an undergraduate. However, I would add two more one-hour courses: understanding art and understanding music. Four of the one-hour science courses might be combined into two to make room for art and music.

Pavur also has some prescriptions for the Jesuit college and its faculty. He wants professional Jesuit educators to provide oversight over the curriculum. He wants Jesuits to lead Jesuit universities, and he criticizes the Land O’ Lakes statement of 1967. This was a meeting of prominent Catholic university academics led by the late Father Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C. (1917–2015) of Notre Dame who drafted a statement that emphasized that Catholic universities were first and foremost universities dedicated to academic excellence. As universities they should be free of external lay or clerical authority. Pavur also dislikes the changes in the education of Jesuits that have occurred since the 1960s, such as the abandonment of Latin as a requirement and the Society’s willingness to substitute theological instruction from theological consortia for its own theological instruction in its own academic units. He also wants to de-emphasize the “publish or perish” syndrome in the appointment of professors in Jesuit institutions. While he is correct that the publishing requirement in American universities has expanded to ridiculous extremes, my experience was that the highly published professors that taught me in graduate school were almost always better teachers than the little—or un-published teachers who taught me as an undergraduate. Why? Because the former communicated their excitement in the subject as well as their knowledge.

The two themes of the book need to be evaluated separately. I do not find the evidence strong enough to agree that the *Ratio studiorum* was a foundational document. For example, I recently studied the debate about the role of mathematics in Jesuit education before and during the preparation of the RS. While Ignatius and the Constitutions were invoked, there were so many other voices and documents appearing between 1556 and 1599 that it is difficult to see the RS as a foundational document. Nevertheless, Pavur’s argument merits attention. And he deserves full credit for focusing laser-like on the genesis, meaning, and connections with Ignatius of Loyola in the RS. Pavur’s long appendix entitled “A Timeline for Jesuit Education” listing key events and documents in the history of Jesuit education from the birth of Ignatius of Loyola

through 2018 is valuable. And he correctly points out that we know little about the evolution of the RS in different locales. Second, I find his modernized core curriculum version of the RS to be overly rigid and probably difficult to implement. But that is only the opinion of an emeritus professor whose knowledge of Jesuit education stops in 1773. Current Jesuit teachers, administrators, and students must decide this matter.

Paul F. Grendler

University of Toronto, Emeritus and Chapel Hill, NC, USA

paulgrendler@gmail.com

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00703008-13

Patrick J. Howell, S.J.

Great Risks Had to be Taken: The Jesuit Response to the Second Vatican Council, 1958–2018. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2019. Pp. x + 225. Pb, \$29.00.

This volume offers a lively account of the renewal of the Society of Jesus in the era of the Second Vatican Council. Part personal memoir, part social history, part theological analysis, it sure-footedly achieves its objective of providing a window onto a turbulent era for the world's largest religious order of priests and brothers. The author, a longtime professor of theology and administrator at Seattle University who died less than a year after the book's publication, does not shy away from the task of engaging the many criticisms levelled against the Society of Jesus in recent decades. Haven't the Jesuits suffered diminishment in numbers and influence precisely because the changes in Jesuit governance, formation, and global mission in the decades after the council constitute betrayals of their traditions? Howell understands these charges well and, with fairness and much insight, provides a consistently clear evaluation of both the strengths and shortcomings of the responses of the Society of Jesus to a revolutionary new era in church history—one we are still experiencing even in the age of Pope Francis.

This book employs first-person narrative to relate and assess key ecclesial developments. This technique displays the advantage of adding vividness and immediacy (Howell has a Zelig-like propensity for finding himself present at key junctures of momentous events, such as General Congregation 34), but may at times tax the patience of certain readers. Expect to learn as much about Howell's reaction to his personal encounters with leaders as about the ultimate significance of their actions and policies. But without doubt, the vignettes