Catholicism itself. Yet, as their presence conditioned the confessionalization of German life until the Enlightenment, their suppression (until 1814) and subsequent very gradual reappearance diminished their significance in the crucial first half of nineteenth century modernizing.

Holzem’s massive account is a tour de force—not only a cogent account of Christianity’s adaptation to modernity in a new German nation and empire but also an amazingly useful compilation of individual stories and episodes. That emphasis adds to his argument about the importance of “typologies of sanctification”—forms of individual piety crafted within each confession. Without going deeply into some of the arguments (necessitating another fifteen hundred words!), one can safely argue that Andreas Holzem’s contribution will crystallize and shape the historiographical debate over German Christianity for decades to come.
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Peter Canisius is best known as a catechist, owing to the hundreds of editions of his three catechisms, the Large, the Small, and the Smallest Catechisms. In 1893, Otto Braunsberger, S.J., the editor of his letters and the consummate expert on Canisius, published his seminal study, Entstehung und erste Entwicklung der Katechismen des seligen Petrus Canisius aus der Gesellschaft Jesu. Another German Jesuit scholar, Friedrich Streicher, produced the indispensable critical edition of the Latin and German catechisms in two volumes (1933, 1936). At the beginning of our century, Hubert Filser and Stephan Leimgruber published a German translation of the first edition (1555) of the Large Catechism, the Summa doctrinae christianae, in a volume of scholarly essays. Paul Begheyn, S.J., the greatest authority on Canisius in our time, produced a detailed bibliography of 330 editions of the catechisms printed until 1597, the year of the Canisius’s death, as well as a bilingual (Dutch, English) introductory survey.

Thomas Flowers has boldly redirected attention to Canisius the catechist. His focus is on the first edition of the Summa. He insists on its unique character in the history of catechesis, attends to its words and not simply its structure,
places it in its ecclesiastical-political context, and aims to set straight a mistaken historiographical record. Flowers writes: “The traditional orthodoxy of the Summa’s theology and the subtlety of its pedagogy have fooled generations of students and scholars into regarding it as a well-executed but pedestrian example of Catholic post-Reformation catechesis.” With his contextual study, he claims, “this illusion dissolves” (34). He maintains: “It is all too evident that cultural-linguistic and confessional biases have blinded many scholars to the history of catechesis outside of the context that interests them most” (35). Their inability to grasp the uniqueness of Canisius’s Summa produced their “blithe declarations” (57) about it.

What made the Summa, according to Flowers, sui generis was Canisius’s deliberate and fundamental catechetical strategy in relating veritas and pietas. Both were essential, but “the Summa privileges pietas in the presentation of Christian veritas” (62) for the formation of Catholic identity. Thus, inculcating piety is the prerequisite for embracing the truth of the Catholic faith. Such a strategy was “not traditional catechesis” (64) in view of the printed catechisms that preceded the Summa and made it “a new genre-defying book” (67). It funded the book’s “subtle, but substantial, Jesuit character” (110), which flowers establishes with an intricate triangulation among the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius of Loyola, the spirituality of his companion Pierre Favre, and the Summa.

Furthermore, Canisius’s catechetical strategy affords the Summa its “brilliant originality” (147) in contrast with Luther’s insistence on catechetical veritas. It was not through a polemical confrontation with Luther’s catechism “but through training Christians in Catholic pietas that Canisius hoped to defeat what he considered the pernicious heresy of Lutheran doctrine” (161). The emphasis on pietas rendered unnecessary and presumably futile theological controversialism in catechesis from the perspective of Canisius.

The “non-polemical nature” (162) of the Summa apparently contributed to its fall from political grace. When he mandated the catechism for his territories in 1555, Archduke Ferdinand of Austria did not understand the dynamic of pietas leading to veritas. Thus, he could not distinguish the Summa from “the sort of text” that he “wanted for his defense of orthodoxy against the Protestant onslaught” (190). Flowers revises the history of the genesis and especially the princely authorization of the Summa by making a sharp distinction between the compendium of Christian doctrine that Ferdinand requested from the Society of Jesus in 1551 and the catechism Canisius composed. In 1561, as Holy Roman Emperor, Ferdinand “wanted a new summary of Christian doctrine” (203). Relying on Paulo Sarpi, the seventeenth-century historian of the Council of Trent, and a seventeenth-century manuscript copy of an anonymous
diarist at Trent, Flowers argues that Ferdinand distanced himself from the *Summa* owing to papal displeasure. He had mandated the *Summa* without papal approval and had acquired a reputation for indifference in doctrinal matters. Ferdinand's political situation explains the *Summa*'s loss of appeal for him. That he disagreed with its pedagogy remains, however, conjectural and unproven. Flowers offers a series of suppositions to explain the emperor's change in attitude "toward Canisius's catechisms and their capacity to achieve his religious designs" (210). "Perhaps," Flowers concludes his conjectures, "Ferdinand had rather come to realize that Canisius's education in *pietas* simply did not confront controversy as directly as he desired" (210).

The priority that Canisius attributed to the inculcation of *pietas* in the formation of Catholic identity distinguished it from "the Roman model of catechesis" (232), early modern and modern. The Roman Catechism (1566), the Catholic Church's first universal catechism, subordinated *pietas* to *veritas*. Robert Bellarmine's *Dottrina Cristiana breve* (1597) and *Dichiarazione più copiosa della dottrina Cristiana breve* (1598) operated in the Roman mould. Flowers does not consider why Bellarmine, a Jesuit, did not follow the "Jesuit catechesis" that Canisius embraced. The Roman model has endured. Pope John Paul II "maintained the importance of defensive catechesis that provided a uniform standard" (231) when promulgating in 1992 the church's second universal catechism, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Contrasting the uniformity of the Roman concept of orthodoxy with Canisius's catechisms, Flowers ends his book provocatively: "They exude confidence in the Catholic paradigm for Christian identity and so stand, in a way Canisius likely never intended, as a bold rebuke of Rome's timidity" (233).

Claims for historical originality incur methodological doubt from historians in testing such claims. That the *Summa* breaks with catechetical tradition(s), especially in printed catechisms that preceded it, requires a more robust demonstration than Flowers offers. What is at stake is an unprecedented strategy of promoting piety to consolidate the truth claims of the Christian faith. Such a strategy seems consistent with Renaissance humanism, with which J. H. M. Tesser sought to ally Canisius in *Petrus Canisius als humanistisch geleerde* (1932). Did Erasmus's catechism, the *Explanatio symboli* (1533), emphasize piety for the sake of truth? If Calvin's stated "organizing principle" in the Geneva Catechism (1541) was "divine worship," Flowers's conclusion requires elaboration, namely that Calvin's "end, thus, is to impart *veritas* in the service of inculcating *pietas*" (56). The Geneva Catechism deserves more than one sentence in elucidating the relationship between piety and truth within it and differentiating it from Canisius's *Summa*. An analysis of the
pre-Reformation catechisms is in order to reveal how they engaged with the dynamic between piety and truth.

Flowers maintains that piety “had a much more expansive meaning and a much richer Christian history” than John O’Malley’s characterization of it as a humanist “updating” of “the medieval term christianitas (Christianity), which had been extensively utilized to describe the catechetical effort to educate and train people in Christian belief and practice” (32). After turning to Augustine to expand the meaning of piety, Flowers ends up with a concept of piety very similar to, if not identical with, O’Malley’s expression of the humanist concept of piety: “the Christian way of both believing and living” (33). How did Canisius use the word and concept of pietas?

Flowers overlooks the polemical potential of the Summa. The “Vigilantians” who clamored against the Catholic practice of praying to the saints were the Protestant successors to the ancient heretic, Vigilantius, against whom Jerome wrote a polemic. The “new scorners” of the church’s venerable teaching on the Eucharist are also Protestants. So too are the “adherents of the new sects,” who exemplify the obstinacy of the sin against the Holy Spirit by refusing to heed Catholic teaching and whom Canisius compares to “vipers” because their ears are “shut against a sweet melody, namely the sound doctrine of the Church.” Surely, Canisius had Protestants in mind when he asked how one should respond to “those who tear up and even defy the law of the ecclesiastical fast” (Friedrich Streicher, ed., S. Petri Canisii doctoris ecclesiae catechismi latini et germanici, vol. 1: Catechismi latini [Rome and Munich, 1933], 16, 35, 56, 62). In the second edition of the Summa, Canisius insisted that the repetition of baptism was an “abomination, whatever finally the Anabaptists, already condemned long ago, might offer as an excuse.” He apostrophized the Sacramentarians: “O dreadful and often condemned impiety!” Modern readers will find shocking Canisius’s contempt for Jews, whom he described as “the bloodthirsty enemies of Christ” (Streicher, Catechismi latini, 119, 125, 132).

Flowers states that the first edition of the Summa “did not treat the topic of justification directly” (158). But Canisius attacked the doctrine of justification by faith alone when he explained presumption as a sin against the Holy Spirit: a combination of trust in God’s mercy and boldness in sinning in defiance of “every consideration of divine justice and of the fear of God.” Canisius continued: “And so, indeed, many people sin today, who, flattering themselves with faith alone (sola fide) in Christ, actually rot like beasts in the midst of filthy sins and dare to promise not only themselves but others too security in the same way: let them only trust (fidant) in the merits of Christ and the grace of God, apprehended by faith, however much in the meantime the fruits of penance are lacking” (Streicher, Catechismi latini, 55).
It is a discredit to Canisius, who had a fine sense of *mis en livre*, to refer, therefore, to “the clumsily tacked-on nature” of the appendix “concerning the fall of man and justification according to the decree and doctrine of the Council of Trent” that appeared in the second edition of the *Summa* because he had not dealt with justification “in the main body” of the catechism (158). The appendix, “organized according to propositions,” did not “follow the question-and-answer format of the rest of the catechism” (158) because it consisted of adapted excerpts of Trent’s decree on original sin and the sixteen chapters of Trent’s decree on justification. Canisius’s recourse in the *Summa* of 1566 to the Tridentine decrees, which by papal mandate he delivered to the bishops of Germany in 1565, reinforced the orthodoxy of his catechism by demonstrating loyalty to church teaching on the fundamental theological matter that divided Christian Europe.

Canisius began the *Summa* with a definition of a Christian: “anyone who professes the saving doctrine of Jesus Christ, true God and human being, in his Church. Accordingly, anyone who is truly Christian and firmly abides by the very doctrine of Christ damns and thoroughly execrates (*detestatur*) all forms of worship and sects, such as the Jewish, Muslim, and heretical [sects], that are found anywhere outside the doctrine of Christ and the Church” (Streicher, *Catechismi latini*, 6). Acknowledging the definition, Flowers tries to defuse it by contending that Canisius’s “‘execration’ of heretics and infidels need not have been motivated by hatred or spite, evincing as it does his desire to give the readers of his catechism all the knowledge they would need to be saved” (166). What Flowers misses in the definition is the confessionally confrontational nature of the Catholic faith that Canisius conspicuously asserted.

That assertion enabled a confluence of pedagogy and polemic in the *Summa* and beyond. In 1567, Canisius advised Andreas Fabricius, tutor of Ernest of Bavaria, that the prince “should in fact understand that heretics must be treated and execrated as pests” (Otto Braunsberger, ed., *Beati Petri Canisii Societatis Iesu epistulae et actae*, vol. 6 [Freiburg im Breisgau, 1913], 100). Catholic identity demanded piety. But it also required for Canisius, as it did for other Catholic controversialists, an unflinching fidelity to the Catholic Church that encompassed determined opposition to heretics as well as to heresy. Will we ever lay to rest the myth of a Canisius who castigated error but who treated the erring with uncommon gentleness?

Flowers has put Canisius’s catechisms back on the agenda of Jesuit history and of the history of Reformation Europe. They deserve a close and complete reading in their various formats and editions to reveal the catechist who developed them over a long career of literary activity that evinced, from
beginning to end, a penchant for pedagogy and polemic. A modern scholarly deepening of Braunsberger’s *Enstehung* will continue, after Flowers’s book, to consider the Jesuit and Catholic characteristics of the catechisms within the confessional culture out of which they emerged and to which they contributed.
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This is the first detailed modern study of Onofrio Panvinio, an important figure within the intellectual world of sixteenth-century Catholicism, now available in paperback. Robert Bellarmine and Cesare Baronio are rightfully regarded as key players in the articulation of the post-Tridentine self-understanding of the Roman church. Bellarmine’s controversial work complemented the historical scholarship of his close friend, Baronio, to promote the idea of an inerrant and visible church which had withstood and continued to withstand a succession of heresies. Of critical importance in this regard was the inheritance of Trent for which the *Controversies* in many respects provided an elaborated justification. But neither of these outstanding figures existed in an intellectual vacuum. As Bauer notes, not only did Panvinio represent a tradition of enquiry still influenced by humanist influences which was not fully responsive to the confessionalized norms of historiography that came to dominate Catholic scholarship, but his work provided an important point of reference for his successors. Bellarmine was the censor of the first volume of his unpublished *Historia Ecclesiastica* and rated him as the most important Italian scholar of chronology of the sixteenth century, while the chronological structure of the *Historia* with its frequent marginal noting of years may have foreshadowed Baronio’s annalistic framework. Baronio’s first lectures on Church History at the Oratory were heavily dependent on Panvinio’s short history of the popes and, as Bauer records, Baronio himself fascinatingly conceptualized his own work as a realization of a call from his spiritual master to supersede Panvinio. While there is no record of actual personal interactions between the two historians, they lived in close proximity to each other during the 1560s. But