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BOOK REVIEWS


Although the editorial policy of this periodical places emphasis on current publication as a basis and norm for selection it is gratifying to see the numerous contributions from the past taking their place in the permanent literature of meteorology. It is an indication of the scientific worth of the contributions accomplished in the Philippines. In the cumulative author index the relative number of authors with four or more listed titles is very small. The great majority are credited with one or two papers. While volume of published work is not an absolute norm of merit, still carefully screened works do indicate a measure of appreciation by competent authorities. It is a pleasure to note that the Philippines has made and is continuing to make definitive contributions to the progress of science.

JAMES J. HENNESSEY

THE IDEA OF A JESUIT UNIVERSITY


IN this work Father Ganss has endeavored to give a clear idea of what St. Ignatius meant by a university. What St. Ignatius meant by a university was of course what almost any educated man of the sixteenth and preceding centuries meant by it, and so in one sense Father Ganss' book contributes nothing that the well read man (and particularly the well read historian of education) does not already know. Anyone acquainted with the works of
Rashdall or of Denifle (and it is startling to find no mention of Denifle in the ten-page bibliography at the end of the book) will find nothing startlingly new in this book.

In other directions however Father Ganss has made several important contributions to educational history. In the first place he has tried to reconstruct Loyola’s idea of a university mainly from two sources: (a) from the earliest colleges of the Jesuits (b) and especially from Part Four of the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus written by Loyola himself. Ganss has thus turned the spotlight away from the better known Ratio studiorum to the principal document of Jesuit pedagogical legislation, the Constitutions themselves which should be ranked among the greatest educational documents of the world.

A second contribution is the fact that Father Ganss has made available to non-Latinists the text of Part Four of the Constitutions. His translation supersedes Miss Mayer’s (contained in Fitzpatrick’s St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum published by McGraw-Hill in 1933) which left much to be desired in point of accuracy.

Thirdly Father Ganss has clarified the various meanings which the term “college” has in Jesuit documents. The term occurs frequently and in varying significations according to the context—a fact which may mislead the reader not well acquainted with Jesuit history. Father Ganss seems to have had in mind the general run of American (and Filipino) educationists whose notion of a “college” is totally different from the European acceptation of that term.

A fourth and perhaps a more important contribution is the fact that Father Ganss has turned the spotlight away from Jesuit education at the secondary school level and focused it instead on Jesuit education at the university level. Father Ganss is not the first to do this, but there was need for an explicit and well documented treatise like this in order to counteract an impression which appears to have become current, namely that Jesuit education is essentially and exclusively education at the secondary school level.

II

The reason for this impression is not hard to seek. In the first place many Jesuit “colleges” were (and are) as a matter of
fact secondary schools. In the second place, the Jesuit idea of a university includes as an integral part the trivial and quadrivial arts as these arts had developed after the great renascences of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. That is to say, the Jesuit university included (as its core) the faculty of arts which in turn comprised the higher faculty of "arts" proper (philosophy) and the subordinate faculty of humanities (comprising the classes of grammar, humanities and rhetoric). Now this faculty of humanities very definitely belonged in a university according to the Parisian model (after which all Jesuit institutions were patterned) but it did not belong in a university according to the modern German idea of a university—and it is this German university structure that has become widespread in many countries today.

Furthermore, the Jesuit faculty of humanities has received so much attention (perhaps deservedly so) from friend and foe alike that the impression was bound to arise that Jesuit education was synonymous with training in the humanities.

To this false impression many Jesuit writers may have unwittingly contributed by their otherwise excellent works on Jesuit education. Farrell's work for instance (The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education Milwaukee 1938) is an excellent study of the genesis of the Ratio studiorum of 1599, but it omits mention of the Ratio studiorum superiorum (which forms the greater bulk of the 1599 document) and concentrates entirely on the Ratio studiorum inferiorum. A similar impression is created by other works less important than Farrell's: for instance McGucken The Jesuits and Education (Milwaukee 1932) or Schwickerath Jesuit Education, its History and Principles (St. Louis 1903) or the many works of Donnelly. Even the French writers may have contributed to this impression, though some of their works deserve close study, e.g. Charmot La pédagogie des Jésuites, ses principes, son actualité (Paris 1943) or Herman La pédagogie des Jésuites au XVIe siècle, ses sources, ses caractéristiques (Louvain 1914) or Dainville Les Jésuits et l'éducation de la société française I (Paris 1941).

III

Although it seems undeniable that the Jesuits were good teachers of the Latin and Greek classics and that they produced men who showed outstanding mastery of language and literature both vernacular and classic, to whom Italian, French, Spanish and English literature are permanently indebted, nevertheless this should not
be allowed to obscure the equally undeniable fact that the Jesuits cultivated also the "higher sciences" (theology and philosophy) and what might be termed the quadrivial sciences in their more advanced form (viz. mathematics, astronomy, seismology, meteorology, geography, etc.). Long before the Jesuit classical professors had won renown, Bellarmine and Lessius were already attracting notice by their theological lectures at Rome and Louvain, and Laynez and Salmeron by their theological discourses at the Council of Trent. Almost all the controversies which involved the Jesuits during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were in the higher fields of scholarship: e.g. in dogmatic theology (the Immaculate Conception; de auxiliis; devotion to the Sacred Heart) or moral theology (probabilism) or metaphysics (scientia media; the real distinction between essence and existence; etc.) or political philosophy (witness the controversy between King James of England and Cardinal Bellarmine) or missiology (the Chinese and Malabar rites). Indeed the first book ever published by a Jesuit was a doctrinal compendium by Peter Canisius who has since been declared a Doctor of the Church for his work in theology. It is of course typical of the peculiar synthesis aimed at by Jesuit educators that Canisius the theologian was also Canisius the humanist who both awed and enthralled his audience at Messina with his Ciceroane Latin.

As for the mathematical and physical sciences, it is sufficient to recall that a Jesuit astronomer (Cristopher Clavius, professor of mathematics at the Roman College) was one of those who worked out the Gregorian reform of the calendar; that a pupil of this same Clavius (Matteo Ricci) opened the gates of China to the Christian missionaries by his clocks, maps and astrolabes; and that Father Angelo Secchi is considered the father of modern solar astronomy. Pope Pius XII recently paid tribute to Clavius by singling him out for special mention in an allocution to the international union of geophysicists.

These things Father Ganss does not bring out; but he does bring out the fact that both in intention and in actual fact the Jesuits conducted universities from the earliest period of their existence. Of the colleges founded during Ignatius' time, some were universities in both fact and name (for instance Messina, Coimbra, Gandia); others were universities in fact though not in name (as those at Palermo, Vienna, Bilom, and likewise the college at Prague where Blessed Edmund Campion, sometime proctor of Oxford, taught rhetoric).
Thus, both in general and in many particulars, Father Ganss' book deserves high praise. On minor details a few animadversions might be permitted. The book does not seem well organized. The treatment is repetitious and the development of ideas is neither rectilinear nor organic.

There appears moreover an undue preoccupation with the ages of students of the sixteenth century. While the point might be important and might have deserved explicit treatment in a special chapter, the recurring mention of it throughout the work creates the impression (perhaps unfounded) that this work was originally not a study of the Jesuit university as such but a dissertation on student ages revised to suit the demands of the enlarged scope.

It might also be noted (as a fact, not as a defect) that the work appears to be addressed not to the scholars of the world but to an exclusively American "educationist" audience, and particularly to a type of reader whose reading has been meager and whose fund of information limited. This may explain why the author finds it necessary to inform the reader that Aristotle was "an experienced teacher of philosophy as well as a writer" (p. 61) or why the author occasionally adopts the educationist lingo. It is difficult for instance to refrain from wincing at the following caption: "Classes are conducted in Latin according to the lecture system" (Plate 3. Italics added).

The accuracy of some of the explanations may also be questioned. The explanation of the meaning of the terms "arts" and "liberal arts" (p. 57) is confusing. The term "chair" of the Europeans is made to correspond to the American term "department" (e.g. the chair of mathematics and the department of mathematics). It is true that the author does not assert an absolute equivalence between the two: he says that the term "chair" has been replaced by the term "department"—an acute observation but in need of clarifying.

The long appendix on the teaching of Latin and the causes of its decline is excellent in many points, but the analysis of the principles of Jesuit pedagogy appears faulty. The suggested solution to the problem of the classics (to read them in translation instead of in the original) will be found inadequate on closer scrutiny.
There is a more fundamental defect of this book. The author of this otherwise excellent study does not seem to have taken into account certain basic principles of Jesuit pedagogy. We have ourselves, in several modest attempts, endeavored to define these principles. Father Matthew Fitzsimmons S.J. in a thorough review of Father Ganss' book (*Jesuit Educational Quarterly* New York XVII, 220 ff.) has done us the honor of quoting what we have said on the subject.

Father Ganss (on pp. 110-111) makes a brief remark that should be taken to heart by all educators: "A striking characteristic emerges from the correspondence of [the early Jesuits] and Ignatius about education: an energetic eagerness to experiment. They discussed and planned ceaselessly in their efforts both to devise a curriculum better adjusted to the emerging needs of their day and to improve their methods of teaching." *An eagerness to experiment*; that is a sign of youth and vitality. With it there is progress; without it there is stagnation.

That is of course only one side of the picture. The other side was Ignatius' certainty about the goal to be aimed at. The early Jesuits were eager to experiment with methods and with materials: but they always knew where they were going.

MIGUEL A. BERNAD

**ILL-CONCEIVED ASSISTANCE**


The thoughtful reader who leaves this booklet at the end of Chapter IV has learned an object lesson in sociology; that the foreigner who would help a retarded people must first understand the institutions he would like to change. If the reader decides to see the book through to the end, he begins to wonder whether the author has really learned the lesson he so aptly teaches in the early chapters.