

Living History

An Historian's Journey to Jesuit Education

Paul F. Grendler
University of Toronto (Canada)

On 2 October 2018, Professor Paul F. Grendler delivered the fourth annual 2018 Feore Family Lecture on Jesuit Studies at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, USA. At that time he received the George E. Ganss, S.J. Award for his “scholarly contributions to the field of Jesuit Studies” from the Institute for Advanced Jesuit Studies of Boston College. This is the text of the lecture. It has been slightly revised to add a handful of footnotes and to delete local references and comments about North American universities. A biographical note and bibliography of Prof. Grendler's Publications in Jesuit Educational History follow the article.

I am pleased and honored to accept the George E. Ganss, S.J., Award. Although I did not know Ganss (1905–2000), I have read his two books. *Saint Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University* (1956) is an important pioneering work, and his English translation of the Jesuit Constitutions (*The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, 1970), with its lucid translation, excellent introduction, and explanatory notes is extraordinarily useful. I deeply appreciate the Ganss Award. And it is very unexpected for reasons that will become clear.

Here is a little-known fact about historians: few of us intended to become historians. I had no intention of becoming an historian. And if anyone had predicted that I would become an historian of Jesuit education, I would have been incredulous. The rest of this lecture will explain how I became an historian of Jesuit education and what I have learned on my journey.

I was born in a town of 700 people in northern Iowa, a rural state in the middle of the United States, and I lived in several other tiny towns until I graduated from high school in 1953 in the metropolis of Greene, Iowa, population 1,300. My parents never had the opportunity to attend university and had little money. But they expected that I and my two brothers would be university graduates from as far back as I can remember. So, I had various jobs before and after school and nights to earn money. I began at Loras College in Dubuque, Iowa, thanks to a competitive examination scholarship that covered tuition. I and two hundred to three hundred other rising

seniors wrote a three-hour examination on a Saturday morning. I was fortunate to be one of the six who won tuition scholarships to Loras College. Tuition was \$300. Today the figure seems so small, but it was a significant sum for my parents. A series of jobs, especially as a waiter in restaurants, paid most of the other expenses of my undergraduate career.

What should I major in? I was good in mathematics, so my parents quite sensibly suggested that I aim to become a certified (chartered) public accountant. But what I really wanted to do was to play the piano, which I had begun at an early age, and also the trombone. So I became a music major. After some time at Loras College, my ambitions rose. With the support of my piano teacher, I applied to the Oberlin Conservatory of Music. I prepared an audition tape playing a Beethoven piano sonata and was accepted.

I arrived at the Oberlin Conservatory — and discovered how good I was not. One of the glories of conservatories is that students are constantly listening to each other playing, which enables them to assess their own abilities. I realized that I was not that good, and I lacked perfect pitch or excellent relative pitch. I calculated that the best that I could aspire to was high school music teacher. That is an honorable and satisfying profession, but it was not for me. So, I transferred to Oberlin College.

Again the question was, what should I major in? English literature and history attracted me. I opted for European history. In retrospect, it was predetermined, because I was always interested in history. While I was in high school the six volumes of Winston Churchill's *The Second World War (1948-1953)* appeared one by one, and the Greene, Iowa, public library bought them. So I read them in study hall and everywhere else, every word including the documentary appendices.

When I decided to major in history I was fortunate to encounter an able and dedicated teacher. In my senior year at Oberlin I took three courses in nineteenth- and twentieth-century European history from George M. Kren (1926–2000), who was a one-year replacement for a faculty member on leave. As my interest in history blossomed, he recommended that I go to graduate school at the University of Wisconsin at Madison in order to study with his mentor there, George L. Mosse (1918–1999). But my historical interests had shifted to the Reformation or the Renaissance and Reformation. At that time Oberlin had a small Protestant-oriented graduate school of theology. Its library was quiet, so I went there to study. The shelves of the main reading room held many standard histories of the Reformation,

which I began to read. The complex history of the sixteenth century attracted me.

To my pleasant surprise, the University of Wisconsin accepted me. At that time Wisconsin had one of the three or four best history graduate schools in America. And Mosse accepted me as a graduate student. Again I was fortunate, because my undergraduate record was undistinguished, to put it mildly. But I received no fellowship, which was understandable.

Mosse was a brilliant, original, and prolific historian, and a demanding teacher. He wrote several books on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe including a well-known textbook on Reformation Europe. Mosse emphasized that the way to understand the culture of a period of history was not by examining the most brilliant thinkers, but by looking at the mediocre secondary intellectuals who wrote works that attracted wide audiences. Their ideas became ideologies that moved people to act. He is best remembered for his many books on nineteenth- and twentieth-century European cultural history, including pioneering studies on the intellectual origins of the Nazi ideology.

In my first semester of graduate study at the University of Wisconsin, Mosse lectured on the intellectual history of sixteenth-century Europe at 11 a.m. Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. His lectures were stimulating and provocative. After one of his first lectures I left saying to myself, how can he interpret Luther in that way? So I skipped lunch and went straight to the library to look up the text (in translation) he had discussed. I found that yes, he had read the text, and yes, it could be understood his way. After that, I did not skip lunch. His seminars were even more stimulating. His students were writing master's theses and doctoral dissertations on sixteenth-, seventeenth-, nineteenth-, and twentieth-century European history. Hence, the papers and discussion flew from Calvinism to Marxism, to the Munich Revolution of 1919, back to the sixteenth century for a paper on the Heidelberg Catechism, forward to French Fascism, and elsewhere. I was in awe of Mosse and the other students. And I was frantically trying to keep up with them.

At that time graduate students had to write a master's thesis. I settled on a topic in sixteenth-century French intellectual history. But instead of finishing my master's thesis in the summer of 1960, I decided to make my first visit to Europe. I found a very inexpensive student flight to Paris, and I bought a youth hostel pass. I spent the summer hitch-hiking around Europe, from Paris to Ljubljana. I

visited Berlin before the wall was erected and argued the merits of democracy and communism with East German students in a mixture of awkward German and English. Most important, I discovered Italy, especially Venice and Florence. I was so attracted to the country and its history that when I returned to Madison, I changed my focus from France to Italy. I wanted to study the Italian Renaissance. So I enrolled in a beginning Italian class. This was in addition to graduate history classes, holding a teaching assistantship, and finishing my master's thesis.

In the fall of 1961 I was again very fortunate. Mosse went on leave and the department of history hired Giorgio Spini (1916–2005) from the University of Florence to substitute for him.¹ This was probably on Mosse's recommendation, because they knew each other. The department of history made me Spini's assistant. That was because I was the only graduate student in the department interested in Italian history. Assistant sounds impressive. But I only checked references, graded some papers, and helped Spini to navigate the University of Wisconsin bureaucracy, which was much more extensive than Italian university bureaucracies. I would meet him in the morning and his mail box would be full of pieces of paper. And he would ask me, "What do I do with all this?" And I would tell him which office of the university it came from, which communication he should answer, and which to throw away. Or I identified the campus group that was inviting him to speak. Spini was very helpful to me. He suggested a dissertation topic, and he wrote a letter that helped me win a Fulbright fellowship enabling me to spend the academic year 1962–1963 in Italy researching my dissertation.

Although I did not realize it fully at the time, I was a member of a generation of graduate students and young scholars who benefitted directly from two major developments in North American Renaissance studies. In my classes at the University of Toronto I sometimes asked a trick question: which two political figures indirectly contributed the most to the growth of Renaissance studies in North America? The answers are Adolf Hitler and U. S. Senator J. William Fulbright (1905–1995). Hitler, with the assistance of Mussolini, drove into exile a host of fine scholars, most of them young and Jewish. The majority went to the United States, some went to England and Canada. They brought with them European

1 Spini, a Waldensian and a socialist, was a brilliant and versatile historian who published books on sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and nineteenth-century Italy, plus a book on New England Puritanism.

scholarly traditions and much technical expertise. Most important, they understood European history in a way that only those who have lived it can. Before their arrival, there was little significant study of the Renaissance in North America. Medieval studies flourished; Renaissance history hardly existed. The great European refugee scholars created the field in North America. Any scholar of my generation who heard their lectures or read their books in the 1950s and 1960s can testify to this.

Refugee scholars strongly influenced my scholarly development. George Kren was born in Austria. In 1938, at the age of twelve, he and his family fled Austria and came to the United States.² George Mosse was the youngest son of a very wealthy Jewish publishing family in Berlin that opposed the rise of Hitler. The family left Germany in 1933 when Mosse was fifteen. He came to the United States, earned a Ph. D. from Harvard, and taught at the University of Wisconsin.³

The Fulbright Act, a law of the American Congress named for Senator Fulbright, provided funds enabling young American scholars to go to Europe to study, that is, to go to libraries and archives to look at the sources at first hand. Thanks to a Fulbright fellowship my wife — we had just married — and I set sail for Italy in October 1962. The Fulbright stipend was enough for one person, but provided no funds for spouses. So, I borrowed some money and we lived and studied in Italy very modestly.

My first three books dealt with Italian Renaissance topics but not education nor the Jesuits. An unlikely source planted the idea for *Schooling in Renaissance Italy*, which was the beginning of my interest in Jesuit schools.

In the academic year 1971–1972 we were living in the outskirts of Florence. Our son, then aged six, attended an Italian elementary school. My wife and I found his notebooks (quaderni) and his description of the pedagogy in the school intriguing. It was more oral and there was more dictation than in Canadian elementary education or what I remembered from my early schooling. It seemed to echo a distant past. I thought no further about the matter until I finished the book I was doing and looked for a new project. I was

2 For Kren's condensed curriculum vitae, see *The Second Generation. Émigrés from Nazi Germany as Historians. With a Biobibliographic Guide*, ed. Andreas W. Daum, Hartmut Lehmann, and James J. Sheehan, New York: Berghahn, 2016, 23, 34, 36, 397.

3 See George L. Mosse, *Confronting History. A Memoir*, Madison, Wis: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2000; and *The Second Generation*, 414–16 and from the index.

and still am interested in intellectual history within its institutional and social contexts. Hence, an idea came to me: why not look at elementary and secondary education in the Italian Renaissance? They were obviously of great importance to their own age and to future centuries. But we knew very little about them. What kinds of schools existed? Who attended? How many boys and girls went to school? What did they learn? Who were the teachers? What were the textbooks?

From my previous research I knew that on 13 November 1564 Pope Pius IV issued a bull requiring all teachers to make professions of faith before the local bishop or his representative. It was a Counter Reformation measure designed to make sure that teachers taught Cicero instead of Calvin. I wondered if this bull was implemented, always an issue in Italian church history. If so, were there any records? Where would they be? There was nothing in the Venetian state archives. So, I looked to the Archivio della Curia Patriarcale, the archive of the Venetian Patriarchate. I learned that it was a small archive open part time, and the archivist was a local parish priest. I obtained his address, went to see him, and explained what I was looking for. He promised to have a look and we agreed to meet at the archive. When I arrived he brought out a big bundle of documents which he said might be what I was seeking. Indeed, it was. The documents were the professions of faith sworn by 258 Venetian teachers in 1587 and 1588. In the course of professing their loyalty to Catholicism, they offered information about themselves, their schools, and what they taught. So for several days in May 1976 I sat in a little upper room with the windows wide open in a building adjacent to the Basilica of St. Mark reading documents. It was exciting because of what the documents revealed. And it was pleasant, because the voices from Piazza di San Marco came floating upward. This was the beginning of a broad investigation that led to *Schooling in Renaissance Italy*, published in 1989.

A major finding of the book was the curriculum revolution of the fifteenth century. Italian pedagogical humanists discarded the late medieval curriculum that taught a non-classical or only partly classical Latin. The humanists substituted ancient authors just rediscovered or newly appreciated. These texts taught Latin grammar, rhetoric, poetry, history, and moral philosophy based on ancient authors. Cicero's *Epistulae ad familiares* became the text for teaching Latin prose. The works of Virgil were used to teach Latin poetry. And Caesar's books taught ancient Roman history. Sallust and Valerius Maximus offered good moral examples. Humanist

teachers taught the ancient classical texts because they believed that the classics taught both eloquence and virtue. It was the beginning of the humanities curriculum that dominated liberal arts education in European and North American education until about the middle of the twentieth century.

But what about the Jesuits? The last seventy pages of *Schooling* introduce the religious order schools of the Catholic Reformation, especially Jesuit schools. When I looked at Jesuit schools, I noticed an important point. The Jesuit lower school curriculum, that is, classes in Latin grammar, the humanities, and rhetoric, taught the same humanistic curriculum and the same classical texts that fifteenth-century Italian humanists taught. Except that the Jesuits taught a highly structured and better organized version of the humanistic studies curriculum. It included oral recitations, composition exercises, repetitions, homework, reviews, and competitions. The Jesuit curriculum guaranteed that the students learned classical Latin well. In short, while most scholars saw the Jesuits as a Counter Reformation religious order whose chief purpose was to teach Catholicism and combat Protestantism, I saw the Jesuits teaching the Renaissance curriculum that developed before the Protestant Reformation.

In the years spent researching and writing *Schooling in Renaissance Italy*, I made my first visit to the Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu. This was late May 1977, long before it moved to its more modern and climate-controlled quarters of today. My visit began with an interview with the archivist, Edmund Lamalle (1900–1989). Father Lamalle was a learned Belgian Jesuit who spent many years in Rome and had a unique speech pattern. He began every sentence in Italian, then after a few words switched to French for long phrases, then returned to Italian at the end of the sentence. Although John O'Malley had warned me, it was still a dizzying experience. I have made many more visits to the Jesuit archive in Rome, a cosmopolitan environment. The scholar at the next table might be reading documents in Chinese or Japanese or Latin or Vietnamese or a European vernacular. Some researchers may have life stories almost as interesting as the Jesuits they study.

The next step on the road to Jesuit education was the discovery of Jesuit universities. It began at the prompting of one of the great German Jewish refugee scholars who created the field of Renaissance studies in North America. This was Paul Oskar Kristeller (1905–

1999) who taught at Columbia University.⁴ Kristeller did pioneering scholarship on Italian Renaissance universities in the 1940s and 1950s. He intended to write a history of Italian Renaissance universities, but his many other projects prevented him from doing so. So he persuaded his extremely able former student, Charles Schmitt (1933–1986), to write the book on Italian Renaissance universities. Charles was then teaching at the Warburg Institute in the University of London. He had already published numerous studies on philosophy and science in Renaissance universities and was the perfect choice. He was also one of my closest friends in the profession. My wife and I met Charles and his wife in Florence in the academic year 1962–1963 when we were both Fulbrighters. In early April 1986 Charles wrote to me — a real paper letter — that he was about to start the book about Italian Renaissance universities. But first he had to go to the University of Padua to deliver some lectures. He went, gave the first lecture, then collapsed and died in Padua on 15 April 1986, at the age of fifty-three. It was a great loss to scholarship and to me.

Then one evening in July 1986 I received a telephone call from Professor Kristeller. He had never called me before, and never did again. He had helped me get an article published in 1966, but we had had little contact since. I read his works and admired him from a distance. Without preamble he strongly urged me to write the book that Charles could not write. He was forceful and persuasive, even at eighty years of age. I was very surprised, because this was three years before *Schooling in Renaissance Italy* was published. How could he have reached his decision? But Kristeller seemed to know everything that was going on in the field, and had ideas about what needed to be done. Taken aback, I only promised to consider his strong request.

As I finished the book on preuniversity education in Italy, the idea attracted me more and more. After I forwarded the *Schooling* manuscript to a press in 1987, I immediately began work on *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance* which was finished in 2000 and published in 2002. It is dedicated to the memory of Schmitt and Kristeller.

My research on Italian Renaissance universities uncovered the little known fact that Jesuits taught in some Italian universities. And

4 Kristeller hardly needs further identification. A good assessment of his impact on Italian Renaissance studies can be found in *Kristeller Reconsidered: Essays on His Life and Scholarship*, ed. by John Monfasani, New York: Italica Press, 2006.

that discovery completed my journey to historian of Jesuit education. Since then I have focused almost exclusively on the history of Jesuit education. And this has stimulated some observations about Jesuit schools and universities in Europe between 1548 and 1773.⁵

As is well known, Jesuit schools were free; students did not pay any fees. This was very important, because at that time Europe had very few free schools. Free public education did not become widely available in Europe until the late eighteenth century and, more often, in the nineteenth century.

Although the Jesuits taught for free, the schools still had heavy expenses. Who paid the bills? The surprising answer was that local civil governments paid the bills. Jesuit day schools in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries almost always received public funding. The pattern was this. Having heard that the Jesuits were excellent teachers, a town council asked them to come and create a school. The Jesuits then stated their requirements. They needed their own church, either owned by them or set aside for their exclusive use. They needed a residence and a school building. And they needed enough funding to support all of the Jesuits and all of their ministries in the town. This meant the school, catechetical instruction, preaching, hearing confessions, comforting the sick and dying, and any other religious and spiritual service they provided. They also needed money for the living expenses of the Jesuit brothers who did the cooking, cleaning, and other mundane tasks. So the town, or the prince, or the bishop, or individual donors provided an endowment, usually properties whose income went to the Jesuits.

However, endowment income almost never was enough. Hence, the Jesuits and the town also negotiated an annual payment for the school and signed a contract. The town agreed to pay the local Jesuit college a fixed annual amount from tax revenues for its educational services. In return the Jesuits promised to teach a specific number and level of classes. For example, the Jesuits might agree to teach three classes, namely, Latin grammar, the humanities, and rhetoric for a certain amount, and would add a logic class for a larger payment. The contracts normally contained penalty clauses. The town would pay the Jesuits less if they did not teach all the contracted classes. But if the town decreased its payments, the Jesuits would drop a class. Contracts were usually limited to a number of years but were

5 For limited elaboration and bibliography concerning statements about Jesuit schools and universities in the rest of this lecture, see my works, especially Paul F. Grendler, *Jesuit Schools and Universities in Europe 1548–1773*, (Brill Research Perspectives, Jesuit Studies 1), Leiden: Brill, 2019.

renewable indefinitely. The arrangement relieved the town of the burdens of finding, hiring, and paying teachers and supervising the school, because the Jesuits operated the school and made all the pedagogical decisions. Most important, the Society provided well-educated and dedicated teachers.

The fact that rulers and city councils across Europe contracted with the Jesuits to operate their Latin schools demonstrated that they saw them as beneficial to their communities. This was true; even their enemies conceded that the Jesuits were excellent teachers. They were also good for the town's budget, because the annual payment to the Jesuits was less than the expense of paying salaries to the same number of lay teachers.

Hence, one can call Jesuit schools semi-public or half-public schools. They were public because funding came from tax revenues. They were public because they were free of charge to the students. They were public because they were open to all male students who passed an entrance examination. They were half-public because they did not enroll female students. (Neither did non-Jesuit Latin schools at that time.) On the other hand, they were Jesuit schools because the city had no control over the school once the contract was signed. The Jesuits provided a fixed, reliable curriculum and did all the teaching. When the Society was suppressed, civic authorities often took control of Jesuit schools and continued them as before. Sometimes the city even hired former Jesuits to teach in them. In the long stretch of history Jesuit schools were a step on the road toward universal public education that fully arrived only in the second half of the nineteenth and in the twentieth centuries.

A number of myths cling to the history of Jesuit education, but do not survive historical scrutiny. Many books state that the Jesuits taught mostly upper class students, or only upper class and middle class students. This was not true. It could not possibly have been true because the sons of the elite were very few, while an overwhelming number of potential students came from the middle and lower classes. But documenting this is difficult, because very few student matriculation lists survive. And such lists are useless for social analysis unless they contain the names, titles, and occupations of fathers of students.

Fortunately, a handful of matriculation lists from France and Germany with names, titles, and occupations of fathers exist. They demonstrate that only about five per cent of the students in Jesuit day schools were sons of nobles, and about six percent were the sons of commoners of standing and wealth. Perhaps another ten to

fifteen per cent were the sons of officeholders of some significance. That leaves about seventy-five percent of students who came from the middle and lower classes. And the day schools were engines of upward social mobility: when a lower-class boy attended a Jesuit school, he acquired facility in Latin, which practically guaranteed his rise in society

Moreover, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Jesuit day schools probably increased the enrollment of students from the lower and middle classes by restoring ABC classes (called *le scolette* in Italy). When the Jesuits first began teaching in the middle of the sixteenth century they offered some ABC classes. These taught reading, writing, the catechism, and a little Latin morphology, that is, declining nouns, conjugating verbs, and very elementary syntax, to young illiterate boys. But Ignatius of Loyola eliminated them, because the Society had a severe teacher shortage in its first fifty years. Parents were unhappy, but Ignatius believed that the Society should concentrate its resources on Latin instruction plus philosophy. The Jesuits also instituted entrance examinations: a boy had to be able to read, write, and comprehend a little Latin before entering the lowest Latin grammar class in a Jesuit school.

However, in the middle of the seventeenth century the Jesuits brought back the ABC schools in Italy and possibly elsewhere. Local Jesuit communities used part of the payments from towns to hire and pay a secular priest or a layman to teach reading, writing, and a little Latin grammar in a beginner class located elsewhere than the Jesuit school. The ABC classes were free, and the teacher followed Jesuit pedagogical directions. After a year or two in an ABC class, the student who wished to attend the Jesuit school submitted himself for examination. If he passed, he entered the lowest grammar class where a Jesuit taught him. Little is known about the revival of ABC classes. It is possible that the Jesuits restored them because parents wanted them. And by the seventeenth century Jesuit colleges had the funds to hire non-Jesuits to teach in them.

A major reason why scholars see the Jesuits as teachers to the upper class was the Jesuit noble boarding school. The ordinary Jesuit school was a day school. However, princes and noble parents also asked the Jesuits to create and operate noble boarding schools. The Jesuits agreed because they wanted to educate boys to become virtuous Catholic adult leaders of society who would act for the common good. Since only noble boys had a realistic chance of becoming adult leaders of state, church, and society in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, the Jesuits educated them in

boarding schools.

The noble boarding schools enrolled boys of proven noble birth aged about ten to eighteen. They lived in a residence and attended Latin classes in the local Jesuit day school. Those classes were free. But this was only part of their education. The Jesuits hired laymen to teach the noble boys riding, fencing, designing fortifications, vernacular languages, singing, dancing, and how to play musical instruments. In other words, the noble boys were taught skills and graces appropriate for court life, diplomacy, and military command. This part of their education was not free: noble parents paid high fees for room, board, and lessons in fencing, riding, and other skills for their sons. They also paid to give their sons the opportunity to bond with other noble boys in the hope that these connections would prove advantageous in the future. The similarity to today's English public schools and American prep schools is real.

To be sure, noble boarding schools were only a small part of the Society's educational ministry. The vast majority of Jesuit noble boarding schools had small enrollments, typically sixty to one hundred fifty boys. Jesuit day schools were much larger; a few had 2,000 students. And there were many more day schools than noble boarding schools. For example, around 1700 Italy had about 120 Jesuit day schools and about fifteen Jesuit noble schools.

Did noble boys who attended Jesuit boarding schools act for the common good as adults? Did they behave differently from noble boys who did not attend Jesuit boarding schools? It is probably impossible to answer these questions. But there was a cost to the Society. By operating noble boarding schools the Jesuits supported and became identified with a hierarchical social and political order. And nobles who attended Jesuit boarding schools did not save the Society from attacks and suppression in the second half of the eighteenth century.

The Jesuits also taught in universities. The first Jesuits had no intention of becoming university professors. Drinking coffee in faculty common rooms did not appeal to them. They became university professors in response to cries for help from Catholic universities in central Europe, which had emptied because of the Protestant Reformation. Professors became Protestants and left, while enrollments plummeted. So a prince-bishop or duke or emperor asked the Jesuits to revive the local university. And Ignatius of Loyola sent some of his most talented Jesuits to the universities of Ingolstadt, Trier, and Vienna.

But Ignatius only reluctantly authorized Jesuits to teach in

universities, and he restricted their university participation. He insisted that the Jesuits should teach only the humanities, philosophy, and theology. He forbade them to teach civil law, canon law, and medicine, because he judged these to be far from the purpose of the Society. This handicapped the Jesuits, because universities in those centuries had only three advanced faculties, law, medicine, and theology. Ignatius also wanted only Jesuit universities, that is, universities under the complete control of the Society, in which Jesuits would govern the entire university and do all or almost all of the teaching.

Subsequent Jesuits were eager to teach in universities and had fewer worries concerning their role in them than Ignatius. And they were welcomed. Catholic Europe had about eighty-five universities between 1548 and 1773, and the Jesuits taught in about half of them. The Jesuits probably did more university teaching than all the other religious orders combined in those centuries. However, only thirteen of the approximately forty universities in which the Jesuits taught were Jesuit universities, meaning universities in which a Jesuit was the rector and the Society governed the whole university. These universities followed the guidelines of Ignatius. They were small and they concentrated on the humanities, philosophy, and theology. All the teachers were Jesuits except for one to three laymen who taught civil law and medicine. The universities of Bamberg, Cagliari, Dillingen, Évora, Graz, and Vilnius were typical Jesuit universities. Many Jesuit universities of those centuries no longer exist.

Most Jesuits taught in about thirty civic-Jesuit universities. These were universities in which the civil power — king, emperor, prince, or city — gave the Society an important position in the university. The Society did not rule the entire university, but shared teaching and governance with other groups and units. Although the importance of the Jesuits in civic-Jesuit universities varied, they typically dominated the teaching of the humanities and philosophy. But the Jesuits had no involvement with the faculties of law and medicine.

Civic-Jesuit universities had corporate structures in which the different faculties were largely independent of each other. When different units disagreed, the civil authority made the decision. The civic-Jesuit university was not the preference of Ignatius of Loyola. But his successors accepted a limited but still substantial position in civic-Jesuit universities across Europe in order to teach the humanities and their version of Aristotelian philosophy. And the Jesuits wished to help the souls of university students, who were notorious for fighting and assaulting the virtue of the women

of the town. The universities of Parma, Prague, and Vienna were prominent civic-Jesuit universities.

The Jesuits also joined civic-Jesuit universities in order to teach what they called “good theology,” meaning Jesuit Thomism, rather than Dominican Thomism or Franciscan Scotism. The Jesuits always sought to dominate faculties of theology, with mixed results. In some universities they filled all of the professorships of theology. In others they obtained a few positions, while other religious orders held the majority of positions. And they were shut out in some universities. For example, no Jesuits filled university professorships of theology at the University of Coimbra in Portugal in the sixteenth century. Then in 1597 King Philip II nominated Francisco Suárez (1543–1617), probably the greatest living Catholic theologian at the time. The faculty of theology objected on the grounds that he lacked a doctorate, which was true. So, Suárez obtained a quick doctorate by examination in the Jesuit University of Évora and was appointed. The faculty of theology still did not want him, but the king could not be denied. Despite some conflicts, the civic-Jesuit university arrangement worked well.

* * *

This is a little of what I have learned as an historian of Jesuit education. I encourage other scholars to study Jesuit education. There is much to be learned and an abundance of sources that have never been read or have attracted little attention. Historians should concentrate on what happened, not what the Jesuit Constitutions and the superior generals in Rome said should happen. The Jesuits operated in the secular world and in partnership or conflict with civil society, which led to surprising results. A certain amount of early Jesuit history consisted of entrepreneurial Jesuits who proceeded aggressively and imaginatively in towns far from Rome. They told the general what they had done after it was too late for him to say no. Jesuit educational history is mostly local history: what happened in one city or territory did not necessarily happen elsewhere. The Jesuits might have great success in one town and fail in the next. Expect the unexpected.

I had no intention of becoming an historian, and I could not have imagined becoming an historian of Jesuit education. But I am very happy that I did both. I have learned a great deal and have made many friends along the way. I intend to continue studying Jesuit schools and universities until I reach the last archive.

Biographical note

Paul F. Grendler is Professor of History Emeritus of the University of Toronto. He received his B.A. degree from Oberlin College in 1959, and his Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in 1964. He taught Italian and European history at the University of Toronto from 1964 to 1998. He has published 11 books and 145 articles. *The Roman Inquisition and the Venetian Press 1540–1605* (1977) received the Marraro Prize of the American Catholic Historical Association. *Schooling in Renaissance Italy* (1989) received the Marraro Prize of the American Historical Association. *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance* (2002) also won the Marraro Prize of the American Historical Association. *The University of Mantua, the Gonzaga, and the Jesuits 1584–1630* (2009) describes how the Jesuits and the duke of Mantua created a university. *The Jesuits and Italian Universities 1548–1773* (2017) received the 2018 Marraro Prize of the American Catholic Historical Association.

Paul F. Grendler was editor-in-chief of *The Encyclopedia of the Renaissance* (6 volumes, 1999), which won the Dartmouth Medal of the American Library Association and the Roland H. Bainton Prize. He has received fellowships from the Guggenheim Foundation, Villa I Tatti (The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies), the Woodrow Wilson International Center, The Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada, and other organizations.

Grendler has been president of the Renaissance Society of America, which awarded him its Paul Oskar Kristeller Lifetime Achievement Award in 2017, the Society for Italian Historical Studies, which awarded him its Lifetime Achievement Award in 1999, and the American Catholic Historical Association. He was elected to the American Philosophical Society in 2002. In 2014 he received the Premio Internazionale Galileo Galilei. In 2018 he was awarded the George H. Ganss, S.J. Award for his contributions to the field of Jesuit Studies. Professor Grendler lives in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA.



Bibliography of Publications in Jesuit Educational History by Paul F. Grendler (listed in chronological order)

- Schooling in Renaissance Italy. Literacy and Learning, 1300–1600.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989. Italian translation: *La scuola nel Rinascimento Italiano*. Traduzione Guido Annibaldi. Roma: Editori Laterza, 1991, 388–408.
- “I tentativi dei gesuiti d’entrare nelle università italiane tra ‘500 e ‘600,” in *Gesuiti e università in Europa (secoli XVI–XVIII)*. *Atti del Convegno di Studi, Parma 13–15 dicembre 2001*. A cura di Gian Paolo Brizzi e Roberto Greci, Bologna: CLUEB, 2002, 37–51.
- The Universities of the Italian Renaissance.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- “Italian Schools and University Dreams during Mercurian’s Generalate.” In *The Mercurian Project. Forming Jesuit Culture 1573–1580*. Edited by Thomas M. McCoog SJ, Roma: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, and St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2004, 483–522.
- The University of Mantua, the Gonzaga & the Jesuits, 1584–1630.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- “The Jesuit Education of Benedetto Pamphilj at the Collegio Romano.” In *The Pamphilj and the Arts. Patronage and Consumption in Baroque Rome*. Edited by Stephanie C. Leone, Chestnut Hill, MA: McMullen Museum of Art, 2011, 85–94.
- “The Attempt to Found a Civic and Jesuit University in Chambéry, 1679–1681.” In *Los jesuitas. Religión política y educación (siglos XVI–XVIII)*. José Martínez, Henar Pizarro Llorente, y Esther Jiménez Pablo (coordinadores), 3 vols. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2012, vol. 1: 407–32
- “Fifteenth-Century Catechesis, the Schools of Christian Doctrine, and the Jesuits.” In *Prima di Carlo Borromeo. Istituzione, religione e società agli inizi del Cinquecento*. A cura di Alberto Rocca e Paola Vismara, Milano: Biblioteca Ambrosiana (Studia Borromaica 26), Roma: Bulzoni Editore, 2012, 291–319.
- “The Attitudes of the Jesuits Toward Erasmus.” In *Collaboration, Conflict, and Continuity in the Reformation: Essays in Honour of James M. Estes on His Eightieth Birthday*. Edited by Konrad Eisenbichler, Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2014, 363–85.
- “The Attitudes of the Jesuits Toward Juan Luis Vives.” In *Neo-Latin and the Humanities. Essays in Honour of Charles E. Fantazzi*. Edited by Luc Dietz, Timothy Kircher, and Jonathan Reid,

Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2014, 123–42.

“Jesuit Schools in Europe. A Historiographical Essay.” *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 1 (2014): 7–25.

“Láinez and the Schools in Europe.” In *Diego Láinez (1512–1565) and his Generalate. Jesuit with Jewish Roots. Close Confidant of Ignatius of Loyola. Preeminent Theologian of the Council of Trent.* Edited by Paul Oberholzer, Roma: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2015, 649–78.

“The Culture of the Jesuit Teacher 1548–1773.” *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 3 (2016): 17–41.

The Jesuits and Italian Universities 1548–1773. Washington, D.C: The Catholic University of America Press, 2017.

Jesuit Schools and Universities in Europe 1548–1773. Leiden: Brill (Brill Research Perspectives in Jesuit Studies 1), 2019.

“Philosophy in Jesuit Schools and Universities,” in *Jesuit Philosophy on the Eve of Modernity.* Edited by Cristiano Casalini, Leiden: Brill, 2019, 13–33.

