

together to create a new reality. Like our ancestors before us we must be self-determining subjects in naming and claiming this new reality.

JAMIE T. PHELPS

Loyola University Chicago

Chicago, Illinois

+++

RENAISSANCE AND MODERN THEOLOGY

- Topic: Historical Criticism
 Convener: William E. McConville, St. Francis of Assisi Church, Raleigh, NC
 Moderator: John E. Thiel, Fairfield University
 Presenter: David G. Schultenover, Marquette University

David Schultenover read a paper entitled "Luis Martín, the Black Pope of the Modernist Crisis, on Historical Criticism." Luis Martín García (1846–1906), superior general of the Society of Jesus at the time of the modernist crisis and sweeping church-state relations, was poised by office to be a foremost reader of the signs of the times. The paper focused on his reading of the signs with respect to historical methodology. It showed how the times—the multiple revolutions in Spain related to the French Revolution and Enlightenment thinkers as well as to Spain's loss of empire and consequent worsening economic conditions—brought to Martín's awareness the importance of preserving Jesuit archives and the Jesuit story. It argued that, as foundational to this effort, Martín enthusiastically but critically supported modern historical criticism. His support took him into many difficult situations, precipitated primarily by the Jesuit Bollandists' large-scale deconstruction of the Church's devotional and liturgical life.

The paper was divided into three parts, sandwiched between introductory and concluding comments. The introduction quoted two encyclicals of Leo XIII, his first, *Inscrutabili Dei consilio*, of 21 April 1878, "On the Evils of Society," and *Saepenumero* of 18 August 1883 on the opening of the Vatican archives, to show how Leo's words were carefully echoed by the words and deeds of Luis Martín.

Part one detailed the story of the founding of the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*, the project to produce the still ongoing publication of the most important documents relating to the Society of Jesus. Part two explained how Martín took the initiative to continue writing general histories of the Society of Jesus, assistance by assistance, that had been interrupted by the suppression of the Society in 1773. Finally, part three narrated Martín's struggle to bring Jesuit writers to be more judicious in their historical criticism, in the face of ecclesiastical criticism for what were deemed excesses, particularly in the Bollandists' effort to deconstruct the Church's liturgical and devotional life.

Relative to Martín's reading of the signs of the times, the paper reached the following conclusions: First in chronology, Martín read the handwriting on the

wall—history-changing revolutions in Spain and elsewhere in Europe—and realized the importance of preserving primary sources and producing narratives based on them, lest they be destroyed or lost to confiscation. Second, when Martín was called to the general's curia to study Jesuit formation, the fragility of the Jesuit record again impressed him: the Society's suppression in 1773 had interrupted the writing of Jesuit history, so that now, a century later, young Jesuits were left without serviceable histories that would help them understand who they are meant to be. It was, therefore, once again his reading of the signs of the times that led him to see the need to preserve Jesuit records and write Jesuit history. The primary benefit would be to Jesuits themselves, but an important secondary benefit would be that others interested in the Jesuit story, friend or foe, would have ready access to primary sources and critical histories. Third, writing histories of the Society credible to contemporaries would mandate the use of critical methods that arose out of the Enlightenment. Martín was open to the new methods but also not uncritical of them. He fully yet cautiously supported their use as a necessary methodology. Finally, his position as superior general of the Jesuit order made him one of the Church's chief readers of the signs of the times. He was intimately involved in church-state issues stemming from expulsions of Jesuits from various European countries and the secularization of minds as well as of properties. In this role, the shrewd Leo XIII relied on him heavily and the less shrewd Pius X, less heavily. Also in this role, Martín often found himself between a rock and a hard place: on the one hand he needed to support historical critical methods as crucial to the credibility of a very costly historical enterprise; on the other hand, proponents of these methods and their findings often clashed with proponents of the old methods, even among Jesuits themselves.

In executing his office of superior general in a most parlous time, Luis Martín was both courageous and astute. Discussion explored a number of issues prompted by the presentation, among them, the hermeneutical principles at work in the *Monumenta* project, connections between Martín's circumstances and those faced by American figures in the Modernist crisis, and the centrality of the challenge of historical criticism to understanding what was at stake in the Modernist debate. The audience was especially appreciative of Schultenover's rich paper.

JOHN E. THIEL
Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut