Eric Verbiest recognizes that the Flemish missionary has been identified as a “more distant figure, a faint shadow” (as Golvers describes Verbiest on page 289). Eric Verbiest thus seeks to add to Ferdinand Verbiest’s academic image, which is studied more easily thanks to the numerous academic works he left behind, a more in-depth analysis of the missionary’s personality, as he was perceived by both European and Asian contemporaries. He succeeds in doing this. Verbiest’s character and skills are consistently portrayed in a very positive light; Schall has nothing but positive words (77), Chinese scholars such as Liu Yunde seek his friendship (84), even enemies (Muslim astronomers) are impressed by Verbiest’s performance (92). Sometimes, Verbiest’s engineering skills allow him to single handedly concoct unusual solutions (156). Verbiest thus comes off as a man with many skills, diplomacy, and deep emotions, for example when the author emphasizes how much pain Verbiest experiences due to the distrust of his fellow fathers (183). By the end, the reader has a much more personal sketch of a supposedly “distant figure,” even though some questions remain and are most likely unanswerable: did Verbiest really believe that his wholehearted dedication to the Kangxi emperor would eventually result in the ruler’s conversion? Was it possible for Verbiest to be the pivot of the Jesuit dilemma of serving both God and emperor and at the same time be one of the last missionaries to unite missionaries of all nationalist backgrounds working together in China? Is it possible for a personality to embody all these contradictions and still be considered loving and unifying by everyone around you?

Frederik Vermote

Social, Behavioral and Global Studies Department, California State
University, Monterey Bay, CA, USA

fvermote@csumb.edu

DOI:10.1163/22141332-08040011-09

Giulia Falato

Alfonso Vagnone’s Tongyou jiaoyu (On the Education of Children, c.1632): The Earliest Encounter between Chinese and European Pedagogy. Studies in the History of Christianity in East Asia, 3. Leiden: Brill, 2020. Pp. x + 298. Hb, €99,00.

In the history of the cultural exchanges between China and the West, “the spread of Chinese Learning to the West” and “the spread of Western Learning to the East” are the two components. What Dr. Giulia Falato discusses in her book belongs to this period of history. By investigating the prolific Italian Jesuit Alfonso Vagnone’s (1566–1640) *Tongyou jiaoyu* (童幼教育) Falato discusses in what way Western knowledge in the field of pedagogy, specifically Western

children's education knowledge, was introduced by the Jesuit to China. She divides her book into two parts: the historical background construction of the text, and the edition of the text based on the texts preserved in Zikawei Library and Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BNF), with transliteration, translation, punctuation, and annotation added.

Being an important part of knowledge *translation/ transmission* between China and the West, the shaping of the *Tongyou jiaoyu* has its own characteristics of the period. For example, the content selected by Vagnone for his book was not only influenced by the education traditions of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in Italy (9–15), but also by his own personal experience in Italy: the formation he obtained in the Jesuit colleges and the *Ratio studiorum* (15–21). After he arrived in China, the production of this book was also affected by the Chinese factors, such as the adjustment of the missionary strategy in China since the death of Matteo Ricci in 1610, in terms of the vocabulary used. Here, Falato cites the translation of the term “God” as an example. Vagnone used the Chinese term “Tianzhu” (天主), rather than that of “Shangdi” (上帝) to name “God,” as a result of the Jiading Conference. At that conference, the preference of Vagnone and others for “Shangdi” was rejected (123–26). Falato provides also an explanation for the fusion of two different cultures in light of the textual analysis of the *Tongyou jiaoyu* and those of Chinese texts (23–49). Falato also takes into account the integration of the shaping of the *Tongyou jiaoyu* with the reality of Chinese society, as seen in the parts “The Educational Debate in Late Ming China” (45–49) and “The Book’s Content and Main Topics: Between Classical and Renaissance Pedagogy” (60–64). However, here the author’s analysis is somewhat flawed. Although she acknowledges Chinese collaborators Duan Gun and Han Lin, and their contributions (55–57, 90–91) to the book’s production, she does not explain either the reasons for this cooperation between Jesuits and the Chinese literati, or the response of the Chinese intellectuals to the book itself (282–84).

Moreover, Falato traces the sources of some Chinese terms used in the *Tongyou jiaoyu* (some of them are still in use today), such as 公司 (gong si, 127), 教育 (jiao yu, 128–129). To them, Falato should have added the words 近視 (jin shi) and 眼鏡 (yan jing), both of which are on page 223, and the word 教師 (jiao shi, 169), which was originally written as 數師 (shu shi), but a reader changed it to “teacher” with a red pen (BNF, Chinois 3389, 15b). Thus Falato’s study opens the possibility of investigating what kind of Western sources Vagnone applied in his book, and the modifications made to accommodate it to the Chinese context. In so doing, Falato’s research complements earlier work by, for example, Thierry Meynard (*Tongyou jiaoyu jinzhu* [Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2017]).

Falato's etymology-based method is still ethnographic, that is, it emphasizes similarities on the surface of the text. For example, when looking for the source of the anecdote, "Not loving and respecting our parents who we often see, [but] loving and respecting God whom we do not see, is this anything but hypocrisy" (188), Falato (188n128) and Thierry Meynard in *Tongyou jiaoyu jinzhu* (184n1) assert that this anecdote is to be found in the First Epistle of John (4:20). But what the First Epistle of John says is the same as Vagnone does in terms of meaning but the content is somewhat different. Sentences with similar meanings can also be seen in other places in the Bible, such as the Gospel of Matthew (15:4–7) and the First Epistle of Timothy (3:5). Therefore, such methodology cannot conduct a more comprehensive study of the source of the texts, nor can it establish a reliable relationship between them, because it ignores other possibilities in the knowledge transmission.

Regarding scholarly criticism, the issues raised above can still be discussed due to the different perspectives of readers. On the other hand, however, there are other issues in this book, which, whether from the perspective of translation or from that of traditional Chinese philology, are undeniable. Among them, the gravest one is that Falato does not apply the traditional Chinese philology to deal with Vagnone's text, and leaves some problems untouched in the text, as we can find in the appendix, including text transliteration, English translation, and annotations. They include the use of the Vulgar, writing errors in traditional characters, transcript errors, punctuations (between sentences, paragraphs, and even phrases and words). Here are some samples of these. Regarding Vulgar characters, which were used by ordinary Chinese people, such as 賢 (xian), 庶 (shu), 躰 (ti), 裁 (zai), 覓 (mi), 畵 (tu) and 解 (jie) that appear in *Tongyou jiaoyu* should be changed into standard traditional characters: 賢, 庶, 體, 災, 覓, 圖, and 解. Wrong usage of traditional characters, for example, 後 (hou) and 后 (hou) are two different words. Generally, 后 in traditional literature means "empress," while 後 means "behind." Falato does not pay attention to such a distinction, using 後 instead of 后 to indicate the empress (142). Regarding transcript errors, we can find at least the following examples, 畫 (hua) is wrongly spelled out as 盡 (jin, 217), 污 (wu) as 汗 (han, 218), 鳥 (niao) as 烏 (wu, 220), 齋 (zhai) as 齊 (qi, 236), 裏 (li) as 衷 (zhong, 244), 寓 (yu) as 萬 (wan, 259), and 隙 (xi) as 障 (zhang, 277). Wrong punctuation can sometimes be found in the text. For example, the sentence 人性原係於天主則人始學返其本根終歸天主者義也 (ren xing yuan xi yu tian zhu ze ren shi xue fan qi ben gen zhong gui tian zhu zhe yi ye) is wrongly punctuated as 人性原係於天主，則人始學，返其本根，終歸天主者義也 (179). However, the correct one should be as following, 人性原係於天主，則人始學，返其本根，終歸天主者，義也. In the end, due to this mistake,

Falato translated 義 (yi) as “God’s righteousness.” However, it is used to affirm the previous content in the *Tongyou jiaoyu*, meaning “something is reasonable, right.”

Last but not least, there are some translation errors, which need to be revised. Here are examples to illustrate. 居士 (ju shi) can be treated as “scholar who is not in the service of the government,” but not as “retired scholar” (138). 蓋老婦得少夫，固為可醜 (gai lao fu de shao fu gu wei ke chou) means “It is shameful that an old woman got married to a young man,” while Falato translates it as “An old woman would be unlikely to obtain any husband because she would be considered ugly” (141–42). 君遂命既刻戮諸市，以警星家之妄者 (jun sui ming ji ke lu zhu shi yi jing xing jia zhi wang zhe) means “Thus, the sovereign ordered to kill immediately the astrologer in the municipality, so as to warn the people of the absurdities of the astrologer,” while Falato has it as “The sovereign, following the mandate, slaughtered all the people in the cities, as he was alarmed by the fortune-teller’s absurdities” (144–45). 或開蒙學 (huo kai meng xue) means “some open elementary education,” while Falato has it as “some open private schools” (165). 事急矣 (shi ji yi) means “The situation looks very urgent,” while Falato has it as “the situation was becoming chaotic” (171). 生人 (sheng ren) means “living person,” Giulia Falato has it as “all who are born” (186). Literally, 骨肉 (gu rou) is treated as “flesh and blood,” but here it is referred to as “children” (248–49). 父卒而遺寶資之重於子，大不如遺善友之眾 (fu zu er yi bao zi zhi zhong yu zi da bu ru yi shan you zhi zhong) means “When a father dies, it is better to leave his son a number of good friends than the significant wealth,” while Falato has it as “When a father dies and leaves behind significant wealth to his son, it is not so different from leaving him a number of good friends” (272). 臥寐弗思 (wo mei fu si) means “Sleeping in bed idly,” while Falato treats it as “Won’t think about rest” (279).

On the one hand, the problems in the translations reflect the author’s carelessness and the insufficient knowledge in Chinese philology. On the other hand, however, this is also a problem of the publisher, which did not take the author’s manuscript seriously and did not deliver such a highly professional manuscript to someone who really masters the Chinese language and Chinese philology. An obvious example is the Chinese sentence, 比亞氏古七大賢之一，在席不言 (bi ya shi gu qi da xian zhi yi zai xi bu yan), which appears twice in a row on page 215 of the book. Another problem is that both traditional and simplified characters are used in the book, just as we can find on pages 36n52; 40n66; 104; 108n47; 144; 175; 183n120; 184; 207; 238n229; 270n302; 283, and so on. If the editors took their job seriously, then these problems could have been avoided, especially when we take into account the consistent academic standards of Brill Publishing House, and the

city where it is located—Leiden, which is one of the most important sinology research centers in Europe, or even the world.

As a matter of fact, scholars who study the Jesuit writings in Chinese must know that the Jesuits followed this rule, “According to the ecclesiastical regulations, all translations of sacred books or books of another nature must be examined three times before they may be printed” (62). Judged from the publication standards set down by the Jesuits, Falato’s work still has room for a thorough revision. Nevertheless, her work makes a very important contribution to Sinology and the study of Christianity in East Asia in many ways.

Xie Mingguang

International Institute of Chinese Studies, Beijing Foreign Studies University,
Beijing, China

xiemingguang@bfsu.edu.cn

DOI:10.1163/22141332-08040011-10

Daniel Kendall, SJ and Gerald O’Collins, SJ

Jesuits, Theology, and the American Catholic Church. New York: Paulist Press, 2020.

Pp. xv + 155. Pb, \$24.95.

This slim volume sets an ambitious goal for itself: to provide a history of the influence that Jesuits have had on theology in the United States. As they explain in the preface, Gerald O’Collins, S.J. and the late Daniel Kendall, S.J. take “theology” in a broad sense, including philosophy (as fundamental theology), biblical studies, and spirituality. Hence, the authors seek to show how American Jesuits have influenced each of these areas of theology in the United States. For anyone involved with Jesuit education, this book seeks to provide a historical backdrop for our educational practices as we work to educate a new generation of young adults seeking both meaning and purpose in life. As a pupil of the Jesuits for almost a decade, the task of this study aligned well with personal questions I have always had about the history of the Jesuit order within the United States in general and about the overall context and aims of Jesuit theology in particular.

The book has seven chapters and a conclusion. The structure of the book is worth noting. The first chapter sets up a wide frame for the rest of the book. In broad strokes, it outlines the history of Jesuit colleges in the United States, from John Carroll’s founding of Georgetown to the modernism controversy and finally to the post-Vatican II context. The final chapter of the book deals