

Boniface VIII, famed for his uncompromising bull of 1302, *Unam Sanctam*, with its bellowing “extra ecclesiam nulla salus.” The subtitle of the chapter, which tells the tale of a pope who died a man broken by secular rulers tired of his megalomania is simply “Big Claims, Big Humiliation” (129). O’M.’s assessment of Pius XII’s papacy during World War II is evenhanded and refreshing in its candor and realism concerning the impossibility of a neat answer to the question “Saint or Sinner.” O’M. reminds readers of the endearing words John XXIII spoke on hearing the diagnosis of his terminal stomach cancer: “My bags are packed” (303). O’M.’s warning that Paul VI, a pontiff who fell “between two superstars,” is in danger of “becoming like Benedict XV a ‘forgotten pope’” (311) is a pertinent observation. Likewise his penetrating conclusion that the papacy under John Paul II often “seemed to have surrendered its traditional role as arbiter of disputes among Catholics and instead both ‘prematurely’ and ‘counterproductively’ took sides and ‘sharpened differences’” (321–22). O’M. draws the conclusion that the church Benedict XVI presides over is “a church beset with problems”—but as his volume demonstrates this “is nothing new” (324).

The book will make a wonderful textbook at various levels, as well as a discussion text for parish groups and perhaps especially for ecumenical discussion groups. It will also be a cherished companion for readers seeking a less dense but nonetheless stimulating immersion into nearly 2000 years of history, regardless of their level of theological and historical training. Above all else, time and again O’M. stirs the reader to think about individual popes, historical periods, and ecclesiological questions in a different way—no mean feat, given the multitude of similar textbooks that have passed under the bridge.

*University of San Diego*

GERARD MANNION

CONFUCIUS SINARUM PHILOSOPHUS (1687): THE FIRST TRANSLATION OF THE CONFUCIAN CLASSICS. Latin translation (1658–1660) of the Chinese by Prosper Intorcetta, Christian Herdtrich, François Rougemont, and Philippe Couplet. Edited and translated into English by Thierry Meynard, S.J. *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*, new series 6. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2011. Pp. vii + 449. €50.

Meynard has given us a fine critical edition of writings that made Chinese philosophy available to a Western audience for the first time in history. He translates the work into English, adds some 80 pages of introduction (First Section) contextualizing Chinese philosophy (1–78), contributes extensive footnotes, and adds appendixes and a comparative chart of the various texts.

In the lengthy Second Section (79–327) M. provides the English translation of the “Preface of the Sinarum Philosophus” followed by its Latin text, commentaries that the early Jesuits felt were the “flower and kernel” of Chinese philosophy (92).

Why was this work historically so important? For one reason, it was “the first systematic presentation and discussion of Chinese thought in the West” (v). Further, since the “Jesuits spent more energy on this text than on any other,” we see the best results of “their interpretative work” (vi). Thus, we learn about not only Chinese philosophy but also how the early Jesuits interpreted that philosophy in order to make it fit into their evangelizing mission.

Indeed, the Jesuits were interpretive. The story they tell in their preface is this: The early Chinese worshipped the one true God. Over time they lost this knowledge as they gave themselves over to the errors of the various Buddhist and Taoist sects, and also to the “atheism” of the Neo-Confucians. Finally, Matteo Ricci came along to impose order on this chaos, and showed the Chinese the way back to the worship of the one true God.

M. shows that there is no little irony in this narrative. He argues that while the Jesuits were holding a Catholic position in Europe, they were backing a Protestant principle in China. What he means is that in Europe the Jesuits argued for the development of doctrine against Protestants who were trying to return to Scripture alone. But in China the Jesuits wanted to get back to the pure and unadulterated Confucius, and bypass centuries of development that the Jesuits felt was blocking the Chinese from reaccepting monotheism.

If it seems rather presumptuous that Europeans should be telling Chinese how to return to true worship, the 17th-century Jesuits note, “the Chinese Atheists should listen to the European Saints” (219).

M. is alert to another irony as well. The Jesuits originally intended to use this work to recruit more Jesuits for the China mission, as well as to show the importance of a Catholic monarchy for Europe. Later Europeans, however, would come to see in the same texts the possibilities of a secular state (67).

It is important to be clear about what this volume is and is not. It is a critical edition with a fine scholarly commentary and extensive notes. It is not a stand-alone original monograph. This is not to take away from M.’s fine contributions in translating this work into English for the first time. In fact, M. has done the really hard work of critical scholarship. Indeed, currently very few people are able to engage in this sort of work. As a French Jesuit, educated in China, M., a latter-day Ricci in his own right, brings a facility in Latin, English, and classical Chinese, as well as in Western and Chinese philosophy, theology, and history. Comparative works like these are difficult to write, yet M. succeeds admirably.

A few minor notes: The translation of the Latin text reads fluently enough, but commenting on its accuracy is beyond the capability of this

reviewer. Further, M.'s work is truly a scholar's work, as it has all the necessary scholarly apparatus. Yet to benefit fully from the extensive footnotes, knowledge of Chinese, Latin, and French would be helpful.

M. has done a real service in translating this foundational work and in giving us an insightful commentary and extensive notes. I recommend it highly to all those interested in understanding more about the first encounter between Chinese philosophy and the Western world.

*Santa Clara University, CA*

PAUL P. MARIANI, S.J.

THE SPIRIT OF AUGUSTINE'S EARLY THEOLOGY: CONTEXTUALIZING AUGUSTINE'S PNEUMATOLOGY. By Chad Tyler Gerber. Ashgate Studies in Philosophy and Theology in Late Antiquity. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012. Pp. xii + 221. \$89.95.

Augustine's theology of the Holy Spirit is certainly one of his most distinctive and also eventually divisive contributions to Christian thought. Gerber's study focuses on the development of his Pneumatology in the writings at Cassiciacum, at Rome after his baptism, and at Thagaste after his return to Africa up to the time of his presbyteral ordination in 391. The principal previous studies on the development of Augustine's early theology of the Trinity and of human nature stem from the works of Olivier du Roy and Robert J. O'Connell in the 1960s, which emphasized the Neoplatonic sources for Augustine's understanding of the triune God and of his image in human beings, although in recent years scholars such as Lewis Ayers and Michel Barnes have come correctly to recognize and emphasize the pro-Nicene influences in the church upon Augustine's thought to a larger extent than had generally been the case.

G.'s volume argues that Augustine's doctrine of the Trinity in the Cassiciacum dialogues is pro-Nicene at its core, and his appropriation of the Plotinian triads is largely the result of his pro-Nicene education in the faith of the Milanese church, which had already absorbed a good deal of Neoplatonism. G. argues against du Roy's and O'Connell's emphasis on the Plotinian sources of Augustine's Pneumatology and against the position of those, such as O'Connell and Phillip Cary, who claimed that Augustine held the divinity of the soul in the Cassiciacum dialogues.

Chapter 1 examines Augustine's trinitarian theology in the Cassiciacum dialogues, namely, *De beata vita*, *Contra Academicos*, and *Soliloquies*, and argues that it is basically pro-Nicene, although G. admits that Augustine was influenced by Neoplatonism directly through his reading of the *Libri Platonicorum* and indirectly through the preaching of Ambrose and the writings of Victorinus. G. sees the Neoplatonic influence as limited to Augustine's ways of conceiving the Father and the Son, and