

Notes

INTRODUCTION

1. Verbiest's letter from Beijing, dated 15 September 1581, appears in Josson and Willaert (1938), 363, with a French translation in Bosmans (1912), 97; the letter is addressed to Charles de Noyelle, SJ (1615–1686), then Assistant General of the Society of Jesus. De Noyelle became vicar-general on 26 November 1681 and general on 5 July 1682.

Xiaocheng married the emperor in 1665 and died on Kangxi 13/5/3, or 6 June 1674, the day that she gave birth to Yinreng (1674–1725), the future proclaimed heir apparent; see *ECCP*, 924. Xiaozhao was the daughter of Ebilun, one of the four regents. First a concubine, she was elevated to empress in 1677, but died one year later on Kangxi 17/2/26, or 18 March 1678. The father of the Kangxi Emperor, the Shunzhi Emperor (1638–1661), had died when the Kangxi Emperor was only six years old, and his mother, Empress Xiaokang (1640–1663), passed away two years later.

Construction of Jingling, the mausoleum of the Kangxi Emperor, began after the death of his first empress in 1676 and was completed in 1681. Meanwhile, the coffins of the two empresses had been stored at Gonghua, located to the north of the capital city, on the banks of the Sha River. Tradition dictated that the body of a deceased emperor or empress, inside its coffin constructed of *nanmu*, a Chinese hardwood, should lie in state for two weeks. The coffin was then usually moved into temporary storage to permit workmen to cover it with forty-nine coats of lacquer and a final coat of gold lacquer. For more on the funerals of the two empresses and on imperial funerals generally, see Rawski (1988b), 228–53; Rawski (1998), 277–85, 292; and de Groot (1892–1897), vol. 3, esp. 1282–1290.

The transfer to the place of sepulture described in the passage quoted here took about one week. The bodies left the temporary place on Kangxi 20/2/19, or 7 April 1681, and arrived at the tomb on Kangxi 20/2/25, or 25 April 1681. The Chinese sources do not give the precise number of participants that is mentioned in the passage quoted here, listing only the large group of court members and officials who had to take part in the procession and in the rituals accompanying the transfer. See *Qing shilu* (1985), vol. 4, 1192–1194 (*Shengzu shilu*, j. 94, 19a–23a); *Kangxi qijuzhu* (1984), vol. 1,

668–70. See also the description in *DaQing huidian (Kangxichao)* (1696), 3525ff. (*juan* 68, *libu* 29, *sangli* 2, 18aff).

2. Van Engen (1986), 543. For the pronounced interest in ritual emerging in the work of several historians of early modern Europe published in the 1970s and 1980s, see Scribner (1997), 17.

3. Schipper (1996), 308.

4. On these shifts, see Standaert (1997).

5. Bell (1997). See also her earlier work (1992), which addresses more theoretical issues.

6. HCC, 300–308, 380–86.

7. See Zürcher (1994), 40–41.

8. Cohen (1984), 14.

9. On the study of funerals in the Chinese American cultural exchange, see Chung and Wegars (2005); on the study of Christian funerals in contemporary China, see Lozada (2001), 132–55.

1. CHINESE AND EUROPEAN FUNERALS

1. Watson (1988a), 12; for a critical discussion, see also Sutton (2007b), 128ff.

2. Ebrey (1991a), xiv.

3. This is a state-of-the-field chapter, based on the most recent research on the topic, mainly taken from secondary sources.

4. For general surveys of Chinese funerary rituals, see de Groot (1892–1897), Ebrey (1991a), Naquin (1988), Watson (1988a), and recent historical overviews: Chen Shuguo (2002), Wan (1998), Xu Jijun (1998), Zhang Jiefu (1995), Zheng (1995). These sources are based on numerous Chinese primary sources. For research overviews, see Tong (2004), 15ff, Oxfeld (2004), 965ff, Chung and Wegars (2005), 1ff.

5. The most important chapters on funerals in the *Liji* are: 31, *Bensang* (Rules on Hurrying to Mourning Rites); 32, *Wensang* (Questions about Mourning Rites); 33, *Fuwen* (Subjects for Questioning about the Mourning Dress); 34, *Jianzhuan* (Treatise on Subsidiary Points in Mourning Usages); 35, *Sannianwen* (Questions about the Mourning for Three Years); and 46, *Sangfu sizhi* (The Four Principles Governing the Dress of Mourning). In the *Yili*, they are: 11, *Sangfu* (Mourning Dress) and 12, *Shisangli* (Mourning Rites for the Common Officer).

6. Rawski (1988a), 30.

7. On the importance of the examination system in this regard, see Elman (2000); on printing, see Chow (2004).

8. The significance of these rites is confirmed by the space that is allotted them in other ritual handbooks or encyclopaedias; see also *Gujin tushu jicheng* (1726–1728) under *Liyidian*: *guanli* (capping) takes 5 *juan*, *hunli* (marriage) 17 *juan*, *sangzang*

(funerals) 68 *juan* and related chapters *shifa* (rules for posthumous names) 24 *juan*, *xudian* (funeral sponsorship) 2 *juan*, and *diaoku* (condoling) 4 *juan*.

9. Naquin (1988), 63.

10. Oxfeld (2004), 965.

11. This sequence is summarized primarily from Ebrey (1991a), 65ff, 194ff.; see also Naquin (1988), 38ff.; Watson (1988a), 12ff.; and *Jiali* (1341).

12. For a historical study of this system, see Ding (2000).

13. Kutcher (1999), 21.

14. The classic studies are the observations of Justus Doolittle ((1867), vol. 1, 168–235) on Fuzhou (1865); Henri Doré ((1911), vol. 1, 41–146) on the lower Yangzi (1911); and Jan Jacob M. de Groot (1892–1897) on Amoy. For an early overview of the variations according to the four regions of Yellow River, Yangzi River, Pearl River and Manchuria, see Chen Huaizhen (1934), 147. Fieldwork studies of the 1960s–1980s mainly concerned Taiwan, by such scholars as Arthur Wolf, Emily Martin Ahern, Xu Fuquan and others; and Hong Kong, by Maurice Freedman, James Watson, and others. More recent studies, especially by Chinese scholars, cover different regions in China mainland; see He Bin (1995) on Wenzhou, Zhejiang; Chen Gang (2000) on Changshou county, Chongqing Municipality; Adam Yuet Chau (2006) on Shaanbei, northern Shaanxi; Feng Jianzhi (2006) on Wuyuan county, Jiangxi; William Jankowiak (1993) on Inner Mongolia; Kenneth Dean (1988) on Fujian; Charlotte Ikels (2004) on Guangzhou; or places of the Chinese diaspora, as in Tong Chee-Kiong (2004) on Singapore. Especially noteworthy is the study of Chinese American death rituals by Chung and Wegars (2005). For a discussion of the tension between standardization and variation, see Sutton (2007b).

15. Naquin (1988), 58.

16. Naquin (1988), 52, 68.

17. For these different funeral specialists, see Watson (1988b).

18. Naquin (1988), 59.

19. Brook (1989), 492; Teiser (1994), 27.

20. Teiser (1994), 28.

21. This sequence is taken from Brook (1989), 481–82; see also Naquin (1988), 41; Teiser (1994), 23–27; and Welch (1967), 179–205, for recent descriptions of Buddhist rites for the dead.

22. Teiser (1994), 28–30. For a recent description of a Daoist funeral liturgy, see Lagerwey (1987), 168–237, Dean (1988); and several articles in Johnson (1989).

23. Ebrey (1991a), xx.

24. Ebrey (1991a), 79, 196.

25. *(Da)Ming jili* (1530), *juan* 36–38, *SKQS*, vol. 650, 128–87; see tables of contents in Ho (2000), 45–47.

26. Ho (2000), 49ff.; Chen Shuguo (2002), 303ff.

27. Ho (2000), 29ff.; Ebrey (1991b), 150ff.
28. Brook (1989), 476; Ebrey (1991b), 173ff.; Ho (2000), 160–61; Kojima (1996), 403–6; *Jiali yijie* (1518).
29. Ebrey (1991b), 188.
30. Ebrey (1991b), 157–58; Brook (1989), 466–68, 480–81.
31. Brokaw (1991), 4ff.; Ho (2000), 71, 90; Brook (1989), 470.
32. Xie (1959), 56, 120; Ad Dudink, “2.6.1. Sympathising Literati and Officials,” in *HCC*, 477; Zhang Xianqing (2003), 53–54.
33. Xie (1959), 419.
34. On traditional arguments, see de Groot (1892–1897), vol. 2, 659ff.
35. Ho (2000), 60ff, 71, 88ff.; Zhang Shouan (1993), 70–73; Kutcher (1999), 23–24; Chen Jiang (2006), 95–97.
36. Ho (2000), 64, 97ff, 101ff.
37. Ho (2000), 67, 108ff. Cremation was condemned by article 200 of *The Great Ming Code* (2005), 119.
38. Ho (2000), 69–71, 85ff, 111ff, 116; Kutcher (1999), 22–23. See also article 200 of *The Great Ming Code* (2005), 119.
39. Ebrey (1991a), xxvi–xxvii; Brook (1989), 479; Ho (2000), 156; for an extensive list, see Ebrey (1991b), 231ff, and Ho (2000), 261ff.
40. *Jiali yijie* (1608); Standaert (1988), 46ff.
41. Lü Kun (1573) and (1614); Ebrey (1991b), 181.
42. Lü Weiqi (1624); Ebrey (1991b), 182.
43. Ebrey (1991b), 177–83; Ho (2000), 161ff.; Handlin (1983), 146.
44. Chow (1994), 130; Ho (2000), 165ff.; Zhang Shouan (1993), 74ff.; Ebrey (1991b), 189. Chow points out that in a similar way, Zhang Lüxiang’s (1611–1674) *Sangji zashuo* (1640) criticized improper popular mourning and funerary customs.
45. Chen Que (1979), 433. Zhang Xianqing (2003), 54; for his praise of Western spectacles, see Chen Que (1979), 356, 668.
46. Chen Que (1979), 494–95; Ho (2000), 211.
47. Ho (2000), 178ff.
48. Brook (1989), 472–73; Ebrey (1991b), 158ff.
49. Brook (1989), 480.
50. Brook (1989), 486.
51. Brook (1989), 465–66.
52. Ho (2000), 9, 189ff.; Handlin (1983), 48.
53. Ho (2000), 11, 202ff.; Leung (1997), 218ff.; Handlin (1987).
54. Ebrey (1991b), 188–89; for a detailed analysis, see Chow (1994).
55. *Duli tongkao* (1696); Chow (1994), 51, 136. The work makes extensive use of writings on rituals by contemporary scholars, including Zhang Erqi (1612–1678), Wang Wan (1624–1690), Huang Zongxi (1610–1695), Lu Yuanfu (1617–1691), Ying Huiqian

(1615–1683), and those who helped Xu with its compilation. An important work in the eighteenth century, based on the model of *Duli tongkao*, is Qin Huitian's (1702–1764) well-known *Wuli tongkao* (Comprehensive Study of the Five Categories of Ritual, 260 *juan*, 1761). An official publication, which takes (*Da*)*Ming jili* as a model, is *DaQing tongli* (Comprehensive Study of the Great Qing Dynasty, 50 *juan*, 1736).

56. Chow (1994), 57, 131; Mao Qiling (Kangxi era) and (1697–1700).
57. Kutcher (1999), 87.
58. Kutcher (1999), 89 n. 56; Meng (1997), 57–59; Ta (1994), 49–51.
59. Meng (1997), 56–57; Kutcher (1999), 88.
60. Meng (1997), 57–58; Kutcher (1999), 88; Rawski (1998), 277; Elliott (2001), 263–64; Ta (1994), 48–49.
61. Kutcher (1999), 89; Ta (1994), 51–52.
62. Meng (1997), 58–59; Kutcher (1999), 90; Rawski (1998), 279; Ta (1994), 51.
63. Chow (1994), 44.
64. Brook (1989), 484–85; Ho (2000), 13–14.
65. Ebrey (1991b), 212–13.
66. Zhang Shouan (1993), 75.
67. Ho (2000), 72; Zhang Shouan (1993), 75.
68. Brook (1989), 493.
69. Jungmann (1961), 74–77. Jungmann's work provides one of the best surveys of the variations practiced within the Western liturgical tradition before the promulgation of the liturgical edicts from the Council of Trent. See also Maher (2002), 204.
70. Jungmann (1961), 105.
71. Since the missionaries were Catholics the focus will be on the Catholic funerary liturgy in use by the majority of Europeans at that time.
72. *Rituale Romanum* (1614): *Exsequiarum ordo* and *Officium Defunctorum*; for descriptions, see Gy (1955), *passim*; Philippeau (1956) and (1957), *passim*; Rowell (1977), 71–72; Rutherford (1970), 41, 69ff., 90ff.; Fortescue and O'Connell (1962), 392ff.; “Dodenliturgie,” *Liturgisch Woordenboek* (1958–1962); and “Christian Burial,” *Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003).
73. See Callewaert (1940); Ruland (1901), 189ff.; Binski (1996), 53–54; “Doden-officie,” *Liturgisch Woordenboek* (1958–1962); and “Office of the Dead,” *Catholic Encyclopedia* (2003).
74. Wieck (1988), 124ff.; for a list of all the prayers of the Office, see 166–67; Wieck (1998), 117ff.
75. Very often together with the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin (*Officium Parvum Beatae Mariae Virginis*).
76. *Breviarium Romanum* (1568). “Brevier,” *Liturgisch Woordenboek* (1958–1962). The Office of the Dead was read once a month, usually on a fixed date, and on some other special days in the year (e.g., 2 November).

77. *Missale Romanum* (1570).

78. *Manuale* (1605); López Gay (1970), 276–79; for a discussion: 272–95; Tsuchiya (1963), 221–32; Laures (1941); Laures (1957), 71–73; Kataoka (1997), 153ff. There are three copies in the Beitang library, including one that contains a partial Japanese translation in transliteration. See Verhaeren (1949), n. 1246–48; Laures (1941); for the other copies, see Laures (1957), 73; López Gay (1970), 272, n. 133; one more copy resides in the library of the University of Amsterdam (971 C 17) (information provided by A. Dudink). It was mainly based on the *Ritual of Toledo* (*Manual Toledano*, Salamanca, 1583); for a comparison of the table of contents of both works: López Gay (1970), 276–79, but partly on some other works among which the *Rituale Sacramentorum Romanum* (1584) by Antonio de Santorio (1532–1602) that was one of the main sources of the *Rituale Romanum* of 1614 (López Gay (1970), 273, 291ff). This explains the relatively high degree of similarity between the *Rituale Romanum* and the Japanese mission's *Manuale*.

79. Ariès (1977) and (1981); the findings of Ariès corroborate several earlier studies; see especially Gy (1955), Philippeau (1956) and (1957), Rowell (1977), Ruland (1901), and Rutherford (1970). Since the publication of the book by Ariès, several regional studies of death rituals in Europe were published, especially based on funeral instructions in wills, see, for example, Chiffolleau (1980) (on fifteenth-century Avignon), Eire (1995) (on sixteenth-century Spain), Lorenzo Pinar (1991) (on Spain of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries), and Cohn (1988) (on Siena in the thirteenth to nineteenth centuries); see also Strocchia (1992) (on Florence of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries).

80. Ariès (1977), 147–48 / (1981), 147–48.

81. Ariès (1977), 152–54 / (1981), 151–54; Ariès (1985), 160ff.

82. Rowell (1977), 70–72; Rutherford (1970), 58–62; Gy (1955), 74; Philippeau (1956), 203.

83. Ariès (1977), 154–56 / (1981), 154–56.

84. Ariès (1977), 161 / (1981), 161; Rutherford (1970), 54, 98.

85. Ariès (1977), 164–65 / (1981), 165; cf. Rowell (1977), 66; Gy (1955), 79–80; Ruland (1901), 189–99.

86. Ariès (1977), 165–66 / (1981), 165–66; Ariès (1985), 116–20; cf. Gy (1955), 72.

87. Ariès (1977), 146–47, 161 / (1981), 146, 161; cf. Rowell (1977), 61; Ruland (1901), 199–204. Later usage reserved the term *absolution* for the benediction of the living and the term *absoute* for the benediction of the dead, in order to distinguish clearly between the two.

88. Rutherford (1970), 55; Ariès (1985), 120–28.

89. Ariès (1977), 175 / (1981), 175–76; Rutherford (1970), 41.

90. Ariès (1977), 178 / (1981), 178; Rutherford (1970), 57; Rowell (1977), 70.

91. Ariès (1977), 168 / (1981), 168; Ariès (1985), 112–15.

92. Binski (1996), 55.

93. The existing rituals for the preservation of the body were not included in the *Rituale*, as discussed by Philippeau (1956), 204–6.
94. Ariès (1977), 172 / (1981), 172.
95. Eire (1995), 151, 180; Strocchia (1992), chapter 3; Cohn (1988), 182.
96. For an overview of anthropological studies of funerals, see Huntington and Metcalf (1979), 1–20; de Mahieu (1991); Tong (2004), 12ff.
97. See Ebrey (1991a), on sending gifts and condoling (99, 200); on the inscription stone (108–9, 201); on the tablet (123, 202); and on different offerings (129ff., 203ff.).
98. Watson (1988a), 8–9.
99. This book only discusses Catholic funerary traditions. Protestants rejected much of the Catholic eschatology, especially purgatory, denied the salvific value of ritual, and repudiated intercessory prayer. See Eire (1995), 119.
100. See Cole (1998) and Oxfeld (2004), 965.
101. Watson (1988a), 9–10.
102. See Berling (1987); Watson (1988a), 10; see also the discussions by Rawski (1988a), Oxfeld (2004) and especially Bell (1997), 191–97; see the special issue of *Modern China* devoted to a discussion of James Watson's ideas, especially Sutton (2007a) and the response in Watson (2007).

2. MISSIONARIES' KNOWLEDGE OF CHINESE FUNERALS

1. For an overview of the different types of sources, see Noël Golvers, “Western Primary Sources,” in *HCC*, 162ff.
2. For a description of Bort's expedition and van Hoorn's embassy, see Lach and Van Kley (1993), vol. 3, book 1, 60–61; Wills (1984), chapters 1 and 2.
3. For a detailed study of the extensive sources Dapper used for his book on Africa, see Jones (1990).
4. Dapper (1670) / (1671). On this description, see Lach and Van Kley (1993), vol. 3, book 1, 490–91.
5. “Lijk-plicht of Lijk-staetsie, en rou over dooden,” Dapper (1670), 407–30 / (1671), 373–92.
6. The original manuscript of Ricci's account, kept in ARSI Jap.Sin. 106a, was first edited by Pietro Tachi Venturi in 1911 (see *OS*), and later by Pasquale d'Elia (see *FR*).
7. Trigault and Ricci (1615) / (1978) / (1953); the modern English translations will be adopted from the 1953 edition. N. Golvers “Western Primary Sources,” in *HCC*, 180–81.
8. Manuscript in British Library, mss. Sloane 1005.
9. Las Cortes (1991) / (2001). Dapper also used unpublished sources for other books of his. See Jones (1990), 185–86.

10. Semedo (1655) / (1996); Lach and Van Kley (1993), vol. 3, book 1, 349. Excerpts from it were published in contemporary French, Latin, and German compilations. Golvers, "Western Primary Sources," in *HCC*, 196. Semedo (1996) is only a slightly revised version of the French edition of 1645.

11. Martini (1981); Lach and Van Kley (1993), vol. 3, book 1, 381–82, 480–81.

12. Martini (1658); Lach and Van Kley (1993), vol. 3, book 1, 526–27.

13. Schall (1942); Lach and Van Kley (1993), vol. 3, book 1, 528.

14. For a short description on Ming funerals, and some other sources, see Lach and Van Kley (1993), vol. 3, book 4, 1625–1627 (late Ming); 1703–1704 (early Qing). See also the general description in Bartoli (1663), 38–43 (partly based on Trigault and Ricci). An important eighteenth-century description (also based on some seventeenth-century sources) is Jean-Baptiste Du Halde (1674–1743), *Description . . . de la Chine* (1735). On funerals, see "Des cérémonies qu'ils observent dans leurs devoirs de civilitez, dans leurs visites, & les présens qu'ils se font les uns les autres, dans les lettres qu'ils écrivent, dans leurs festins, leurs mariages, & leurs funérailles" (1735), vol. 2, 124–30 / (1736), vol. 2, 146–54 / (1738–1741), "Their Mourning and Funerals," vol. 1, 306–10.

15. On the idea of "proto-ethnographic" descriptions, see Odell (2001), 239; "ethnohistories" in Lach and von Kley (1993), vol. 3, book 4, 1566; and Rubiés (1993 and 1995).

16. On the changes to Ricci's text, see Shih (1978); Foss (1983); Fezzi (1999); and Gernet (2003).

17. Trigault and Ricci (1615), iii / (1978), 64 / (1953), xiv. Claims of truthfulness are common in introductions to travel book narratives of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Not only do publishers praise the credibility of their own authors, but they also disparage the lack of accuracy in others. See also Odell (2001), 225.

18. Trigault and Ricci (1615), iv / (1978), 65 / (1953), xiv.

19. Trigault and Ricci (1615), iv / (1978), 65 / (1953), xv.

20. Trigault and Ricci's bestseller, *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinas* of 1615, had been preceded by Pantoja's booklet about China with the very similar title of *Relacion de la entrada de algunos Padres de la Compañia de Jesus en la China* (Seville, 1605), which was originally a letter written in Beijing in 1602. Pantoja, who had arrived in Beijing one year earlier, probably used the same sources (letters and personal notes of Ricci and others) that later became the basis for the first book in Trigault and Ricci's *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinas* (see Ricciardolo (2003), 35–38). This explains why there are several similarities between Trigault's and Pantoja's descriptions of funerals (see Pantoja (1605), 81r–86r / (1625), 367–68). A partial English translation of Trigault's treatise on funerals can also be found in Purchas (1625), III.ii, 393; it was shortened because the same volume contains a more extensive description of funerary customs by Pantoja (367–68). Purchas' collection mainly contains the ethnographic chapters of Trigault and Ricci. The description in Trigault's and

Ricci's *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinas* was later partly adopted by António de Gouvea, SJ (1592–1677); see de Gouvea (1995–2001), vol. 1, 105–6; 269–73.

21. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 63; *FR* I, 71. Trigault's and Ricci's title compares with the chapter title of the French version of 1616, "De quelques coutumes des Chinois" ([1978], 124). For "civilitie," see Purchas (1625), 391.

22. On superstition, see chapter 9 (*FR* I, 94); on the religious sects, chapter 10 (*FR* I, 108). Both Semedo and Schall use chapter titles directly related to funerals or the care of the dead: "Of the Funeralls and Sepultures of the Chinesses" (Semedo (1655), 73), and "De cura universim mortuorum apud Chinenses" (Schall (1942), 422).

23. Rubiés (1993), 170–71. These characteristics are developed in several other articles by the same author; see also Rubiés (1995).

24. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 79 / (1978), 138 / (1953), 72.

25. Dapper (1670), 407–8 / (1671), 373; cf. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 79–80 / (1978), 138 / (1953), 72. Compare this and the following sections with the original version of Ricci, *FR*, vol. 1, 83–85.

26. The reference to the Franciscan monks does not appear in the original Italian version by Ricci (*FR*, vol. 1, 83), though it does appear in Trigault and Ricci (1615), 79–80 / (1978), 138 / (1953), 72; but it appears first in Pantoja (1605), 81v / (1625), 368. The reference to "as in Europe" is added in the English version of Dapper ((1671), 373); in the Dutch version ((1670), 408) it is said: "gelijk ook hier te lande" (as also in this country). This comparison seems to apply to the variation of mourning periods rather than to the "three months"; in Trigault and Ricci the comparison does not appear.

27. Dapper (1670), 408–9 / (1671), 373–74; cf. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 80–81 / (1978), 138–39 / (1953), 72–73. *Cie* is probably *qi* (lacquer).

28. Dapper (1670), 409–10 / (1671), 374; cf. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 81–82 / (1978), 140 / (1953), 73–74. The phrase, "which is perform'd like the Romans Processioning," is added by Dapper; in the last sentence, the Latin version mentions "suburbanos."

29. For other descriptions of Chinese condoling practices, see Dapper (1670), 409 / (1671), 374; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 80–81 / (1978), 139 / (1953), 73 (compare *FR*, vol. 1, 84); Du Halde, (1735), vol. 2, 125 / (1736), vol. 2, 147 / (1738–1741), vol. 1, 307–8; see also Du Halde, (1735), vol. 3, 177 / (1736), vol. 3, 214 / (1738–1741), vol. 2, 63, based on an unidentified Chinese source, probably dating between 1680 and 1722 (Landry-Deron (2002), 232).

30. Semedo (1996) 112–13 / (1655), 75; compare Dapper (1670), 412 / (1671), 376–77 (where tea is transliterated as *Tee*).

31. Dapper (1670), 417 / (1671), 381; Schall (1942), 424.

32. Semedo (1996), 111–12 / (1655), 74–75; Dapper (1670), 412 / (1671), 376.

33. Semedo (1996), 111 / (1655), 73, 74; Dapper (1670), 410, 411 / (1671), 375, 376.

34. Semedo (1996), 111 / (1655), 73–74; Dapper (1670), 411 / (1671), 375.

35. Dapper (1670), 430 / (1671), 392 and Martini (1981), 155; Martini on page 153 also mentions explicitly that they do not use coffins as the Chinese do.
36. Dapper (1670), 416 / (1671), 380; Schall (1942), 422.
37. Dapper (1670), 416 / (1671), 381; Schall (1942), 425.
38. Dapper (1670), 419 / (1671), 382; Schall (1942), 428.
39. Naquin (1988), 42.
40. Dapper (1670), 420 / (1671), 383; Schall (1942), 430–31.
41. See Rubiés (1993), 160–62; (1995), 38.
42. For text and translation see Mish (1964).
43. Aleni (1637), *juan shang*, 24b–25a; trans. Mish (1964), 59.
44. Semedo (1996), 110 / (1655), 73; Dapper (1670), 410 / (1671), 375.
45. Dapper (1670), 416 / (1671), 380; Schall (1942), 422.
46. Aleni (1637), *juan shang*, 25a; trans. Mish (1964), 59–60; on the European location of graves, see also Aleni's discussion of siting and geomancy, Aleni (1637), addendum, 1aff.; trans. Mish (1964), 79ff.
47. For instance, burial places in sixteenth-century Madrid, discussed in Eire (1995), 91ff., or in Avignon, mentioned in Chiffolleau (1980), 154ff.
48. Semedo (1996), 111 / (1655), 74; Dapper (1670), 411 / (1671), 376.
49. Pantoja (1605), 84v / (1625), 368. For other descriptions of Chinese tombs, see Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, 125 / (1736), vol. 2, 147–48 / (1738–1741), vol. 1, 307.
50. Semedo (1996), 111 / (1655), 74; Dapper (1670), 411 / (1671), 376.
51. Dapper (1670), 416 / (1671), 380; Schall (1942), 423.
52. Las Cortes (1991), 188 / (2001), 463.
53. See Thompson (1988), 104, for an anthropological discussion.
54. *Mubei* is an epitaph on a tombstone (*bei*) or memorial stele (set up above ground). Its purpose is to provide facts about the identity of the deceased. In its simplest form, it always carries at least the family name of the occupant of the tomb, but a more extensive memorial stele might include the names of family members who erected the stone, the title or honors of the deceased, etc. Since the term *bei* signifies the instrument of composition, the nature of the medium is imputed to have influence over its content. Edwards (1948), 782, and Weinberg (2002), 6, 15ff.
55. *Muzhi*, also called *muzhiming* or *kuangming*, is a tomb epitaph, grave record, or funerary inscription. It is a brief laudatory biography inscribed on a stone tablet buried with or near the coffin. Its purpose (or one purpose) was to identify the remains should the grave be disturbed. At the end of the *muzhi*, and also of a *mubiao* (see below), a formal poem (*ming*) in praise of the deceased is often included, normally much shorter than the biography itself and adding no new facts about him. Edwards (1948), 781–82; Nivison (1962), 459; and de Groot (1892–1897), 1101ff.
56. Dapper (1670), 416–17 / (1671), 380; Schall (1942), 423–24.
57. *Recueil de Tombeaux Chinois* (18th century). See also Cordier (1909), 222, “Sur

les plats armes de Bertin,” and Gall (1990), 28, “Fonds Bertin” no. 7 (this was included in the Cabinet des estampes in 1793–1794; cf. 88–89). These illustrations belonged to the collection of Henri L. J.-B. Bertin (1719–1792), who as Secretary of State in France from 1762–1780 had maintained an intensive correspondence with the French Jesuits in Beijing.

58. Aleni (1637), *juan shang*, 25a–25b; trans. Mish (1964), 60.

59. Semedo (1996) 110 / (1655), 73; Dapper (1670), 410 / (1671), 375.

60. Watson (1988a), 14–15. In some places, such as Taiwan or Guangdong, the coffin is punctured prior to burial.

61. Pantoja (1605), 83v–84r / (1625), 368. For other descriptions of coffins, see Dapper (1670), 409, 416 / (1671), 374, 380; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 81 / (1978), 139 / (1953), 73 (compare *FR*, vol. 1, 84); Schall (1942), 422; Martini (1658), 156 (book 5); Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, 125 / (1736), vol. 2, 147 / (1738–1741), vol. 1, 306.

62. Aleni (1637), *juan shang*, 25b; trans. Mish (1964), 60.

63. Dapper (1670), 422 / (1671), 385; Martini (1658), 31 (book 1). For other descriptions of the mourning garments, see Dapper (1670), 407–8, 413–15 / (1671), 374, 377–79; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 79–80 / (1978), 138 / (1953), 73 (compare *FR*, vol. 1, 83); Semedo (1996), 113 / (1655), 74–75; and Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, 124 / (1736), vol. 2, 146 / (1738–1741), vol. 1, 306.

64. Dapper (1670), 420–21 / (1671), 383–84; Schall (1942), 431–32.

65. Las Cortes (1991), 189 / (2001), 156, 394–97.

66. Dapper (1670), 415 / (1671), 379.

67. So far attempts to identify the source, such as in collections of encyclopaedias for daily use (*riyong leishu*), have been unsuccessful; see, for example, the collection of late Ming encyclopaedias, *Chūgoku nichiyō ruisho shusei*.

68. *Sancai tuhui* (1607), vol. 4, 1551ff. (*yifu*, *juan* 3, 13ff.).

69. Dapper (1670), 414–15 / (1671), 378–79; Las Cortes (1991), 189–90 / (2001), 156, 404.

70. De Groot (1892–1897), vol. 2, 587–88; pl. xiv; fig. 26.

71. For an extensive description, see de Groot (1892–1897), vol. 1, 152–207.

72. Aleni (1637), *juan shang*, 26a–26b; trans. Mish (1964), 60–61.

73. See Eire (1995), 121–23, 134 and Chiffolleau (1980), 126ff, and also the description of the procession at the beginning of *Exsequiarum ordo* in *Rituale* (1614).

74. Semedo (1996), 113–14 / (1655), 76; Dapper (1670), 412–13 / (1671), 377.

75. On this difference, see also de Groot (1892–1897), vol. 1, 158.

76. Eire (1995), 122; Strocchia (1992), 7–8; both authors refer to Geertz (1977), where what Eire calls a “nearly universal pattern to funeral processions” is less explicit.

77. Dapper (1670), opposite 422–23 / (1671), opposite 388–89. It was adopted by the artist Bernard Picard (1673–1733) for another illustration; see *China on Paper* (2007), 152–53.

78. Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, between 126–27 (A. Humblot, designer, and A. Maisonneuve, engraver) / (1736), vol. 2, between 148–49 (J. C. Philip, engraver; of lesser quality) / (1738–1741), vol. 1, between 306–7.

79. For Chinese illustrations, see *Jiali yijie* (1608), *juan* 5, 52a–54b; *Sancai tuhui* (1607), vol. 5, 1952ff. (*yizhi*, *juan* 7, 12ff.); and illustration attached to chapter 65 of *Jinpingmei cihua* (1617), opposite 1808.

80. *DMB*, vol. 2, 856–59.

81. For a discussion of Herrera Maldonado, see Lach and Van Kley (1993), vol. 3, book 1, 335 and book 4, 1627.

82. Herrera Maldonado (1620), chapters 13–17, 90–121. It is not clear why he incorrectly dates the demise as 30 March 1617. Chapter 12 is a discussion of the funeral and burial rites.

83. Herrera Maldonado (1622) chapter 13–17, 314–408. The French version is in many regards more extensive than the Spanish version.

84. On his sources, see *Europe Informed* (1966), 20ff.

85. Herrera Maldonado (1622), 315–16. The first contained the ceremonies and sacrifices from the day of death until the burial; the second, the sacrifices to be performed at the place of the corpse and for the sepulture; and the third, the indulgences, graces, and privileges granted by the emperor to the nation.

86. Semedo (1996) 115 / (1655), 77–78.

87. See Herrera Maldonado (1622), 359–60, for Dias' participation.

88. Semedo (1996), 115–21 / (1655), 78–83 (chapter 17); Dapper (1670), 426–30 / (1671), 388–91. It is also adopted (from Semedo) by Antonio de Gouvea; see de Gouvea (1995–2001), vol. 1, 106–10; vol. 2, 353–58.

89. *Ming shilu* (1987), *Shenzong shilu*, *juan* 517–21, 9743–839. The sections that could correspond to these days in *Wanli qijuzhu* (1988) are missing.

90. Semedo (1996), 121–24 / (1655), 83–86 (at end of chapter 17); Dapper (1670), 430 / (1671), 391; *Ming shilu* (1987), *Shenzong shilu*, *juan* 596, 11448–450; for the regulations of his funeral, see *Ming shilu* (1987), *Guangzong shilu*, *juan* 2, 0023ff. See a more extensive account of the last days of the Wanli Emperor, the translation of his last will, and the description of some of the funerals, as well as the death of the Taichang Emperor, in *Histoire de ce qui s'est passé'es Royaumes de la Chine et du Japon* . . . (1625), 44 (from Trigault's report in *Littera Annua* 1621), 161ff. Compared to the description for the funeral of the mother of the Wanli Emperor, however, it is rather limited because, Trigault states, "he does not want to annoy the reader" ("Je ne dis rien icy du style de ces ceremonies, par ce que j'ennuyerois le Lecteyr") (*ibid.*, 171).

91. Schall (1942), 434–49; Dapper (1670), 422–25 / (1671), 385–87. See also Vāth (1991), 209–10.

92. *Qing shilu* (1985), vol. 4, 40ff.; see also *Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 85, 1–29; SKQS, vol. 622, 655–69.

93. Schall (1942), 428–29 (Dapper (1670), 425 / (1671), 387–88). Dongshi, also known as Dong'e fei (Imperial Secondary Consort of the Donggo clan) (1639–1660), was the favorite consort of the Shunzhi Emperor. She was posthumously made an empress and canonized as Xiaoxian huanghou. At her funeral, elaborate Buddhist ceremonies were conducted at enormous cost. Certain eunuchs and maids in the palace committed suicide hoping that their spirits might accompany her. This practice had long been abandoned by Chinese rulers, but was retained by the Manchus until this time. See ECCP, vol. 1, 301–2. Not copied by Dapper are the short references to funerals and processions for other members of the imperial family: Daisan, 1583–25 November 1648, second son of Nurhaci; Dorgon, 1612–31 December 1650; and the brother of Shunzhi emperor, probably eleventh son of Huangtaiji, who died at the age of 16 years, 22 August 1656. Schall (1942), 425–27; see also Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, 128–29 / (1736), vol. 2, 151–52 (which contains a short reference to the funeral of the emperor's mother) / (1738–1741), vol. 1, 309.

94. For later descriptions of funerals, such as the funeral of Empress Xiaosheng (1693–1777), mother of the Qianlong Emperor, see Amiot (1780) (Chinese text in BnF, Chinois 2322); see also Rawski (1988b), 245, and (1998), 279.

95. Rawski (1988b), 238–40; see also de Groot (1892–1897), vol. 2, 632ff.

96. Herrera Maldonado (1622), 322ff.

97. Semedo (1996), 119 / (1655), 82; Dapper (1670), 428 / (1671), 390. It is not entirely clear whether “eighth day” means the eighth day of the sixth month, or eight days preceding the funeral (as translated by Dapper); these details are not mentioned in *Ming shilu* (1987), *Shenzong shilu*, *juan* 521, 9729–31.

98. Rawski (1998), 279.

99. Dapper (1670), 424–25 / (1671), 387; Schall (1942), 446–47. Compare *Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 85, 10a–12a; SKQS, vol. 622, 660–61. See also the short description by Johann Grueber, SJ (1623–1680), who was at that moment in Beijing; Grueber (1985), 79–83.

100. *Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 85, 12a–b; SKQS, vol. 622, 661. Compared to the preceding (nineteenth of the second month, or 17 February) and subsequent (the seventh of the third month, or 7 March, seventh of the fourth month, or after one hundred days, or 5 April) sacrifices, the sacrifice on the twenty-seventh day was the most important one in terms of the objects burned (*Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 85, 9b, 13a, 18b; SKQS, vol. 622, 659, 661, 664).

101. Herrera Maldonado (1622), 332, 342, 372, 374, 393, 400.

102. Schall (1942), 406–7. Buddhist ceremonies are not mentioned in *Veritable Records*, but extensive sacrifices are; see *Qing shilu* (1985), vol. 3, 1076ff.

103. Semedo (1996), 115 / (1655), 77.
104. European funerals for kings were also major events; see, for example, the extensive discussion in Eire (1995), (book two), 255ff, of the funeral of King Philip II of Spain who died 13 September 1598.
105. Herrera Maldonado (1622), 314–15; compare (1620), 90v.
106. In the English version of Semedo, “ceremonies” always occurs in italics.
107. Herrera Maldonado (1622), 387–92.
108. *Qing shilu* (1985), vol. 4, 48; see also Rawski (1998), 282.
109. Dapper (1670), 423–24 / (1671), 386; Schall (1942), 442–45. The phrase in brackets at the beginning of the quote comes from Schall’s own text (1942), 442–43; it does not appear in Dapper.
110. Compare for instance *Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 85, 10a–12a; SKQS, vol. 622, 660–61.
111. *Ming shilu* (1987), *Shenzong shilu*, *juan* 517, 9746–47.
112. Semedo (1996), 116–17 / (1655), 79–80; compare Dapper (1670), 427 / (1671), 389.
113. See Rawski (1988b), 253.
114. See Eire (1995), 360–61.
115. Dapper (1670), 409 / (1671), 374. These comparisons are on the whole quite limited and have little parallel with the distinction between Catholic and Protestant of the nineteenth century that was one of the most pervasive of the binary oppositions structuring Victorian Protestant perceptions of Chinese religions. Victorian Protestant missionaries so thoroughly embraced anti-Catholicism, especially in the rejection of Catholic ritual, that they projected their judgment of ritual onto their experience of Chinese ritual. See Reinders (2004), esp. 210–11.
116. See Ginzburg (1999), 77.
117. Todorov (1982b), 191 / (1984), 185.
118. Semedo uses the most emotive language in this regard. See also Dapper (1670), 416 / (1671), 380; Schall (1942), 422; and Martini (1658), book 1, 31. In Europe, funeral excesses were also criticized, but the criticism was of a slightly different nature. As Eire (1995), 151–53, has shown, even though funerals became increasingly complex throughout the sixteenth century, some restraint continued to be exercised in regard to mourning gestures. This may be due in part to the fact that certain ecclesiastical laws distinguished between those gestures that benefited the dead and those that affected only the survivors. Intercessory gestures, such as the participation of priests, friars, confraternities, and poor people were deemed not only acceptable but meritorious. Non-intercessory gestures, such as the wearing of mourning clothes or the lighting of a certain number of candles, had long been deemed tolerable but unessential—or even worse, un-Christian. The customs most excoriated were excesses in the wearing of mourning clothes, excesses in the use of candles, and uncontrolled “dolorous crying.”
119. Rubiés (1995), 42–43.

120. In Dapper (1670), 422 / (1671), 375; Semedo (1996), 111 / (1655), 73.

121. Pantoja (1605), 81r / (1625), 367: “The thing wherein the Chinois are most observant, Ceremonious and Superstitious, is in their Burials, Funerals, and Mournings; for herein they shew their obedience and love to their Parents, whereof their bookes are full”; Martini (1658), 30 (book 1) (in Dapper (1670), 422 / (1671), 384): “It is very strange [*miram*: marvelous, extraordinary] to observe the Duty and Reverence which the Children shew to their Dead parents, wherein no other People may be compar’d to them.”

122. Semedo (1996), 121 / (1655), 83.

3. THE GRADUAL EMBEDDING OF CHRISTIAN FUNERAL RITUALS IN CHINA

1. There is comparatively much more information on funerals of the first thirty years of the Christian mission in Japan: see Cieslik (1950), López Gay (1964) and (1970), 196–240; for Christian burial practices, see the discussion of findings from recent archaeological excavations of Christian tombs in Imano Haruki (2004).

2. Almeida died 17 October. *FR* I, 311–12; Bettray (1955), 303. Compare also with Trigault and Ricci (1615), 266 / (1978), 321 / (1953), 242.

3. *FR* I, 311–12; Bettray (1955), 303–4.

4. *FR* II, 334; Bettray (1955), 299. Compare with Trigault and Ricci (1615), 498–99 / (1978), 548 / (1953), 447.

5. *FR* II, 246; Bettray (1955), 300–1. Compare with Trigault and Ricci (1615), 469 / (1978), 516 / (1953), 427.

6. *FR* II, 247; Bettray (1955), 300–1.

7. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 469–70 / (1978), 516–17 / (1953), 427–28.

8. *FR* II, 249; Bettray (1955), 301; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 469 / (1978), 517–18 / (1953), 428–29.

9. *FR* II, 351 (*christianità*). Trigault and Ricci (1615), 517 (*ritu Christiano*) / (1978), 567 / (1953), 474.

10. *OS* II, 368.

11. *OS* II, 328 (letter to C. Aquaviva, 18 October 1607 quoting a report by M. Dias Sr.); Bettray (1955), 305.

12. *FR* II, 361; Bettray (1955), 310. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 521–22 / (1978), 571 / (1953), 477–78.

13. *FR* II, 516; Bettray (1955), 302 (this passage was written by Trigault). Trigault and Ricci (1615), 602–3 / (1978), 649 / (1953), 553.

14. *FR* II, 523 (in Portuguese: *estilo* and *cortezias*); Bettray (1955), 306. Compare with Trigault and Ricci (1615), 605 (*è ritu Sinensi . . . Ecclesiastico more*) / (1978), 652 / (1953), 556: the remark about past experiences is not mentioned.

15. See detailed discussion in chapter seven of this book.
16. *FR* II, 565–66; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 617 / (1978), 663 / (1953), 566–67 (slightly adapted).
17. *FR* II, 619–20; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 640 / (1978), 685 / (1953), 588 (slightly adapted); Bettray (1955), 309.
18. *FR* II, 628; Bettray (1955), 309. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 644 / (1978), 690 / (1953), 592.
19. Bettray (1955), 312.
20. This is a quote from the *Zhongyong* chapter in the *Liji* (see below).
21. *FR* I, 117–18; translation Rule (1986), 49 (slightly adapted). Rule (note 268) points out that this passage has been subjected to a great deal of critical examination. Compare with Trigault and Ricci (1615), 107–8 / (1978), 163–64 / (1953), 96.
22. For the history of the word “idolatry,” see the study by Bernand and Gruzinski (1988); for “superstition,” see Harmening (1979).
23. *Rito de’ christiani, cerimonie ecclesiastiche* (*FR* II, 246); *è more Christiano, Ecclesiastico ritu* (Trigault and Ricci (1615), 469); *cerimonias da Igreja* (*FR* II, 516); *Ecclesiasticis ritibus* (Trigault and Ricci (1615), 602).
24. It is used in this sense in *FR* I, 311: *quando entrano in religione* (Ricci’s answer to the Chinese who wondered why the Jesuits did not wear mourning garments), *Religiosos nostrates* (Trigault and Ricci (1615), 266).
25. For the history of the term *religio*, see the works by Smith (1963), Despland (1979), and Feil (1986) and (1997); the three authors came together in a conference to discuss their approaches and opinions: see Despland and Vallée (1992).
26. A good translation of *religio* in the seventeenth century seems to be “pratique culturelle” (“pratique liée à une foi déterminée et à une certaine doctrine de la divinité”), see *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1948–1957), vol. 10, 230–31; it had not so much the meaning of a “system” to be academically investigated; for this focus on ritual, see also Smith (1998), 270.
27. Bernand and Gruzinski (1988), 43–44, 234.
28. E. Feil, “From the Classical *Religio* to the Modern *Religion*: Elements of a Transformation between 1550 and 1650,” in Despland and Vallée (1992), 32–56.
29. *FR* I, 108.
30. For an example of the use of these words, see *OS* II, 368.
31. *Riti gentilichi* (*FR* II, 249, 334), *cerimonia de’ gentili* (*FR* II, 249), *cerimonie gentiliche* (*OS* II, 369), *Ethnicis ritibus* (Trigault and Ricci (1615), 498).
32. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 104 / (1978), 160: “Diverses sectes de fausse religion entre les chinois.”
33. *Ex more (sinico)* (*FR* II, 565, 628; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 617, 644); *conforme ao costume da China* (*FR* II, 499); *è Sinensi consuetudine* (Trigault and Ricci (1615),

596). The term *more* is not exclusively used for China, it is also applied to Christianity: e.g., *è more Christiano, Ecclesiastico more* (Trigault and Ricci (1615), 469, 605).

34. *FR I*, 117: *come se fossero vivi*; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 107: *ac si essent superstites*. See also quote about Chinese rituals by Trigault in the previous chapter: *FR I*, 84: *come quando erano vivi*; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 81: *non secus ac si superessent*.

35. *Liji*: 32.13 (*Zhongyong* chapter, 19); also quoted in the chapter on rituals (*Lilun*) in *Xunzi* 19.

36. Plaks (2003), 37 (emphasis mine). Compare Legge (1991), vol. 1, 403: "Thus they served the dead as they would have served them alive; and served the departed as they would have served them had they been continued among them."

37. Ames and Hall (2001), 99: "Serving their dead as though they were living, and serving those who are long departed as though they were still here."

38. *Riti che non fossero conformi al rito de' christiani* (*FR II*, 246) *è more Christiano* (Trigault and Ricci (1615), 469); *non fare nessun rito contra le regole della christianità* (*FR II*, 361) *exclusa omni rituum superstitione* (Trigault and Ricci (1615), 522); *Riti che non erano contrarij alla religione christiana* (*OS II*, 369); see also, against the Christian creed (*profissão, Fede*: *FR II*, 500; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 596–97: *è Christianis legibus . . . praeceptorum legis Divinae custodiam*; mother of John Xu Leshan, grandfather-in-law of Candida Xu who died on 11 February 1611; (Dudink (2001), 107–8).

39. Augustine (1963), book VI, vol. 2, 313; see also O'Daly (1999), 101–9.

40. Or, *Litteratorum*. See, for example, Trigault and Ricci (1615), 104ff, and compare with Trigault and Ricci (1978), 160ff.

41. Lionel Jensen (1997) mistakenly attributes the manufacturing of the term "Confucianism" to the Jesuits of the seventeenth century; see book reviews by Willard J. Peterson in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59, no. 1 (1999): 276–83; Paul Rule in *Journal of Chinese Religions* 27 (1999): 105–11; and N. Standaert in *EASTM (East Asian Science, Technology, and Medicine)* 16 (1999): 115–32.

42. Trigault and Ricci (1615), 110, 112: *profanae Religionis*; compare with Trigault and Ricci (1978), 166, 170.

43. *Ministri degli idoli* (*FR II*, 246); *Bonzo o sacerdote degli idoli* (*OS II*, 369). From the writings of Ricci and his companions, it appears that the Jesuits used two main categories for describing the Chinese "religions." The first, *lex*, or "law," referred to the doctrinal side, including the juridical or prescriptive teaching, of what we today call religions. The term was also used for the three universal laws of *lex naturalis*, *lex Mosaica* and *lex evangelica*. The second category, *secta*, did not have the strong negative connotation that it has in Western languages today; it was a neutral term, derived from the verb *sequi* (to follow), and referring to, among other things, a following, a body of followers, or the adherence to a particular religious or philosophical teacher

or faith. As appears from the translations, in early seventeenth-century texts the terms *lex* and *secta* were often used interchangeably and therefore were apparently close in meaning. These terms correspond to a certain extent to the native terms *jiao* and *jia* as in the expression *rujiao* or *rujia*.

44. For the concept of “inflated difference,” see Ruland (1994).
45. *Histoire de ce qui s’est passé es Royaumes de la Chine et du Japon . . .*, 44 (*Littera Annua* 1619 by M. Dias).
46. *Histoire de ce qui s’est passé es Royaumes de la Chine et du Japon . . .*, 125–27 (*Littera Annua* 1620 by W. P. Kirwitzer (Pantaleon)). The final paragraph makes reference to the anti-Christian movement led by Shen Que (1565–1624) that led to the expulsion of four Jesuits to Macao in 1617.
47. Bartoli (1663), 892.
48. “Wulin Yang mu Lü gongren zhuan,” in Chen Jiru (ca. 1641), *juan* 45, 14a–16a; Chen Jiru also wrote a funeral ode for Yang Tingyun, “Ji Yang Qiyuan shiyu,” in Chen Jiru (ca. 1641), *juan* 8, ff. 40a–41a.
49. Chen Jiru (ca. 1641), *juan* 45, 15a; Standaert (1988), 48.
50. Standaert (1988), 46–47.
51. *Yang Qiyuan xiansheng (chaoxing) shiji* (ca. 1630?), ff. 6a–7a; CCT ZKW, vol. 1, 224–25.
52. See Brokaw (1991), 4ff.; Handlin Smith (1987).
53. Cf. HCC, 422.
54. *Lixiu yijian* (ca. 1639–1645), 26b–27a; WXSBS, vol. 1, 496–97; it is taken from *Yang Qiyuan xiansheng (chaoxing) shiji*.
55. For a short description of the funeral of Han’s mother who died in 1626, see Margiotti (1958), 538.
56. Huang Yi-long (2004), 81; Huang Yi-long (2005), 274.
57. Zürcher (1993), 84–89.
58. *Duoshu* (ca. 1641), 6a–6b; CCT ZKW, vol. 2, 648–49.
59. See detailed discussion in chapter six of this book.
60. Zürcher (2005), 81, dates it from the 1670s. See also Chan (2002), 56–57, 59.
61. Li Jiugong (before 1681), CCT ARSI, vol. 9, 96–99; compare 63–65 (much shorter).
62. Li Jiugong (before 1681), CCT ARSI, vol. 9, 98; compare, 65. On these biographical genres, see Edwards (1948), 780, 782.
63. For a discussion of *zheng*, see Zürcher (1997), 615ff.; see also Liu Kwang-Ching (1990), 4ff.
64. Ebrey (1991a), 79, 196.
65. Li Jiugong (before 1681), CCT ARSI, vol. 9, 100–101; compare, 66–67.
66. Zhang Xiangcan (1680s?), CCT ARSI, vol. 11, 289. Date is unknown. The only indication is that it was presented to Vice-Provincial Giandomenico Gabiani

(1623–1694), who was vice-provincial from 1680 to 1683 and from 1689 to 1692; see Chan (2002), 59.

67. On these practices, see also Ebrey (1991a).

68. Zhang Xiangcan (1680s?), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 11, 290. The quote from *Jiali* comes from a section of the 1341 version reprinted in Ebrey (1991a), 98, 200.

69. Aleni (1637), vol. 1, 28a; Mish (1964), 63 (adapted).

70. Cf. Zürcher (1990a), 451.

71. For an annotated translation of the full text, see Zürcher (2007).

72. *Kouduo richao* (ca. 1630–1640), *juan* 7, 6b–7b, *CCT ARSI*, vol. 7, 468–70; trans. Zürcher (2007), n. VII.9. Zhang Geng's *Haoguai shi* is no longer extant.

73. Quoted in and translated by Menegon (2002), 102; Aleni in response to Juan Miao Shixiang's letter in Biblioteca Casanatense (Rome), ms 1073, 21v–22r; also collated with “Ritos Chinos,” vol. 1, doc. 1, 214v–215r of Archivo de la Provincia del Santo Rosario, Manila and Avila (information provided by E. Menegon). For similar argumentation on the basis of the *Zhongyong* quote, see *Kouduo richao* (ca. 1630–1640), *juan* 4, 11b, *CCT ARSI*, vol. 7, 276; trans. Zürcher (2007), n. IV.10.

74. Aleni (1637), *juan shang*, 27a; trans. Mish (1964), 61.

75. Eire (1995), 141.

76. Li Jiugong (before 1681), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 9, 105; compare 70.

77. *Kouduo richao* (ca. 1630–1640), *juan* 7, 7b, *CCT ARSI*, vol. 7, 470; trans. Zürcher (2007), n. VII.9. Zürcher points out that an almost identical description is contained in Ricci: *FR* II, 481–82; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 589 / (1978), 635 / (1953), 541. *Zhao* and *mu* are ancient cultic terms indicating the hierarchical arrangement of positions, in an alternating sequence starting from the left side of the main personage.

78. Zürcher (2007), n. VII.9 and Zürcher (1990a), 452.

79. Zürcher (1990a), 452.

80. Reference to *Liji* (1992), chap. *Tangong xia*, 4.35.

81. The other version has *yi* (righteousness) instead of *dao*. Li Jiugong (before 1681), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 9, 69.

82. Reference to *Liji*, chap. *Sannianwen*, 39.1.

83. Li Jiugong (before 1681), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 9, 103–5; compare, 68–70.

84. Zürcher (1997), 634.

85. Welch (1967), 184ff.; Lagerwey (1987), 170ff.

86. See Brokaw (1991).

87. *Shengjing zhijie* (1636–1642), *juan* 6, 4b; *WXS*B, vol. 5, 2048.

88. Metzler (1980), 15–17. In 1629, André Palmeiro, SJ (1569–1635), the visitor of the mission, issued instructions summarising the conclusions of the Jiading (Zhejiang) conference where the Jesuits together with some well-known converts had discussed matters such as the name for God, the angels and the soul. The text of Palmeiro is

in many regards pastorally oriented but hardly discusses the funerals in detail. His major concern is the observance of the specific Christian rituals for the dead: the recitation of prayers, the Mass, and Office of the Dead at the commemoration service. Palmeiro, 25r–25v: nos. 16–18 (information provided by L. Brockey and E. Menegon); see also Brockey (2007), 84–85.

89. Menegon (2002), 100, 296. Those related to funerals will be discussed in chapter five of this book.

90. González (1955–1967), vol. 1, 393.

91. Lobo (1915), 384; see also Maas (1926), 103–4 and Biermann (1927), 48. Lobo had left the Society of Jesus and re-entered in 1635; he died in the Indies after having left the Society again (Dehergne (1973), 153).

92. See pontifical brief *Romanae Sedis Antistes* (27 June 1615): Bontinck (1962), 41–42. The use of the Chinese language was granted only to *Chinese* priests.

93. *Shanzhong zhugong guili* (before 1638); Chan (2002), 248: this is a reprint by the Yuedan tang in Jianwu (Jianchang, Jiangxi); the correctors were M. Dias, L. Cataneo and Pedro Ribeiro (1570–1640); the imprimatur was given by Francisco Furtado (1589–1653); other copy ARSI Jap. Sin. I, 112 (Chan (2002), 161–62).

94. See the remark in Palmeiro (1629), 26r, no. 2 “[In baptism] we will use the ritual of Japan, and we will do the ceremonies that it orders since we do not have a copy of the Roman one.”

95. *Manuale* (1605), 192–235; compare also Laures (1941), xviii. Fróis follows Cerqueira’s *Manuale* relatively closely, but not always in the same detail, especially with regard to the instructions. As mentioned by Cerqueira (*Manuale* (1605), 198–200), the three considerations offered to the dying person (*CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 352–55) are taken from Joannes Gerson’s OP (1363–1429), *Opus tripartitum*; see Gerson (1966), 404–7: “332. La médecine de l’âme.”

96. See “Ad R.P.N. Generalem. Judicium P. Ludovici Buglio circa promotionem Sinarum ad sacerdotium” (Beijing, 19 May 1678) (ARSI Jap. Sin., 124, ff. 129–33), repr. in Bontinck (1962), 462–72; for a discussion of this text, see *ibidem*, 180–86.

97. *Misa jingdian* (1670); Bernard (1945), no. 432; Pelliot (1924), 357, n. 2; Bontinck (1962), 155.

98. *Siduo kedian* (1674); Bernard (1945), no. 462; Pelliot (1924), 358, n. 3; Bontinck (1962), 157.

99. Buglio himself calls it “Rituale” in one of his letters, see Bontinck (1962), 466: letter of Beijing, 19 May 1678, 131.

100. *Shengshi lidian* (1675); Bernard (1945), no. 470; Pelliot (1924), 357, n. 4; Bontinck (1962), 157–58; Chan (2002), 211–12. The correctors were G. de Magalhães and F. de Rougemont; the imprimatur was given by F. Verbiest. According to one anonymous article (A. L. (1939), 242; cf. Bontinck (1962), 158, n. 26) the original manuscript of the translation of the *Rituale* and *Breviarium* were in the Beitang Library.

101. Some general differences: both Cerqueira's *Manuale* (1605) and *Shengshi lidian* (1675) start with a calendar; the *Rituale* does not include it. In the baptismal rites of both *Manuale* and *Shengshi lidian*, distinction is made between baptism of men and of women, but not in the *Rituale*. The short note on confirmation in both *Manuale* ((1605), 61) and *Shengshi lidian* ((1675), CCT ARSI, vol. 11, 429) is absent in the *Rituale*. In both *Manuale* and *Shengshi lidian*, the sacrament of marriage precedes the one of extreme unction; in the *Rituale* it follows after the section on the funerals.

102. *Shengshi lidian* (1675), CCT ARSI, vol. 11, 476–521. There are several detailed proofs that Buglio used *Manuale*, rather than *Rituale*. Just like *Manuale* ((1605), 200–201), *Shengshi lidian* (1675) includes the questioning of the sick person (476–77), which is not in *Rituale*. In the Litany of the Saints, Saint Joseph is left out in both *Manuale* and *Shengshi lidian*, though he is present in *Rituale* (after John the Baptist). Several of the specific instructions for the funerals in *Shengshi lidian* (491) can be found in *Manuale* (235), but not in *Rituale*. Both in *Manuale* (268–72) and *Shengshi lidian* (495–502), the verses of Psalm 50 are interrupted with an antiphon; in *Rituale* they are not. The psalms for the funerals of children are similar in *Manuale* (276–79) and *Shengshi lidian* (509–13) (Ps. 112, 148, 149, 150) but different from *Rituale* (Ps. 112. [118], 23, 148). The place and the order of the responsorial prayers is similar in *Manuale* (281–86) and *Shengshi lidian* (515–21); they do appear in *Rituale*, though in a different order and in a different place (under *Officium defunctorum*) and are also included in *Missale* (see sections *Missae defunctorum* and the different prayers for the dead (*Orationes diversae pro defunctis*)).

103. Compare *Shengshi lidian* (1675), CCT ARSI, vol. 11, 476–77, and 477ff. with *Shanzhong zhugong guili* (after 1638); CCT ARSI, vol. 5, 355–59 and 387f. Buglio shortened the text, leaving out the “Exhortationes” of Cerqueira's *Manuale* ((1605), 202–19) and keeping only the prayers.

104. This includes translations of Psalms 50, 112, 148, 149, 150.

105. Bontinck (1962), especially chapter 6 on Couplet.

106. *Shanzhong yiyi lidian* (after 1675); Bernard (1945), no. 444; see also copy in ARSI Jap. Sin. I, 95; Chan (2002), 147–48. See also Brunner (1964), 111–13 (sometimes it is added as a supplement to another text). That *Shanzhong yiyi lidian* (after 1675) is later than *Shengshi lidian* (1675) can be proven by the fact that every time there is a difference between the two, the *Shengshi lidian* is closer to the original version by Fróis. Compare, for example, differences between *Shanzhong zhugong guili* (before 1638), CCT ARSI, vol. 5, 490ff., *Shengshi lidian* (1675), CCT ARSI, vol. 11, 480, and *Shanzhong yiyi lidian* (after 1675), 4aff.

107. Bernard (1945), no. 444 dates it ca. 1671, but it is certainly later than *Shengshi lidian* (1675). In comparison with the 1675 version of the *Shengshi lidian*, the vocabulary and phrasing of Buglio's *Shanzhong yiyi lidian* have been occasionally altered.

108. *Yiwangzhe rikejing* (possibly after 1675); Bernard (1945), no. 443 (date: ca. 1670, but it is possibly later than 1675); see also copy in ARSI Jap. Sin. I, 96; Chan (2002), 96. It is possibly later than *Shengshi lidian* (1675), but it is not clear whether it was compiled before or after *Shanzhong yiyi lidian* (after 1675). When one compares the prayers for the deceased in the three texts, in some cases *Shanzhong yiyi lidian* is closer to *Shengshi lidian*, but in other cases *Yiwangzhe rikejing* is closer to *Shengshi lidian*. See *Manuale* (1605), 281ff.; *Shengshi lidian* (1675), CCT ARSI, vol. 11, 516ff.; *Shanzhong yiyi lidian* (after 1675), 21aff.; *Yiwangzhe rikejing* (possibly after 1675), 5b ff., 27aff.

109. See also, for example, instructions by Palmeiro (1629), 25r, n. 18: “If there is a sufficient number of Fathers, they will recite the entire *Office of the Dead*, according to the custom of the Society.” The *Office* is included in the European *Breviarium* (1568), and similarly the Chinese translation of it, *Yiwangzhe rikejing* (possibly after 1675), is added at the end of some copies of *Siduo kedian* (1674), e.g., at the end of BnF, Chinois 7388.

110. Bontinck (1962), 412; Jennes (1946), 248 n. 42.

111. Brook (1989), 492.

112. Edwards (1948), 786–87.

113. Xu Jijun (1998), 2 and Watson (1988a), 14–15.

114. *Manuale* (1605), 235–301 (including the various prayers for the deceased that could be said at the ordinary Mass).

115. The subdivisions of *Manuale* (1605) are: 1) Funerals of clergy, religious persons or of lay people buried with solemnity; 2) Ordinary funerals of lay people; 3) Children.

116. *Shanzhong yiyi lidian* (after 1675), 10a, 16a; compare with *Shengshi lidian* (1675), CCT ARSI, vol. 11, 492, *Anzang lijie* (“Funerary ritual”), and 506 small note.

117. On the clerical orientation of *Manuale* (1605), see also Rutherford (1970), 98 n. 41. The name of the prayers for encoffining is not given a separate section as it is in Fróis, though in *Shengshi lidian* (1675), CCT ARSI, vol. 11, on page 476, there is a small note, “See below the *rulianjing*.”

118. The only explicit reference to someone liturgically responsible appears on 12a under the name *sidai* (the one replacing the priest).

119. The involvement of the Christian community is probably also an important reason why “the Jesuits could reconcile in their own corporate mind the fact that on one side of the Eurasian continent they insisted on strict adherence to [liturgical] rubrics while on the other side of it they accepted some very important variations” (Maher (2002), 217).

120. See also some of the prayers that are left out, such as the prayer for a deceased pope or priest (*Manuale* (1605), 284; *Shengshi lidian* (1675), CCT ARSI, vol. 11, 518;

Shanzhong yiying lidian (after 1675), 22b); only one prayer to be used at the anniversary of the commemoration of the death of a bishop is kept (*Yiwangzhe rikejing* (possibly after 1675), 6a; 27a).

121. Pfister (1932–1934), 240–41; Brunner (1964), 113 remarks that “The *Ritual for the Dead* of Buglio is very much liked by the Chinese Christians; children learn it by heart in the prayer schools. When a Christian dies in a village, it is very impressive to see the community united before the home of the deceased while chanting in choir like monks these prayers translated in a very beautiful style.”

122. Gy (1955), 79–80.

123. *HCC*, 555; see also Menegon (2002), 112ff.

124. Wills (1994), 390, 394.

125. Ad Dudink, “2.6.1. Sympathising Literati and Officials,” in *HCC*, 483.

126. *HCC*, 383–85.

127. *HCC*, 456ff. and Brockey (2007), chapters 9 and 10.

128. Handlin Smith (1987).

129. *FR* II, 482.

130. Standaert (1988), 65–66, 89–90; Wang Zheng (1634); Zürcher (1999), 278, 282. Margiotti (1958), 548–549.

131. The first six of these are listed in the biblical parable of the sheep and the goats (Matthew 25:31–46). They are the criteria by which Christ will judge people. As early as the third century the additional deed, burying the dead, was added. It was chosen for inclusion because it is highly praised in the book of Tobit (Tobit 1:17–19) (Kirschbaum (1968–1976), vol. 1, 246).

132. Zürcher (1990a), 441–42.

133. Handlin Smith (1987), 330–31.

134. Zürcher (1999), 281.

135. Black (1989), chapters 4 and 5; Maher (2002), 201.

136. Bürkler (1942), 13.

137. Dehergne (1956), 970; Margiotti (1961), 135; see also the list of congregations existing in Shanghai in 1683 in Pfister (1932–1934), 226–27.

138. See also Brockey (2007), chapters 9 and 10.

139. Black (1989), 104–7, 231–33; Eire (1995), 134ff.

140. For this date, see Chan (2002), 234.

141. *Shengmu huigui* (before 1673), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 455. *Shanzhongjing* is possibly a reference to João Fróis’ *Shanzhong zhugong guili* or to a section in a prayer book, i.e., Brunner (1964), 74, 265, 337–38.

142. “Renhui huigui” (n.d.), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 475–76; see also the rules “Shengmu huigui” (n.d.), that refer to “Renhui huigui”: “When a Christian is in agony of death, let his family notify the president, who will transmit to the neighbouring

Christians that they gather at his house to chant prayers. The rituals of funeral and burial should be performed as prescribed in the rules of the Association of Charity.” *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 494 (cf. Chan (2002), 459).

143. Schall von Bell (1942), 328–31; Margiotti (1963), 57; see also the Congregation of the Good Death, canonically established in 1680 in Macao, and twenty years later in Beijing (54–57).

144. Schall von Bell (1942), 330–31.

145. Zhang Xianqing (2007a), “Conclusion”; see also Brook (1989) and Szonyi (2002).

146. On the Eucharist, see Dudink (2007); on confession see the various articles in *Forgive Us Our Sins* (2006).

147. For an analysis of the creation of new rituals within a lineage, see Szonyi (2002), 143ff.

148. For variation in Confucian rituals, see Ebrey (1991b), 209.

4. FUNERALS AS PUBLIC MANIFESTATION

1. The child was born Shunzhi 14/10/7, or 12 November 1657, and died Shunzhi 15/1/24, or 25 February 1658, before having received a name. Contrary to practice, the child was posthumously made a prince of the first class. He was buried Shunzhi 15/8/27 (24 September 1658).

2. For Magalhães’ European evaluation at that time of Schall’s role in this Bureau, see Romano (2004).

3. On this controversy, see Ad Dudink, “2.6.3. Opponents.” In: *HCC*, 513–15; Huang Yi-long (1991).

4. Twenty-one Jesuits, three Dominicans and one Franciscan; four Dominicans in Fujian were “overlooked.”

5. Metzler (1980), 23ff.; Cummins (1993), 150.

6. German partial translation and summary are in Metzler (1980), 24–28; for the original sources, see Metzler (1980), 28 n. 11, and the printed version in *Acta Cantonensia Authentica* (1700); a Latin version is also included in Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars I, Cap. VI, n. 2 (1668), 195r–197v.

7. Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars I, Cap. VI, n. 2 (1668), 197v (for translation and discussion, see in part 4 of this article); Metzler (1980), 28.

8. *Acta Cantonensia Authentica* (1700), 30; Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars I, Cap. VI, n. 2 (1668), 197r–v; Metzler, 27. *Acta Cantonensia Authentica* has “cum funereo apparatu” (absent in Dunyn-Szpot) and “committitur” (“relinquitur” in Dunyn-Szpot).

9. Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710).

10. “Funerum et Exequiarum Christianarum Ratio à Patribus Exulibus Cantone

instituta, et ad Praxim reducta”: this title can be found in the index at the end of the second volume. It is not clear whether this section, like the preceding one, originates from Adrien Grelon, SJ (1618–1696), *Dissertatione de Sinis Ieiunantibus* as mentioned in the margin of Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars III, Cap. IV, n. 8 (1677–1678), 285v.

11. Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars III, Cap. IV, n. 8 (1677–1678), 286v.

12. The link between this accusation and the decisions of the Canton Conference is made explicit by the fact that the first sentence of article 34 of the Canton Conference is quoted literally by Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars III, Cap. IV, n. 8 (1677–1678), 286r.

13. Suffragia are interventions by the living faithful (Mass, prayers, alms, works of piety) for other faithful, especially for the consolation and the liberation of the souls in purgatory. See “Suffragium” in *Liturgisch Woordenboek* (1958–1962) and Hériss (1955).

14. Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars III, Cap. IV, n. 8 (1677–1678), 287r–v.

15. Ibid.

16. First printed in French in 1688 with the title, *Histoire d’une dame chrétienne de la Chine, ou par occasion les usages de ces Peuples, l’établissement de la Religion, les manières des Missionnaires, & les Exercices de Pieté des nouveaux Chrétiens sont expliqués*, with Spanish (1691), Dutch (1694), and Italian translations. The Dutch version, titled *Historie van eene groote, christene mevrouwe van China met naeme mevrouw Candida Hiu*, is more extensive and sometimes more detailed than the French. Therefore the notes will refer first to the Dutch and then to the French version.

17. *Shengjiao guicheng* concerns a manuscript that belonged to the Beitang library. The Chinese text and French translation were published in Verhaeren (1939–1940). For dating and authorship, see Verhaeren (1939–1940), 451–53. The reason to attribute it to Pacheco (Chinese name: Cheng Jili) or Couplet (Chinese name: Bo Yingli) is that the text is signed by someone for whom the final character of his name was *li*. Pacheco was as vice-provincial of China one of the persons responsible for the Canton Conference. There are also similarities between several rules and descriptions in this text and in Couplet’s *Life of Madame Candida Xu* (including the funeral cross).

18. Couplet (1694), 91–92 / (1688), 86–87; similar passage (1694), 144 / (1688), 136. Since Couplet left Macao on 5 December 1681, most of the information included in this book dates from before that date. One may notice that in 1671 Couplet himself brought the remains of Brancati, who had died in Canton 25 April 1671, to his former mission in Shanghai to be buried there (Chan (1990), 69).

19. Couplet (1694), 92–94 / (1688), 87–88. See also Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars III, Cap. I, n. 2 (1672), 253r–v. Chinese text: *Xichao ding’an* (version 3), 61a–64b; XC, 116–7.

20. For Christian cemeteries in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century China, see Ad Dudink, “3.3. Church Buildings, Cemeteries and Tombstones,” in *HCC*, 586–91; concerning the use of consecrated cemeteries in the 1660s, see also the reference in Brockey (2007), 118.

21. Couplet (1694), 141 / (1688), 133.

22. Chan (1990), 70–71.

23. Couplet (1694), 142 / (1688), 134.

24. Couplet (1694), 93–94 / (1688), 88–89. At this occasion it was discovered that the body of M. Martini, buried for eighteen years, had been fully preserved.

25. Golvers (1999), 316, 336; see also “Account book,” 150, 165, 166, 216.

26. *Shengjiao guicheng* (n.d.), 472–73; French translation in Verhaeren (1939–1940), 460–61.

27. Couplet (1694), 150–51 (reference to four thousand families) / (1688), 141–42.

28. Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, between 78–79 / (1736), vol. 2, between 120–21 / (1738–1741), vol. 2, between 12–13. See also “Figure de la Croix avec laquelle les chrestiens de la Chine ont accoustumé de se faire ensevelir” (engraved by F. De Louvement). ARSI Jap. Sin. III, 22.5 (Chan (2002), 496).

29. See Henschenius and Papebrochius (1685–1688), in the section *Danielis Papebrochii e Soc(ietatis) Jesu paralipomena addendorum, mutandorum aut corrigendorum in conatu chronico-historico ad catalogum Romanorum Pontificum* (1688) (one folio after 141). The Bollandist Daniël Papebrochius, SJ (1628–1714), was an active supporter of Philippe Couplet during his stay in Europe (1683–1692). See Golvers (1998).

30. This question had already been raised in Ricci’s time; see Bettray (1955), 310–11.

31. *Shengjiao guicheng* (n.d.), 472–74; French translation in Verhaeren (1939–1940), 460–61.

32. “Against the Catholics” is added in the Dutch version.

33. Couplet (1694), 144 / (1688), 136–37.

34. Watson (1988a), 14.

35. Couplet (1694), 145 / (1688), 137. The final remark only appears in the Dutch version.

36. The Dutch version reads “three times.”

37. Couplet (1694), 152 / (1688), 143.

38. Instead of “a eulogy, or,” the Dutch version reads “a tomb inscription, and.”

39. Couplet (1694), 152–53 / (1688), 143–44.

40. See especially the preliminary laying out and the final laying out, described in Ebrey (1991a), 81ff. and Naquin (1988), 39–41; see also the family condolence sequence in an early twentieth-century description (originally 1917), *Qingbai leichao* (1996), (*sangjilei*), vol. 8, 3544; on funerary portraits in China see Ebrey (1991a), 78 (Zhu Xi questioned the use of such portraits); and Xu Jijun (1998), 487–88.

41. Many details appear in *The Golden Lotus* (1988), especially in chapter 62 (The Death of the Sixth Lady) and chapter 63 (The Sixth Lady's Funeral) in vol. 3, 142ff. For example, table with incense (143, 154), curtain (146, 152), portrait (146, 151, 153, 158, 161), women behind a curtain (161), printed obituary notice (155), funeral dress (155), and panegyric (159). As pointed out in chapter two, above, these details are also present in the contemporary European descriptions. For more on women behind curtains, see Dapper (1670), 412 / (1671), 373–74; and Semedo (1996), 112 / (1655), 75. See also illustrations attached to chapter 63 of *Jinpingmei cihua* (1617): selection of the portrait (opposite 1764), and women behind the curtain (opposite 1765).

42. The practice of using effigies of the deceased is mentioned in several other contemporary European sources: Dapper (1670), 409, 412, 419–20 / (1671), 374, 376, 383; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 80 / (1978), 139 / (1953), 73 (compare *FR*, vol. 1, 84); Semedo (1996), 112 / (1655), 75; Schall (1942), 430–31. Portraits of Jesuits in China include those of Matteo Ricci (1610) by Manuel Pereira (Trigault and Ricci (1615), 614 / (1978), 660 / (1953), 564 (compare *FR*, vol. 2, 543)); Niccolò Longobardo (1654), by order of the Emperor (Schall (1942), 308–9); and Gabriel de Magalhães (1677) and Lodovico Buglio (1682), also by order of the Emperor (Couplet (1694), 143 / (1688), 135). Xu Guangqi, wanting to imitate the example of Ricci, refused to have a portrait made during his lifetime (*FR*, vol. 2, 543 n. 3). For an example of the use of a portrait for a common Christian, see *Kouduo richao* (ca. 1630–1640), juan 7, 7b, *CCT ARSI*, vol. 7, 470.

43. Aleni (1637), *juan shang*, 27a; translation in Mish (1964), 61. On the realistic representation of a person recently deceased as a new theme in portrait painting since the beginning of the sixteenth century, see Ariès (1985), 199ff. The works are few in number and do not include many men or members of the laity—the custom appears to have been mainly reserved for nuns.

44. Stuart and Rawski (2001), 52, 56.

45. Couplet (1691), opposite 1 (with Latin explanation); compare with Couplet (1688) (with French explanation) / (1694) (with Dutch explanation). In Du Halde (Humblot designer, Foubonnen engraver) the funeral portrait is transformed into a standing figure. Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, between 78–79 / (1736), vol. 2, between 120–21 / (1738–1741), vol. 3, between 16–17.

46. Couplet (1694), 120–21 / (1688), 114–15. For the title of *shuren*, see Hucker (1985), n. 5438. This title corresponds to the third rank of honorary title. Franke (1942), 52.

47. Stuart and Rawski (2001), 58. Compare the portrait of Candida Xu with that of Lady Guan (circa mid-seventeenth to early eighteenth century; inscription dated 1716) who is depicted with Buddhist prayer beads. Stuart and Rawski (2001), 53, fig. 2.1.

48. Couplet (1694), 153–54 / (1688), 144–45.

49. Cf. *Jiali* (1341): Ebrey (1991a), 98–100; Naquin (1988), 41–42; Zheng (1995), 266ff.; Xu Jijun (1998), 490; *The Golden Lotus* (1988), vol. 3, 158–59.

50. Couplet (1694), 154 / (1688), 145–46.
 51. Couplet (1694), 154–55 / not in French version.
 52. Cf. Naquin (1988), 43; for descriptions of pompous funerary processions, see also *The Golden Lotus* (1988), chapter 65 (The Burial of the Lady of the Vase), vol. 3, 180ff., and *A Dream of Red Mansions* (1978), chapter 14 (Lin Ruhai Dies in Yangzhou), vol. 1, 195ff. See also illustration attached to chapter 65 of *Jinpingmei cihua* (1617), opposite 1808.
 53. Schall (1942), 442–43. Though it is not always said clearly, they seem to have attended all public ceremonies and sacrifices that accompanied these funerals. An earlier example is Manuel Dias, superior of the Jesuits, who presented in 1614 his condolences to the emperor himself upon the death of his mother. Herrera Maldonado (1622), 359–60.
 54. Jossion and Willaert (1938), 363. French translation in Bosmans (1912), 97. See introduction of this book.
 55. Yang (1961), 37–38. For a detailed account of two funeral processions, including the expenses, written in 1924 by Gu Jiegang (1893–1980), see Gu (1928–1929) / (1981).
 56. Couplet (1694), 91 / (1688), 85–86; similar passage in (1694), 144 / (1688), 136. Since Couplet left Macao on 5 December 1681, most of the information included in this book dates to before his departure.
 57. “Descriptio Processionis non visae in Europa”: Funeral of Xu Guangqi (died 1633; transfer of coffin to Shanghai 1634; burial 1641), in Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus I, Pars I (1641), 6r–7r. See also the funeral of G. Rho, who died 26 April 1638 and was buried 5 May 1638, in Văth (1991), 129–30. For the funeral procession of the Dominican Friar Domingo Coronado (1614–1665), who died and was buried in Beijing after being summoned there due to the Calendar Case, see Gabiani (1673), 349–50.
 58. In the eighteenth century there are also several descriptions of elaborate Christian funeral processions. For a detailed description of the funeral procession of Bernardino della Chiesa, OFM (1644–1721; died 20 December 1721; buried 7 April 1722), bishop of Beijing diocese, see “Relatio de Illmi D. Bernardinus della Chiesa Exsequiarum celebratione a P. Carolo de Castorano Illmo D. Ioh. Fr. Nicolai Data, Lintsing 10 Septembris 1722,” in *SF* V, 798–803.
- One important case was the controversy that arose from the (excessive) funeral of Girolamo Franchi, SJ (1667–1718; died 13 February 1718; buried 10 April 1718), celebrated by Miguel Fernández Oliver, OFM (1665–1726); see “Relatio examinis circa exsequias Patris Hieronymi Franchi a P. Fernández Oliver celebratas, Tsinan-fu 23 Maii 1719,” in *SF* VIII, 2, 970–78, and also several other documents in *SF* V and *SF* VIII (see also Mungello [2001], 91–103). Oliver was criticized for having organized an extravagant funeral service and procession. To this criticism he answered: “Why

with so much and exaggerated pomp? . . . With such pomp I wanted to counter the claim I have heard for many years, that [the members of] our sacred law bury their own [dead] as if they are dogs, and that they do not give them those final honors that even the enemy usually gives to the enemy, qualifying us as non-pious, even toward the fathers who brought us here, the masters who taught us, and the friends who loved us" (*SF* VIII, 2, 974).

Another example is the case of Dominique Parrenin (1665–1741; died 29 September 1741; buried 15 November 1741); see Gaubil (1970) (letter of 21 November 1741 to Du Halde), "Le 15 novembre fixé pour l'enterrement, fut un jour de *triomphe* pour la religion," 547–50; see also Naquin (2000), 579.

59. The images of "elephants, camels and tigers" are mentioned by several European sources, but it is not clear how widespread this practice was.

60. Johann Adam Schall von Bell died in 1666, but received funerary honors only after his rehabilitation in 1669. The next one to receive such honors was Thomas Pereira in 1708. A detailed discussion appears in chapter seven of this book.

61. Zürcher (1994), 40–41.

62. Chow (1994), 12–14; these two modes of transmission can be compared to Yan Yuan's (1635–1704) argumentation that moral order was sustained not through writing and words but through concrete ritual practice. Shang Wei (2003), 39ff.

63. Turner (1969), 96ff.

5. FUNERALS AS COMMUNITY PRACTICE

1. This is the only guideline found for the seventeenth century so far; for the eighteenth century, see, for example, the funeral instructions and guidelines for the condolence sequence for the Yunnan–Sichuan region compiled by Joachim de Martiliat, MEP (1706–1755), in 1744. Launay (1920), vol. 2, 7–11.

2. "Linsang chubin yishi" (earlier version), ARSI Jap. Sin. II, 169.4; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 439–46.

3. "Linsang chubin yishi" (later version), ARSI Jap. Sin. I, 153; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 447–65.

4. "Sangzang yishi" (earlier version), ARSI Jap. Sin. I, 164; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 467–79.

5. "Sangzang yishi" (later version), ARSI Jap. Sin. I, 164a; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 481–91.

6. Though text A may very well be the original version on which text B was based, there are major differences between them. Text A is much shorter, nineteen articles in total, versus thirty-two articles in text B. Three have been split into two articles of text B and one into three articles of text B; thus, text A₁ corresponds to B₂ plus

B3; A5 corresponds to B9 plus B10 plus B11; A6 corresponds to B24 plus B25; and A12 corresponds to B28 plus B29. Two articles of text A become one in text B, namely, A17 combines with A19 to make B30. The corresponding number of articles is also limited: eight of the nineteen articles of text A (8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18) have not been retained in text B or the subsequent texts. The articles unique to text A mainly concern instructions for prayer. Text B is the longest text. It is very similar to texts C and D, but it has two articles more: article 23 (formula of the necrology) and article 25 (invitation of community leader to burial service). Besides some minor differences in vocabulary or phrasing, the other major differences consist in the content of article 11 (see below). Texts C and D are identical, except for one sentence in article 11.

7. There are no notes on text A.

8. “Linsang chubin yishi” (later version), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 448; trans. Chan (2002), 205.

9. “Sangzang yishi” (earlier version), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 470; trans. Chan (2002), 214 (slightly adapted here).

10. For a biography, see *SF* III, 333–51 and *SF* VII, 123–32. Unfortunately, his correspondence does not make reference to the apparent conflict that required the various revisions of “Ritual Sequence” guideline. On his Chinese treatises, see Bernard (1945), nos. 461, 502, 503, and 520; on the pastoral norms, see “Normae pastorales pro seraphica missione statutae, Cantone exeunte a. 1683,” *SF* VII, 187–95.

11. Giovanni Francesco Nicolai da Leonissa (1656–1737), *SF* IV, 463–77; *SF* VI, 3–18.

12. “Sangzang yishi” (later version), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 482; trans. Chan (2002), 215. This document is signed 15 May 1685 (in fact one day earlier than text C). The phrase, “solemn declaration of protest” of “Sangzang yishi” (earlier version) has changed into “statement of clarification.” The detailed discussion of the reasons for this withdrawal follows in the next chapter.

13. Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710) also remarks that he is not sure whether it was ever printed. See next note.

14. Filippucci was of the opinion that it was difficult to condemn on the basis of one protest a practice that for many years had taken a stable form for Jesuits and that was put into practice by neophytes without stigma of error in faith. See the section, based on a letter by Filippucci (Canton, 23 February 1686), “Controversia inter Basilicanum and Philippucium ob ritum quondam Sinensium à morte vita functorum fieri solitum” in Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. VII, n. 2 (1685), 73r–v.

15. “Linsang chubin yishi” (later version), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 447–65. Subtitles have been added in this translation, within square brackets, in order to illustrate that the guideline closely follows the sequence of the *Jiali* laid out in chapter 1. The numbering of the statutes is original.

16. No mention is made here of the washing or dressing of the body, a step that *Jiali* includes at this point of the preparations.

17. The phrase appears in article 19 where *bendi zhi li* of text B has been replaced by *yuezhong zhi li* of texts C and D. That the reference is to customs within Guangdong is additionally confirmed by the fact that the title page of text B bears the three large characters for Dayuantang as place of production (“Linsang chubin yishi” [later version], *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 448). This is the Jesuit church then existing in Canton.

18. For an overview of this structure, see Watson (1988a), 12–15 and Ebrey (1991a), 65–70. In the translation the elementary structure has been added between square brackets.

19. Ebrey (1991a), 81 and 84; Naquin (1988), 39–40. This reference is left out in the other versions.

20. Yan Mo (ca. 1694).

21. These three are also called *daqí*; see Zheng (1995), 263 and Chen Huaizhen (1934), 140; compare also Naquin (1988), 41.

22. Watson (1988a), 7, 12, 18; Watson (1988b), 133.

23. Watson (1988b), 118–19.

24. Watson (1988b), 118.

25. Watson (1988b), 122.

26. See DuBois (2005), 53, 179, 183, 191. It is partly because the sectarians are cheaper than monks. How far back this practice goes is unclear, however.

27. These are instructions for a day watch—morning, midday, and evening—and not for the night watch, as mentioned in A7 (B26), with evening, midnight, and morning prayers.

28. For these prayers, see also Brunner (1964), 275ff. The number of repetitions for the Our Father and Hail Mary prayers is the same as in “Renhui huigui” (n.d.), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 476.

29. Fróis, *Shanzhong zhugong guili* (before 1638), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 428 (*rulian qiannian*), 431 (*rulian hounian*), 433 (*anzang qiannian*), 434 (*anzang hounian*); Buglio, *Shanzhong yiying lidian* (after 1675), 9a (*zhonghou daowen*); compare with *Shengshi lidian* (1675), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 11, 489.

30. For *lianbujing* (A3), see *shenglian bujing* in Brunner (1964), 111.

31. Making four genuflections, instead of the more customary three, was quite common in China. It is mentioned in *Jiali* (1341) (Ebrey (1991a), 29, 189), and also in numerous contemporary writings, such as Xu Qianxue’s *Duli tongkao* (1696), *SKQS*, vols. 112–14.

32. See also Lozada (2001), 150. Lozada gives an anthropological description of Christian funerals in “Little Rome,” a village in the province of Guangdong in the 1990s. The funeral ritual as he observed it and the ritual process as stipulated in the “Ritual Sequence” guideline from the seventeenth century, from the same prov-

ince, are surprisingly similar. Compare also with Kang Zhijie (2006), 305–33, which includes a description of the Catholic funeral liturgy in Mopanshan (northwest Hubei) and a comparison with “Linsang chubin yishi” (later version).

33. Compare with the role of the funeral associations for the spreading of Confucian ideas, in Ho Shu-yi (2000), 209.

34. Brunner (1964), 184, 278; see also *Misa jingdian* (1670) (end of final volume *zhusheng guiyi*), 59a.

35. According to Chen Gang (2000), 80, *xiaozi* is a general term for filial descendant that refers to the deceased’s sons and daughters, sons- and daughters-in-law, grandchildren, nieces and nephews, and their spouses and children.

36. Watson (1988b), 115.

37. This conflict will be analyzed in the next chapter.

38. Watson (1988a), 4; Thompson (1988), 73. For Arnold Van Gennep’s analysis of rites of passage, see Huntington and Metcalf (1979), 8 ff.; Bell (1997), 94ff.; and Tong (2004), 147.

39. Watson (1988a), 10. An exceptional text on the correct interpretation and belief with regard to funeral rites is Ferdinand Verbiest’s *Tianzhujiao sangli wenda* (1682) (see especially the next chapter of this book).

40. Thompson (1988), 73; Granet (1922), 105.

41. See the use of the same quotations by Ricci and Aleni in chapter three.

42. On this notion, see “Communion des saints,” in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (1903–1972), vol. 3, 429–79.

43. For an explanation of the prayer at funerals and especially prayers of intercession for those who are in purgatory, see Verbiest (1682), 1a–2aff.; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 495–97; this text on Christian funerals is sometimes printed with Verbiest’s treatise on the related theme of remuneration of the good and the bad: *Shan’ebao lüeshuo* (1670), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 509–30 (Chan [2002], 36).

44. Ariès (1985), 139–47.

45. *Shengshen xiangtonggong* concerns the exchange of merit between the faithful and from the saints to the faithful. *Jiaoyao jielüe* (1615), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 1, 203–4; Brunner (1964), 275. For other references to *tonggong*, see also: *Shengmu huigui* (before 1673), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 456; Li Jiugong (before 1681), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 11, 104–5. On *tonggongdan*, see also Zhang Xianqing (2007b). See, for example, the *tonggongdan* (printed in 1740) in BnF. Chinois 7441, with the names of Clara and Anna. See also the different *tonggongdan* of Peter Huang (died 10 June 1783 at the age of eighty-five years) and Monique Zhao (died 9 July 1783 at the age of eighty-one years; the pamphlet was attached to a memorial by the Governor of Huguang reporting about Christian activities, 31 October 1784). See *Qingzhongqianqi xiyang tianzhujiao zai-hua huodong dang’an shiliao* (2004), 421, no. 197.

46. *Shengjiao guicheng* (n.d.), 472; French translation by Verhaeren (1939–1940), 460. The work of mercy of burying the dead was one of the core tasks of many associations: see *Shengmu huigui* (before 1673), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 455; “Renhui huigui” (n.d.), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 475. Some associations were especially established with the purpose of helping the dying and organizing funerals; for example, a congregation established by J. A. Schall von Bell in Beijing (to counter the criticism that Christians neglect funerals), in Schall von Bell (1942), 328–31 (Margiotti [1963], 57–59); see also the association of the “good death” established in Macao in 1680 and later introduced in the mainland (Margiotti [1963], 54–57).

47. Cf. Lozada (2001), 12.

48. Chen Gang (2000), 181; Granet (1922), 105–6; Lozada (2001), 12, 150.

49. Yang (1961), 35–38.

50. Yang (1961), 35; see also Granet (1922), 107–10; Johnson (1988); Huntington and Metcalf (1979), 23ff.; Ebersole (2000), 238.

51. Dapper (1670), 409, 412, 417, 418, 419 / (1670), 374 (“crying and lamenting; cry without ceasing”), 377 (“cry”), 381 (“formal Lamentations,” “continual doleful noise”), 382 (“they make a hideous noise, more like howling than weeping,” “crying a second or third time”); Trigault and Ricci (1615), 81 / (1978), 139 / (1953), 73 (compare *FR I*, 84); Las Cortes (1991), 190 / (2001), 156; Semedo (1996), 112 / (1655), 75; Schall von Bell (1942), 425, 426, 429.

52. Le Comte (1990), 83–84 / (1737), 50, concerning the funeral procession for F. Verbiest, writes, “Christians hold in one hand a lighted taper and in the other a handkerchief to wipe off their tears. The Gentiles are accustomed at such solemnities to shed feigned tears; but the Christians’ loss made them [the Christians] shed real ones.” See also the remark in Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, 127 / (1736), vol. 2, 150 / (1738–1741), vol. 1, 308: “Nothing can be more surprising than the Tears which the Chinese shed, and the Cries they make at these Funerals; but the Manner, in which they express their Sorrow, seems too regular and affected to excite in a European the same Sentiments of Grief that [one] is the Spectator of.” The English translator added the following note: “The Irish still put forth as many doleful Cries over the Dead as the Chinese, and perhaps shed so many Tears: whether as unfeignedly I will not say, because the Irish Mourners are for the most part hired.” For a discussion of tears expressing “real” emotions, see Ebersole (2000), 213ff.

53. The expression in A2 is not adopted in the corresponding articles of B, C, and D; the expression in B7 is not adopted in the corresponding articles of C and D (idem in B20).

54. Yang (1961), 37.

55. Chau (2006), 133ff. Ritual banquets were also the culmination of burial ceremonies throughout early modern Spain; see Eire (1995), 148.

6. CHRISTIAN VERSUS SUPERSTITIOUS RITUALS

1. *HCC*, 680–88.
2. Thus the time frame chosen for this book ends when the sharpest discussions of the Rites Controversy begin.
3. Dunyn–Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars III, Cap. IV, n. 8 (1677–1678), 287r.
4. The word *xie* has been translated as “superstitious” when it is related to ritual (the neologism “heteroprax” might also be used), and as “heterodox” when related to doctrine, as in the prohibition of entering heterodox words in eulogies (B22).
5. Texts C and D, the versions adopted by Bishop Luo Wenzao, OP, and Agustín de San Pascual, OFM, seem less restrictive because they leave out the prohibition and the adjective “non-superstitious” (*wuxie*) (see also article B16): “The rituals of the Holy Teaching and the local rituals are different. Therefore it is appropriate that followers of the Teaching first perform the rituals of the Holy Teaching and next the local rituals.” A similar difference appears at the beginning of article 13, where texts A and B read, “Before the funerary tablet of the deceased, it is not appropriate to chant prayers, but only to perform the local rituals.” Texts C and D leave out the prohibition of chanting prayers, so that the sentence reads, “Before the funerary tablet of the deceased, one only performs the local rituals.” These are minor changes, but they indicate that the way in which a prohibition is explicitly or implicitly mentioned reflects a difference in attitude towards the other tradition.
6. For a discussion in the early period, see Bettray (1955), 296ff.
7. Original text: *CPF* (1893), no. 1698; *CPF* (1907), no. 114; translation: *100RD*, no. 1.
8. “The Congregation of the Holy Office, March 23, 1656 to China missionaries,” original text: *CPF* (1893), no. 1699; *CPF* (1907), no. 126; translation: *100RD*, no. 2 (slightly adapted).
9. “Normae pastorales pro seraphica missione statutae, Cantone exeunte a. 1683,” *SF VII*, 187–95.
10. This part of the sentence is unclear in the original text.
11. “Normae pastorales pro seraphica missione statutae, Cantone exeunte a. 1683,” *SF VII*, 189.
12. The four ritual guidelines contain little explicit description of “superstitious rituals.” What is considered superstitious can only be deduced from the different prohibitions the text makes—what is “not allowed.”
13. *Shengjiao guicheng* (n.d.), 472; French trans. Verhaeren (1939–1940), 460.
14. *Liji* (1992), 4.27; Legge (1885), 177.
15. “Sangzang yishi” (earlier version), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 473–74.
16. “Sangzang yishi” (later version), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 485–86.
17. “Sangzang yishi” (earlier version), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 470; “Sangzang yishi”

(later version), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 482; Chan (2002), 214–15; Chan, 214 translates: “to add a solemn declaration of protest to number eleven.” The same term also appears twice in the above quoted “The Congregation of the Holy Office, March 23, 1656 to China missionaries.”

18. See the section “Controversia inter Basilicanum & Philippucium ob ritum quondam Sinensium à morte vita functorum fieri solitum,” based on a letter by Filippucci (Canton, 23 Febr. 1686), in Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. VII, n. 2 (1685), 73r–v. At this point Dunyn-Szpot himself mentions that Filippucci was not ignorant of the Instruction from Propaganda Fide to the three new Vicars Apostolic in Tonkin and Cochin China (1659): “Do not try to persuade these peoples to change their rites, their customs, their ways, as long as they are not openly opposed to religion and good morals. What would be sillier than to import France, Spain, Italy, or any other country of Europe into China? Do not import these, but the faith. The faith does not reject or crush the rites and customs of any race, as long as these are not evil. Rather, it wants to preserve them.” Dunyn-Szpot gives the reference to “Philippus Couplet in sua Relatione.” Original text: *CPF* (1907), no. 135; translation: *100RD*, no. 3.

19. In 1682, a few years earlier than the “Ritual Sequence” guideline, Filippucci had written an extensive rejection of the seventeen questions Morales had raised to the Propaganda Fide. In this rejection Filippucci contests the “false assumption” (*falsa suppositio*) that offerings for the dead are sacrifices. This document was written in Macao in 1682 (Filippucci (1700), 155; 25 November 1682; manuscript version is dated 23 March 1683) and published in Paris in 1700. See Filippucci (1700), 21–28 (nos. 24–29), 45ff.

20. “Normae pastorales pro seraphica missione statutae, Cantone exeunte a. 1683,” *SF VII*, 189.

21. “Normae pastorales pro seraphica missione statutae, Cantone exeunte a. 1683,” *SF VII*, 190; see another reference in article 17, *SF VII*, 194.

22. On the origin of this practice, see de Groot (1892–1897), vol. 2, 711ff.; Doré (1911), vol. 1, 114. For descriptions of the burning of paper money and objects in contemporary European sources, see Dapper (1670), 409, 413, 418, 419 / (1671), 374, 377, 381, 382; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 82 / (1978), 140 / (1953), 74 (compare *FR*, vol. 1, 84); Semedo (1996), 113 / (1655), 76; Schall von Bell (1942), 428.

23. Aleni (1637), *juan shang*, 27a–28a; trans. Mish (1964), 62–63; slightly adapted. Compare with the discussion about “real” and “false,” in M. Dias’ *Shengjing zhijie* (1636–1642), *juan* 6, 4b–5a; *WXS*, vol. 5, 2048–49 (see chapter three of this book).

24. *Kouduo richao* (ca. 1630–1640), *juan* 4, 11b–12a, *CCT ARSI*, vol. 7, 276–277; trans. Zürcher (2007), n. IX.10.

25. *Acta Cantonensia Authentica* (1700), 32; Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars I, Cap. VI, n. 2 (1668), 197v; Metzler (1980), 28. *Kin in tim* is *jinyinding*. *Chi cien*

is probably *zhiqian*, though Dunyn-Szpot has a comma between *chi* and *cien*. The characters for the final word(s) are not yet identified: *cù* can be *gu/ku* or *zu/cu*. According to Margiotti (1958), 463, n. 54 it should be *ma-tsu* (*mazu*). *Ma* could also refer to *zhima*, paper on which were printed the horse-head guardians of the underworld (see Doré (1911), vol. 1, 62–63).

26. Several Chinese Christians reject the use of paper money explicitly in their writings; see Li Jiugong (before 1681), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 11, 94, 96, 100; Zhang Xiangcan (ca. 1680s?), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 11, 290 (on the basis of the fact that it is not mentioned in *Jiali*); “Sangli ailun” (n.d.), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 11, 272–73 (similar argument as previous text). On Zhu Xi’s opinion about the use of paper money, see Ebrey (1991a), 98 n. 91; de Groot (1892–1897), vol. 2, 716.

27. On the occasion of Buglio’s death, Verbiest received an imperial edict granting a subsidy for funeral costs (see discussion in next chapter). *ARSI Jap.Sin.* II, 165.2; Chinese text and translation in Chan (2002), 452. See detailed discussion in the next chapter.

28. Verbiest (1682); Chan (2002), 35–36. The date is added at the end of the text (f. 7b) in a different script from the rest of the text; see also the other copy in *ARSI Jap.Sin.* I, [38/42] 38/2.1.

29. Gayoso was a Spanish Jesuit who came to China from the Philippines in 1678. He is rather unknown, partly because he returned to the Philippines in 1685 or 1686. See Reil (1970). Gayoso’s letter appears in Gayoso (1683), with references to Verbiest’s letters on 3v–4r. Information provided by Noël Golvers. A critical edition and summary are to be published by Golvers in *Supplement to F. Verbiest’s Correspondence*.

30. See Chan (2002), 35–38. At earlier occasions officials sent by the Kangxi Emperor had asked questions on funeral rituals; at the death of G. de Magalhães (6 May 1677), they asked “What [funerary] rituals does Catholicism use?” (*An xian-sheng xingshu* (ca. 1677) *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 328); at the death of Buglio (7 October 1682), they asked “What ceremonies of the Chinese could [they] perform before the deceased?” (Grimaldi (1927), 326).

31. Verbiest (1682), 5a–6a; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 503–5.

32. Gayoso (1683), 1v (7a ratio), 2r (8a ratio), and 4r, the discussion of Verbiest’s letters.

33. Gayoso (1683), 3v, writes, “in illo libello, a nostris scripto, qui titulo praenotatur *Pie vam*.” This reference was identified by Ad Dudink (Dudink (2001), 122) as *Piwang* (1615?) and is an important argument in his conclusion that *Piwang* is probably falsely attributed to Xu Guangqi. Both the fourth (*WXXB*, vol. 2, 629–34; *CCT ZKW*, vol. 1, 46–51) and the ninth section (*CCT ZKW*, vol. 1, 68–70) of *Piwang* (1615?) contain a condemnation of the burning of paper.

34. On the question of intrinsic evil, see the similar argument in the pastoral rules for the Franciscans, n. 4, in “Normae pastorales pro seraphica missione statutae,

Cantone exeunte a. 1683,” *SF* VII, 189. On extrinsic evil, see esp. Gayoso (1683), 1v (4a–5a ratio); see also 2v, 3v, 4r (discussion with Herdtrich).

35. “Political” is mentioned in Gayoso (1683), 1v, “*rationem polyticam*”; “*parte Sinarum polyticâ*”; and 4v, “*cultum polyticum*”; he refers to purified intentions in a discussion with Herdtrich on 2v, and also on 2r (8a ratio).

36. Gayoso (1683), 1v (5a ratio); see also 4r–v.

37. Gayoso (1683), 3v. See the above-mentioned text of “The Congregation of the Holy Office, March 23, 1656 to China missionaries,” original in *CPF* (1893), no. 1699; *CPF* (1907), no. 126; translation: *100RD*, no. 2.

38. Gayoso (1683), 4r.

39. Verbiest (1682), 6a9; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 506 = *Piwang* (1615?), 6b5 (*WXXB*, vol. 2, 630); Verbiest (1682), 7a1–2; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 507 = *Piwang* (1615?), 7a4–5 (*WXXB*, vol. 2, 631); Verbiest (1682), 7a2–7; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 507 = *Piwang* (1615?), 8a1–8 (*WXXB*, vol. 2, 633) (identification provided by Ad Dudink).

40. For this sentence the Kangxi Emperor did not use circle dots but commas.

41. Verbiest (1682), 6a–7a; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 505–7. A similar argument appears in “*Sangli ailun*” (n.d.), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 11, 273.

42. Trans. Kutcher (1999), 91; *DaQing shichao shengxun* (1965), *juan* 6, 3a (Huangtaiji 2/1/5, or 9 February 1628); on Huangtaiji’s funeral policy, see also Zhang Jiefu (1995), 264ff.

43. Kutcher (1999), 91–92; on the basis of *Kangxi qijuzhu* (1984), vol. 2, 1676–77.

44. The same event is mentioned in Schall von Bell (1942), 428 (see also Dapper (1670), 419 / (1671), 382).

45. Gayoso (1683), 2v (discussion with Herdtrich). The expression for “Chinese Catholic Christians” is “*Christiani Sinenses Catholici*.”

46. Verbiest (1682), 7a–b; *CCT ARSI*, vol. 5, 507–8. One will find the same argument with regard to the prostrations in front of the funeral tablet in Doré (1911), vol. 1, 108.

47. Kutcher (1999), 48, 50.

48. Kutcher (1999), 92–93.

49. Kutcher (1999), 92ff.

50. *Qing shilu* (1985), vol. 5, 434 (*Shengzu shilu*, *juan* 133, 3a); trans. Kutcher (1999), 93.

51. Kutcher (1999), 96.

52. The attention paid by Kangxi to the notion of filial piety (*xiao*) also appears in the *Xiaojing yanyi* (100 *juan*), an exposition and amplification of the *Classic of Filial Piety*. This work was commissioned in 1656, completed in 1682, and printed in 1690. The preface (*Xiaojing yanyi xu*), written by Kangxi in 1690, was translated into French (probably by Joachim Bouvet, SJ [1656–1730]) as “*Système abrégé des rites de la piété filiale des Chinois par l’Empereur Camhi*” (*ARSI Jap.Sin.* IV 28), dated

Kangxi 29/14/11, or 14 December 1690, while the SKQS version of the original Chinese preface is dated Kangxi 29/4/24, or 1 June 1690.

53. Tong (2004), 147–48.

7. IMPERIAL SPONSORSHIP OF JESUIT FUNERALS

1. Thomas wrote about Verbiest in “Mors, Funus, & Compendium vitae seu Elogium P. Ferdinandi Verbiest,” which is based primarily on reports by Thomas (1688) in Beijing, in Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. XII, nn. 1–5 (1688); Thomas, “Carta acerca de la muerte del Padre Fernando Verbiest, Flamenco, de la Compania de Jesus, que sucedió à 28. de Enero del ano de 1688, en PeKim, Corte de la China,” in Couplet (1691), 216–46, and the funeral specifically on 239–42; Thomas (1726) “Von Dem Apostolischen Leben und Seeligen Todt R.P. Ferdinandi Werbiest,” in *Der Neue Welt-Bott* vol. 1, Theil 2, no. 38, 8–13; and in a short reference in his letter dated 8 September 1688, in Thomas (1688), 188–93. See also Bosmans (1914).

2. Le Comte (1990), 82–86 / (1737), 43–53.

3. The letter is dated Zhoushan, 15 February 1703. For the passage on the funeral, see Fontenay (1707), 129–39 / (1979), 117–20. Part of this letter is also included in *Der Neue Welt-Bott* (1726), vol. 1, Theil 5, no. 97 (a map of the arrangement of the tombs is included).

4. Du Halde (1735), vol. 3, 98–100 / (1736), vol. 3, 118–22 (in section “De l’établissement & du progrès de la Religion Chrétienne dans l’Empire de la Chine”) / (1738–1741), vol. 2, 20–21.

5. Du Halde (1738–1741), vol. 2, 20.

6. Other occasional honors will not be discussed here. For instance, at the death of Christian Herdtrich, SJ (1625–1684), the Kangxi Emperor, at the request of Verbiest, wrote the calligraphic text *Haiyu zhi xiu* (Outstanding person from an overseas region) that was brought by Grimaldi to Jiangzhou to be installed as a horizontal tablet at Herdtrich’s tomb. See Couplet (1694), 142–43 / (1688), 134–35; Margiotti (1958), 154–56; letter of Verbiest to Nicolas Avancini, SJ (1612–1686), in Josson and Willaert (1938), 473–82; and Dudink (2006), 41 (n. 19.927).

7. *Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 91, 29–39; SKQS, vol. 622, 874–79; *Qinding libu zeli* (1844), vol. 2, 1010–17 (*juan* 167). See also *Gujin tushu jicheng* (1726–1728) under *Liyidian: xudian* (funeral sponsorship), *juan* 130–31. For the Ming regulations, see *DaMing huidian* (1587), *juan* 101, 1555ff.; see also *Libu zhigao* (1620), *juan* 34, 1a–14a (SKQS, vol. 597, 624–31).

8. *Qinding libu zeli* (1844), vol. 2, 1012 (*juan* 167, 4b).

9. *Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 91, 30a; SKQS, vol. 622, 875 mentions also the “money for the construction of the tomb” *zaofengong jiayin* (amount for an official of the highest rank three hundred *liang*).

10. The Inner Court (*neiyuan* or *neichao*) refers to the palace halls and, by extension, those who served in them: the Grand Secretariat (*neige*). It was the most distinguished and influential body in the central government, staffed with Grand Secretaries of the Hanlin Academy dispatched to establish offices within the imperial palace to handle the Emperor's paperwork, recommend decisions in response to memorials received from the officialdom, and draft and issue imperial pronouncements. The Manchus had originally structured the central government with Three Palace Academies (*neisanyuan*), of which the *Nei* (*Hanlin*) *mishuyuan* was in charge of, among other matters, funeral texts such as *jiwen*. In 1658 they were organized into a Hanlin Academy and a Grand Secretariat of the Ming sort, and several other reorganizations followed. See Hucker (1985), n. 4193.

11. *Qinding libu zeli* (1844), vol. 2, 1017–19 (*juan* 168).

12. *FR* II, chapter 22. This chapter, written in Latin, is an extract from the annual letter of 1611 that was compiled by Trigault (see *FR* II, 564, n. 1); a short description also appears in chapter 10 of De Ursis' account of Ricci; see De Ursis (2000), 87–92 (Italian translation), 155–60 (Portuguese). Trigault's text served as a basis of the account in Bartoli (1663), 535–38, entitled “Esequie, sepultura, e titoli d'onore al P. Matteo Ricci.” An abbreviated English translation of Trigault's description can be found in Purchas (1625), III.ii, 407.

13. *FR* II, 566–67; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 617 / (1978), 663 / (1953), 567 (adapted).

14. See critical edition of Wu Daonan's memorial (14 June 1610), including the petition by D. de Pantoja and S. De Ursis in *FR* III, 3–8; the translation of the petition is also included in *FR* II, 568–72 and Trigault and Ricci (1615), 618–20 / (1978), 664–66 / (1953), 568–69.

15. *FR* II, 572–75; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 620–21 / (1978), 666–67 / (1953), 569–70 (slightly adapted).

16. *FR* II, 576; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 621 / (1978), 667 / (1953), 570.

17. *FR* II, 578; Trigault and Ricci (1615), 622 / (1978), 668 / (1953), 571 (adapted).

18. The term “funeral sponsorship” (*xu*) is not mentioned in de Pantoja's or in Wu Daonan's text. Yet, a few years later, in the inscription for the imperial gift of a place of burial and a residence (29 March 1615) written by Wang Yinglin (1545–1620), at that time Metropolitan Governor of Beijing, de Pantoja's petition is called a request for funeral sponsorship (*xu*). Cf. *FR* III, 15, 16.

19. Memorial by Wu Daonan, *FR* III, 7.

20. *FR* III, 6.

21. These are the protocols of the Bureau of Receptions (*zhuke qinglisi*): *DaMing huidian* (1587), 1624 (*juan* 108, 28a: *chaogong tongli*); *Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 94, 27bff.; *SKQS*, vol. 622, 941ff.; *Qinding libu zeli* (1844), vol. 2, 1017ff. (*juan* 168, 1aff).

22. *FR* II, 619ff., 626ff.

23. Even if the burial grounds were confiscated on several occasions, i.e., during the Calendar Case and the Cultural Revolution. The place, however, retains its stability even today.
24. *Poxie ji* (1640), *juan* 1, 16a; trans. by Kelly (1971), 288; see Dudink (2000), 150–51.
25. Wang Yinglin repeats the expression in his inscription (*FR* III, 16). See also Dudink (2000), 151.
26. Esherick (1998), 143–44.
27. Johann Schreck Terrenz (1630), Giacomo Rho (1638), Br. Christopher (Xu Fuyuan, 1640), Br. Pascoal Mendes (Qiu Lianghou, 1640), Niccolò Longobardo (1654), and the Dominican Domingo Coronado (1665) were all buried there; see Malatesta and Gao (1995), 35–38.
28. Malatesta and Gao (1995), 35–36; Stary (1998), 156–59.
29. Vāth (1991), 320.
30. *Xichao ding'an* (version 1), *WX*, 115–27; *XC*, 77–80. A similar request was made for Li Zubai and others “according to their original office” (*WX*, 122; *XC*, 79).
31. *Xichao ding'an* (version 1), *WX*, 129–30; *XC*, 83. The exact day of the ninth month on which the request was granted has been wiped out. For Western sources on Schall’s rehabilitation through funeral sponsorship, see letters by Giovanni Filippo De Marini, SJ (1608–1682) to Balthasar Moretus in Antwerp, 20 Oct. 1670 and 8 Dec. 1670, in *Der Neue Welt-Bott* (1726), vol. 1, Theil 1, no. 14, 46–47; the original letters are kept in ARSI, see Vāth (1991), 331, n. 28.
32. Vāth (1991), 331, mentions the 525 *liang* but the source of his information is not clear; the letter by De Marini in *Der Neue Welt-Bott* does not mention the amount, and no references could be found in the letters Vāth refers to on 331, n. 28 (checked by N. Golvers); see also *Zhengjiao fengbao* (1894), 62a: 524 *liang*; and Huang Yi-long (1992), 164.
33. Huang Yi-long (1992), 164.
34. *Xichao ding'an* (version 1), *WX*, 131–32; *XC*, 83 (the exact day of the tenth month has been wiped out).
35. Malatesta and Gao (1995), 133 (translation by Ad Dudink); dated Kangxi 8/11/16, or 8 December 1669 (slightly adapted); *Xichao ding'an* (version 1), *WX*, 131–32 (dated Kangxi 8/10/-); *XC*, 83; the Chinese text and a Latin translation are also found in A. de Gouvea’s *Innocentia Victrix* (1671), 27r–29v; another modern English translation is in *CCS* 6 (1933), 32, and a German translation in Vāth (1991), 331–32; see also “Grabschrift” translated in De Marini’s letter, dated 8 December 1670, in *Der Neue Welt-Bott* (1726), vol. 1, Theil 1, no. 14, 46–47. It is not clear whether this is a translation of the same text or of an unknown *beiwen* (commemorative text). Schall could also retain his original honorific title Tongwei jiaoshi (see also imperial edict in *Xichao ding'an* [version 1], *WX*, 133–34; *XC*, 84).

36. Edwards (1948), 786; Nivison (1962), 459; de Groot (1892–1897), vol. 3, 1127ff.; Honey (1981), 76ff.; Weinberg (2002), 6, 30ff.
37. See the sacrificial odes, or *jiwen*, that are included in the *juan shou* of *Huguang tongzhi* (Yongzheng 11, or 1733), f. 4a (Kangxi 1, or 1662), 5b–6a (three texts; Kangxi 17, or 1678), 31b (Yongzheng 4, or 1726), *SKQS*, vol. 531, 20–21, 33 (discovered by searching the Siku quanshu electronic database).
38. Malatesta and Gao (1995), 133; Gouvea (1671), 29r–29v; Vāth (1991), 332 n. 29.
39. The most important sources for Magalhães’ funeral are: the short biography *An xiansheng xingshu* by Lodovico Buglio and Ferdinand Verbiest (ca. 1677); and the description in the life and death by L. Buglio, see [Buglio] (1688), 380–85 / (1689), 348–52.
40. Zürcher (2002), 363.
41. [Buglio] (1688), 378 / (1689), 346; Pfister (1932–1934), 253; Pih (1979), 131–32.
42. In fact Magalhães strongly criticized the official positions occupied by Schall and Verbiest; see Pfister (1932–1934), 254; Pih (1979), chap. 3; Zürcher (2002), 372.
43. [Buglio] (1688), 380 (converts the two hundred taels into “approximately eight hundred francs”) / (1689), 348 (the French version does not specify the final “two” messengers).
44. Vande Walle (1994), 511. Verbiest had done so when, in 1673, he asked the emperor that G. Gabiani be allowed to transport the body of the deceased G. F. De Ferrariis to Xi’an. *Xichao ding’an* (version 3), 61a–64b; *XC*, 116–7.
45. Compare with the “special edict” (*tezhi*), referring to the appointments made by the emperor without recourse to normal selection and appointment procedures, which were often resented by the officialdom (Hucker [1985], n. 6333); the possibility for this course of action was foreseen in the rules for the funeral sponsorship (see *Qinding libu zeli* [1844], *juan* 167, 2b; vol. 2, 1011).
46. “Imperial edict of Kangxi 16/IV/6, or 7 May 1677, given on the death of G. de Magalhães,” *ARSI Jap. Sin.* II, 165.4, text and English translation in Chan (2002), 453; another copy (printed in red) can be found in the British Library, Chinese collection 15303.d.7; the text also appears in *Xichao ding’an* (version 4), 1a, after 199; *XC*, 127; *Zhengjiao fengbao* (1894), 76a–b; and *An xiansheng xingshu* (ca. 1677), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 327–28; *XC*, 408; the Chinese text is carved on the tombstone, as mentioned in Malatesta and Gao (1995), 145; the French translation is in [Buglio] (1688), 383 / (1689), 349; and appears in Portuguese in Pereira (1677), 566r; another modern English translation is in *CCS* 6 (1933), 32–33.
47. *An xiansheng xingshu* (ca. 1677), *CCT ARSI*, vol. 12, 323–34; *XC*, 408; part of the text is also in *Xichao ding’an* (version 4), 2a–2b, after 199; *XC*, 128.
48. Edwards (1948), 780–81; Nivison (1962), 460; de Groot (1892–1897), vol. 3, 1109ff.; Weinberg (2002), 6, 37ff.

49. [Buglio] (1688), 382 / (1689), 349–50.
50. *An xiansheng xingshu* (ca. 1677), 328–32; *XC*, 408–9; compare also with the account of the funeral in [Buglio] (1688), 382–85 / (1689), 350–52.
51. Huang Bolu, in *Zhengjiao fengbao* (1894), 76b, gives the name of one of the three as Imperial Guard (*shiwei*) Xi Sa.
52. *An xiansheng xingshu* (ca. 1677), 331; *XC*, 408–9.
53. [Buglio] (1688), 384–85 / (1689), 350–52. In the final paragraph one word is unclear in the English version.
54. *An xiansheng xingshu* (ca. 1677), 332; *XC*, 409.
55. Pereira (1677), 568r/v (information provided by L. Brockey). The Jesuits attempted to make up for this public slight to their Christians by holding a private prayer ceremony in memory of Magalhães after the burial. Brockey (2005), 64–65.
56. This expression comes from Esherick (1998), 149, who was inspired by a quotation of Dai Zhen (1724–1777) in Chow (1994), 189: “Rituals are the rules and the laws of heaven and earth; they are the perfect rules, only those who understand heaven will know them.”
57. Concerning Buglio’s death and funeral, there is a short report by Filippo Grimaldi, written on 4 October 1682: Grimaldi (1927), 325–28. See also the short references in Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, 128 / (1736), vol. 2, 150 / (1738–1741), vol. 1, 308: “Particularités de celles [funerals] du P. Broglio [Buglio].” See also the short biography *Li xiansheng xingshu* by Ferdinand Verbiest, Claudio Filippo Grimaldi and Tomé Pereira (ca. 1682).
58. See Witek (1982), 43 and Wills (1984), 161.
59. “Imperial edict of Kangxi 21/11/7 (7 October 1682) given to Ferdinand Verbiest and others,” ARSI Jap.Sin. II, 165.2: text and translation in Chan (2002), 452; text also in *Xichao ding’an* (version 4), 1b, after 199 (where it is wrongly dated by one year, namely Kangxi 22/11/7, or 26 October 1683); *XC*, 127–28; *Zhengjiao fengbao* (1894), 82b–83a; the Chinese text is carved on the tombstone (see Malatesta and Gao [1995], 149); another modern English translation is in CCS 6 (1933), 33.
60. On the importance of hosting, see Chau (2006), 126.
61. See remark after the imperial edict *Xichao ding’an* (version 4), 1b, after 199; *XC*, 128; Grimaldi (1927), 326. According to *Li xiansheng xingshu* (ca. 1682), CCT ARSI, vol. 12, 339; *XC*, 410 and *Zhengjiao fengbao* (1894), 83a, Zhao (Chang) and Xi (Sa) were among the court delegates.
62. Grimaldi (1927), 327.
63. Grimaldi (1927), 325.
64. According to Thomas (1688), it was Xiaozhuang who made the formal gesture of tearing into pieces the order from the four regents for Schall von Bell’s death sentence. Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. XII, n. 1 (1688).
65. CCT ARSI, vol. 12, 389–92; *Xichao ding’an* (version 2), WXXB, vol. 3, 1729–31;

XC, 167. The help of the literatus is mentioned in Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. XII, n. 1 (1688). In order to spread this memorial more widely, it was later examined by the Astronomical Bureau, which added four characters to improve the style. Some opponents in the Catholic camp believed that a superstitious meaning had been added.

66. CCT ARSI, vol. 12, 391; *Xichao ding'an* (version 2), WXXB, vol. 3, 1731; XC, 167. This answer of the emperor is mentioned in *Kangxi qijuzhu* under the date of Kangxi 27/2/7, or 8 March 1688.

67. CCT ARSI, vol. 12, 393–95; *Xichao ding'an* (version 2), WXXB, vol. 3, 1735–37; XC, 167.

68. *Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 91, 29–39; SKQS, vol. 622, 874–79; *Qinding libu zeli* (1844), *juan* 167, 1–14; vol. 2, 1010–17.

69. CCT ARSI, vol. 12, 381–83; *Xichao ding'an* (version 2), WXXB, vol. 3, 1733–34; XC, 168; the edict is dated Kangxi 27/1/27, or 28 February 1688, one month after Verbiest's death; the delay was due to the funeral activities for Xiaozhuang. See also *Zhengjiao fengbao* (1894), 87aff.

70. *Xichao ding'an* (version 4), 183a–84b; XC, 147; (cf. Vande Walle [1994], 513, adapted). Verbiest received one added class at this time; it is not clear when he was granted a second added class.

71. This rule of precedence lasted well into the eighteenth century. At the death of José Soarez (1736), missionaries still referred to the precedent of Magalhães and Buglio. Two years later, at the death of Jean-Baptiste Régis (1738), they referred to the precedent of Tomé Pereira (1708) and Antoine Thomas (1709) (see *Ruijian lu* (1735–1737), Qianlong 1, 6b; Qianlong 3, 4b). Missionaries who received sponsorship in the eighteenth century quite consistently received two hundred *liang*; besides those previously mentioned, they include Franz Stadlin (1740), Dominique Parrenin (1741), Ehrenbert Xaver Fridelli (1743), André Pereira Jackson (1743), Ignatius Koegler (1746), Teodorico Pedrini (1746), Giovanni (da) Costa (1747), Valentin Chaliér (1747), Joseph Marie Anne de Mailla de Moyriac (1748), Anton Gogel (1771), August von Hallestein (1774), Michel Benoist (1774), Ignaz Sichelbarth (1780), Félix da Rocha (1781), Jean Matthieu Ventavon Tournu (1787), and José d'Espinha (1788). Exceptions were those who received 100 *liang*: Noël d'Incarville Le Chéron (1757), Léonard de Brossard (1758), Etienne Rousset (1758), and Gilles Thébault (1766). The reasons for these exceptions are not entirely clear. The single other major exception was Giuseppe Castiglione (1766), the only missionary who received three hundred *liang*. In the early nineteenth century the subsidy changed: one hundred and fifty *liang* for José Bernardo de Almeida (1805) and Alexandre de Gouvea (1808), and one hundred *liang* for Domingos-Joachim Ferreira (1824). All these missionaries were Jesuits or had been Jesuits (the Society of Jesus having been suppressed in China in 1775), except for Pedrini and Ferreira who were Lazarists, and de Gouvea who was a

member of the Regular Third Order of St. Francis. For these data, see the text on their tombstones given in Malatesta and Gao (1995) and Chen Dongfeng (1999).

72. Thomas (1688), 188v.

73. Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. XII, n. 1 (1688).

74. For a description of the Christian community of Beijing (with ca. ten thousand Christians) at the eve of Verbiest's death, see Witek (1995).

75. Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. XII, n. 1 (1688): "Tumquechamus" (normally transcription similar to Tong Guozhang); see also *Zhengjiao fengbao*, 89b. This is probably Tong Guowei (d. 1719), uncle of the Kangxi Emperor and father of an imperial consort who was raised to the rank of Empress in 1689 (with the posthumous name Xiaoyi Renhuanghou); see *ECCP*, 795–96. Tong Guowei's brother Tong Guogang (d. 1690) was also addressed by Kangxi as "uncle" (*jiujiu*). He was one of the signers of the Treaty of Nerchinsk in 1689; see *ECCP*, 794–95.

76. Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. XII, n. 1 (1688) mentions "Chao laoye," most probably the aforementioned Zhao Chang; see also *Zhengjiao fengbao* (1894), 89b.

77. Le Comte (1990), 85, mentions "sept cents écus d'or" / (1737), 52: "seven hundred golden crowns"; Thomas speaks of "trecenti & quinquageni [350] aurei nummi Sinici" (Dunyn-Szpot [1700–1710], Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. XI, n. 4 (1688)); the latter corresponds to the stele money of an official of the first rank. See *Qinding libu zeli*, *juan* 167, 1b; vol. 2, 1010; *Qinding daQing huidian zeli* (1768), *juan* 91, 30a; *SKQS*, vol. 622, 875.

78. Du Halde (1738–1741), vol. 2, 20–21. Compare with Du Halde (1735), vol. 3, 98–100; (1736), vol. 3, 118–22.

79. Le Comte (1990), 84 / (1737), 50.

80. A surplice is a ritual dress, a large-sleeved half-length tunic made of fine linen or cotton, shorter than an alb. It is the choir dress worn by the clergy and also the vestment for processions or the administration of certain rituals, and is also worn by assistants.

81. Zürcher (1997), 630–32, 650.

82. *Xichao ding'an* (version 2), *WXXB*, vol. 3, 1747–48; *XC*, 171.

83. *Xichao ding'an* (version 2), *WXXB*, vol. 3, 1781–82; *XC*, 178–9; Malatesta and Gao (1995), 139; another modern English translation is in *CCS* 6 (1933), 33–35.

84. Cf. Honey (1981), 85ff.

85. Based on Weinberg (2002), 72, 145–46, 193.

86. Honey (1981), 85.

87. According to Liu Xie's *Wenxin diaolong*, "those who can write an elegy (*lei*) on the occasion of a death are capable of becoming ministers. . . . It was not the prac-

tice for a person inferior in social status to write an elegy for his superior, or for a younger man to write an elegy for an older one. In case of the ruler, heaven was invoked to write his elegy. To read an elegy before the dead and to confer upon him a posthumous title is a ceremony of very great importance.” Liu Xie (Liu Hsieh) (1959), 64 / (1998), 109.

88. The phraseology of Schall’s *jiwen* can be found almost in its entirety in other *jiwen*; this is not the case for Verbiest’s *jiwen*, nor for his *beiwen* (conclusion based on searching the *Siku quanshu* electronic database).

89. CCT ARSI, vol. 12, 381; *Xichao ding’an* (version 2), WXXB, vol. 3, 1733; XC, 168.

90. “Mors, Funus, & Compendium vitae seu Elogium P. Ferdinandi Verbiest,” based on report of A. Thomas, Beijing, 1688. In Dunyn-Szpot, Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. XII, n. 1 (1688).

91. *Xichao ding’an* (version 2), WXXB, vol. 3, 1747, 1781; XC, 171, 179; Malatesta and Gao (1995), 139.

92. Le Comte (1737), 44 / (1990), 75: “Il fit des canons qui furent le salut de l’État”; see also “Compendium vitae” by A. Thomas, in Dunyn-Szpot (1700–1710), Tomus II, Pars IV, Cap. XII, n. 4 (1688): “military machines, cast after a European model and introduced amidst the armed battle-array.”

93. In a letter most probably written by Grimaldi, SJ (Oct. 1681), ARSI Jap.Sin. 163, 108r (information provided by N. Golvers).

94. One example is the conflicts that occurred between the Jesuits and Matteo Ripa (1682–1746) and other missionaries sent by the Propaganda Fide when they attended the funeral services for the Kangxi Emperor (died Kangxi 61/11/13, or 20 December 1722) and for the mother of the Yongzheng Emperor (died Yongzheng 1/5/23, or 25 June 1723). See Ripa (1939), 119–20; 126–27. The original (more complete) documents will be published by Michele Fatica in the forthcoming volumes of Matteo Ripa, *Giornale* (1705–1724). For some later examples, see Laamann (2006), 33–34.

95. The events are related in “Acta Pekinensia” (Beijing Journal, or Historical Diary of the Things that Happened since 4 December 1705, the First Arrival of his Excellency Charles-Thomas Maillard de Tournon, Patriarch of Antioch, Apostolic Visitor, with the Power of a Legate a latere) compiled by Kilian Stumpf, SJ (1655–1720), which is currently being translated into English. [Stumpf] (1705–1712), 16ff.; von Collani (2004), 23ff. (information provided by C. von Collani).

96. [Stumpf] (1705–1712), 21.

97. [Stumpf] (1705–1712), 26.

98. See, for example, the reference to the funerary honors in the memorial by Pereira and Thomas (Kangxi 31/11/16, or 2 February 1692) in *Xichao ding’an* (version 2), WXXB, vol. 3, 1786–87; XC, 183.

8. CONCLUSION: THE METAPHOR
OF TEXTILE WEAVING

1. It is hoped that the readers of this book, on the basis of the material presented, will bring forward other interpretations.
2. For a detailed engagement with the philosophical background on cultural interaction and its methods of study, which is here applied to ritual, see Standaert (2002).
3. For a good discussion of the different reasons for the apparent “failure” of the Jesuit mission in China, see Zürcher (1990b).
4. For an overview of the state of the field in social sciences, see Chazel (1990).
5. As proposed by Robert Dahl in Chazel (1990), 299.
6. Van den Bulck (1996), 34–35, 46.
7. Cohen (1984).
8. See also the subtitle of Jacques Gernet (1982), *Chine et christianisme: Action et réaction*; the title of the English version (1985) turns the book into an “impact model”: *China and the Christian Impact: A Conflict of Cultures*.
9. Cohen (1984), 9, 53.
10. For an overview of this approach, see Loomba (1998), esp. 43ff.
11. See, for example, Mignolo (1995), 324. Mignolo applies this method to “Ricci’s world map.”
12. For more, see Pratt (1992), 6, and Schwartz (1994), 7.
13. Loomba (1998), 49.
14. Mignolo (1995), 18.
15. For the term “interaction” and its related notion of “interactive emergence” applied to the study of the history of maritime Asia, see Wills (1993); Pratt (1992), 6, prefers the term “contact.” For similar approaches in the field of anthropology, see especially the writings by Tedlock (1979) on “dialogical anthropology” and Tedlock and Mannheim (1995) on the “dialogic emergence of culture”; in the history of art, see Bailey (1999) and his notion of “global partnership,” especially chapter 2.
16. Tedlock and Tedlock (1985), 142.
17. Todorov (1989), 428.
18. Van den Bulck (1996), 93.
19. For the place of the “other” in history, see de Certeau (1969) and especially de Certeau (1973), chapter 4, “L’autre du texte” and the conclusion, “Altérations.”
20. For a discussion of this theory of alterity, see Standaert (2002), 28ff., and also Todorov (1979) and (1982a).
21. On this topic see the article by Curto (2005), partly inspired by the collective volume edited by Michel Vovelle (1981).
22. For more on this, see Tedlock (1979), 388; Waldenfels (1995), 43.

23. Tedlock and Tedlock (1985), 122; Clifford (1988), 41, 43, 46–47 (both based on Bakhtin).

24. The underlying assumption from which the search for coherence begins is that any text or ritual is coherent (in the sense defined here), even if certain elements may appear incoherent, illogical, or unrelated to the experience of the twenty-first-century reader. Thomas Kuhn (1977), xii, makes the following suggestion, which can be applied to the text of any culture: “When reading the works of an important thinker, look first for the apparent absurdities in the text and ask yourself how a sensible person could have written them. When you find an answer . . . when those passages make sense, then you may find that more central passages, ones you previously thought you understood, have changed their meaning.”

25. Van den Bulck (1996), 23, 98–100.

26. For a general topology of such interaction, see Standaert (2001). The works by Luzbetak (1963) and (1988) have been the inspiration for much of the clarification of these categories.

27. For these words, see Gruzinski (1999), 34–36, 40–42, 56.

28. An overview of these analogies and their application to the cultural exchange between China and Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is provided in Standaert (2001), 103ff.

29. For a seventeenth-century representation of a drawloom (*huaji*), see Song Yingxing (1637), *juan shang, nai fu* 25b–26a; for a translation, see Song Yingxing (Sung Ying-hsing) (1966), 55–56. In the European version the male weaver becomes female: Du Halde (1735), vol. 2, between 222–223 (Hausard engraver) / (1736), vol. 2, between 246–247 / (1738–1741), vol. 1, between 352–353.

30. Ivan Marcus (1996) similarly demonstrates how easily medieval Jews could borrow elements of rituals, stories as well as gestures, from the dominant Christian culture.

31. Van Engen (1986), 540–41.

32. See Thoraval (1992).

33. See the appendix for diagrams that help to visualize these characteristics and those that follow. The diagrams are inspired by Scribner, “Ritual and Popular Belief in Catholic Germany at the Time of the Reformation,” in Scribner (1987), 45.

34. See also Zürcher (1990b), 33, and Zürcher (1997), 630–32.

35. Herein Catholics differ from Protestants, since for Protestants the very idea that mere human words and gestures could force the Divine Will to act was nothing less than blasphemy and heresy. Catholics claimed that the ritual *presented* God’s action, while the Protestant community on the other hand held that ritual at best *represented* or pointed to God’s action. See Maher (2002), 196–97.

36. Maher (2002), 204.

37. Maher (2002), 216–17.

38. See Dudink (2007) and *Forgive Us Our Sins* (2006).
39. Castells (1996), 22 and (1997), 6.
40. Turner (1969), 94–95.
41. Turner (1969), 131ff.
42. Pye (1969), 237, describes “contact—ambiguity—recoupment.”
43. Lozada (2001), 153.