

mid-1990s. There are a number of sources absent from this list, as all such lists are inevitably incomplete. I shall just mention two: *Mirer yeshive in golus* (The Mirer [not “Mirror”] Yeshiva in exile) (Brooklyn, 1950), a Yiddish-language account of the “miraculous” rescue of this entire school; and, among numerous articles and books in Japanese, Kashiwada Tadakazu 柏田忠一, “Shina to Yudayajin” 支那猶太人 (China and the Jews), in *Tō-A kōkyūkai kaihō* 東亞攻究會會報 5 (July 1922): 89–109.

Joshua A. Fogel

Joshua A. Fogel is a professor of history and East Asian studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He specializes in Sino-Japanese cultural relations.

Noël Golvers, editor. *The Christian Mission in China in the Verbiest Era: Some Aspects of the Missionary Approach*. Louvain Chinese Studies, vol. 4. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Ferdinand Verbiest Foundation, 1999. 114 pp. Paperback BEF 595, ISBN 90–6186–996–x.

Noël Golvers. *François de Rougemont, S.J., Missionary in Ch’ang-shu (Chiang-nan): A Study of the Account Book (1674–1676) and the Elogium*. Louvain Chinese Studies, vol. 7. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Ferdinand Verbiest Foundation, 1999. 794 pp. Paperback BEF 2,995, ISBN 90–5867–001–5.

The historiography of the Roman Catholic China mission has traditionally revolved around the impact of Christianity and “Western knowledge” upon literati and court circles in late imperial China. In the last two decades, however, this research paradigm has been to a great extent both refined and broadened. On the one hand, following a long-standing tradition that gave almost exclusive attention to Western sources and the deeds of foreign missionaries, new scholarship has endeavored to elucidate the scientific and artistic accomplishments of the Jesuits in China by increasingly studying works written in Chinese by missionaries, converts, and opponents, as well as the social context of scientific interactions at the center and the periphery of the empire. On the other hand—and this is a more recent development—scholars have focused their attention on the life of the Christian communities, where the vast majority of converts were located at any given time.

The two volumes under review here exemplify both of these historiographical shifts, which I will group under the headings “scholarly interaction” and “Christian life.”

The Christian Mission in China in the Verbiest Era: Some Aspects of the Missionary Approach is a collection of six essays by different authors who adopt both the “scholarly interaction” and the “Christian life” approaches. Although the volume lacks an overarching editorial integration, the main focus of the collection is the scholarly interaction between the Jesuits and the court elite circles during the early Qing. Not surprisingly in a volume with Ferdinand Verbiest, S.J. (1623–1688) as its pivotal figure, the most prominent topic is the *Qiongli xue* 窮理學 (The learning of the fathoming principle). This work, edited by Verbiest in the late 1670s, represented an important part of the philosophical foundations needed to transmit Christianity and its *Weltanschauung* to China in an organic way. The project, in Verbiest’s own words, should consist of “a Chinese version of our [Western] Dialectics and Philosophy, more specifically under the cover of giving a deeper insight into our Astronomy, but in reality to give a better foundation to our Christian Teaching.”¹ Obviously for this purpose the Jesuits had to be in a position to offer to the Chinese translations of crucial texts of the Aristotelian tradition, which, together with Thomistic theology, was one of the main pillars of Catholic learning. By including in one collection a number of such texts, the *Qiongli xue* capped the piecemeal yet persistent translation efforts by the Jesuits and a number of prominent converts—especially Li Zhizao 李之藻 (d. 1630)—over a period of almost a century. Since the philosophical curriculum per se included many branches of knowledge other than metaphysics, the Jesuits also integrated in their presentation of Western learning such disciplines as logic, physics, natural philosophy, and natural theology.

In his essay “Verbiest’s introduction of *Aristoteles Latinus* (Coimbra) in China: New Western Evidence” (pp. 33–55), Noël Golvers, using Western sources, describes the history and significance of the *Qiongli xue*. To him, this compilation represents the ultimate effort of the Jesuit missionaries “to open up to the Chinese the Western theological and philosophical tradition in which . . . [the Jesuits’] catechetical system was embedded” (p. 33). For similar “catechetical” reasons, the Jesuits also felt compelled to translate the mathematical basis of their astronomical knowledge, which they considered organic to evangelization. By illustrating empirically the nature of astronomical phenomena, they hoped “to establish faith in their *transcendental* heaven, and thus . . . pave the way to an actual propagation of Christian teaching” (ibid.).

The only extant copy of the compilation is an incomplete manuscript in Beijing University’s rare books collection. This copy is described in the essay titled “Ferdinand Verbiest’s *Qiongli xue* (1683)” (pp. 11–32), coauthored by Adrian Du-dink and Nicolas Standaert. Acquired by Yenching University in the 1930s, this

version of the *Qiongli xue* contains only part of what was actually included in the original compilation, as ancient sources indicate. Divided into three main sections, it offers some translations from the Aristotelian philosophy textbooks of the Jesuit College of Coimbra (Portugal), the so-called *Commentarii Conimbricenses*, published between 1591 and 1606. The first and second sections are both adaptations from the commentary to *In Universam Dialecticam*. The first, dealing with logic, is an abbreviated *Isagoge Porphyrii*; the second is a partial translation of the *Analytica Priora*. The third section is more diverse in character, containing pages summarizing Aristotle's *Physica* as well as some technical treatises on engineering, ballistics, meteorology, and physics. Some of these materials are unique texts that were never published by the Jesuits elsewhere. However, it would be wrong to assume that the *Qiongli xue* was used for philosophical and technical purposes only.

In 1683 the finished manuscript was offered to the emperor for approval. If printed under imperial auspices—so the missionaries thought—the *Qiongli xue* could well become part of the examination curriculum, and the literati would have “to arduously study this [law] in order to obtain their promotion to become officials, and so these literati, after having acquired the knowledge of the principles of this same [philosophy] would easily find their way to the Divine Law.”² This was an overly ambitious and artful plan indeed.

Soon after receiving the text, the emperor submitted it to the Ministry of Rites and the Hanlin Academy for appraisal, but a negative recommendation came down against publication. Missionaries spitefully observed that the close relationship between their philosophy and their religion, a relationship that these subtle propagators liked to call “the trap” (*casses* or *laqueus*), in fact became apparent in the eyes of literati. As a consequence, the Kangxi emperor decided to follow the advice of his Han counselors, although he privately continued to study the Western “principles.” This seems to corroborate what has been outlined by Benjamin Elman and Catherine Jami, among others, namely that whereas the school of Dao Learning tended to dominate in the Ministry of Rites and in the Hanlin Academy, the emperor himself focused on, and in fact monopolized, the access to and acquisition of Western knowledge. The Jesuits' teachings, in the eyes of the emperor and his courtiers, belonged to the category of “methods” (*fa* 法), not to that of “learning” (*xue* 學). Thus, in that historical juncture, they could never have competed with the “principles” of Dao Learning, remaining confined to the technical domain.³

On the other hand, however, the respective essays by Xu Haisong, “The Reaction of Scholars to the Work of Ferdinand Verbiest, S.J., during the Kangxi-Qianlong Reign [*sic*]” (pp. 73–83), and by Han Qi, “The Role of the Directorate of Astronomy in the Catholic Mission during the Qing Period” (pp. 85–95), show how Jesuit knowledge went beyond the immediate circle of the emperor. Xu makes use of collected works by different Chinese scholars in his attempt to probe

the extent of Verbiest's influence on the native scientific discourse in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He concludes that among the literati interested in the natural sciences, direct Jesuit impact remained strong well into the Qianlong period. However, given the state of our knowledge, I believe that this claim will need further extensive research before it can be fully substantiated.

Han Qi's essay, on the other hand, reveals that a large portion of the minor officials employed in the Qing Directorate of Astronomy were Christians. Moreover, the Directorate remained an important center of Catholic activities from the late Ming up to the mid-eighteenth century. Generation after generation of Christian families, either from the metropolitan prefecture or from the more distant Jiangnan area, filled the positions available at the Directorate. Most likely, the Jesuits, who constantly recommended candidates to the court, helped build up and perpetuate this professional lineage. A considerable number of these officials also had a role as sworn witnesses in the controversies surrounding the Chinese Rites in the early eighteenth century. In fact, documents bearing their original signatures can be found in the Jesuit Archives in Rome. Han concludes that even in the Yongzheng and Qianlong periods, Christian officials in the Directorate of Astronomy, through their influence and many contacts in the capital, helped the Christian communities in the provinces exist and survive. Although groundbreaking and very informative, both essays would have rendered a better service to the interested reader by mentioning the location of rare editions, and by referencing manuscripts more precisely.

The remaining two essays in this collection fall under the rubric of "Christian life." John Witek's "Explaining the Sacrament of Penance in Seventeenth-Century China: An Essay of Ferdinand Verbiest (1623–1688)" (pp. 55–71) gives a detailed presentation of a treatise on penance authored by Verbiest himself. To some limited extent, we can sense from Witek's contribution how penance was experienced by Chinese converts. However, it is the second essay, Noël Golver's "Some Aspects of the Missionary Approach of F. de Rougemont, S.J. in Changshu (Jiangnan), 1661–1676" (pp. 97–111), that offers a more integral depiction of daily life in the Jiangnan mission. In fact, this piece summarizes the main findings of the second book under review here, which represents a great advance in what I have termed studies of "Christian life."

In spite of its massive size, Noël Golver's *François de Rougemont, S.J., Missionary in Ch'ang-shu (Chiang-nan): A Study of the Account Book (1674–1676) and the Elogium* can be subsumed under the category of "microhistory." It is, in fact, an extremely elaborate commentary on a manuscript text that the author found in 1992 in the Royal Library of Brussels. On a closer look, this "small in-12° codex of 230 single pages" turned out to be the account book and spiritual diary of the Flemish Jesuit missionary François de Rougemont (1624–1676), who was stationed at the inland mission in Changshu in the Jiangnan area between 1661 and 1676.

Golvers offers at the start a detailed biography of this missionary (pp. 3–30), based on archival documents and local history sources from the Low Countries. François de Rougemont is a relatively unknown figure, who did not leave a notable corpus of Chinese writings and whose few Western works, such as the *Historia Tartaro-Sinica Nova* (Louvain, 1673), did not receive the same attention as other contemporary Jesuit works from the China mission. He spent all of his missionary life far away from the main stage of the Imperial Court, at a time when another Flemish Jesuit, the famous Ferdinand Verbiest, headed the Directorate of Astronomy in Beijing, and his only claim to sinological fame is his marginal participation in the famous *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus*, a major Jesuit translation of the Confucian classics published in Paris in 1687.

Ironically, it is exactly the ordinariness of de Rougemont's career that makes his personal financial and spiritual account book an important document. The manuscript offers a ledger of expenses and income, as well as a record of the missionary's spiritual progress and of his setbacks. From its pages we learn much about the workings of daily life in an inland mission, the sort of information lacking in other sources. As a matter of fact, this manuscript is unique. We know that many Jesuit missionaries kept such ledgers, but whenever a missionary died, his confrères always made sure to consign such diaries to the flames. The reason was that these documents were known to contain highly confidential matters, pertaining to the inner and intimate life of their owners. This kind of record keeping had been recommended by St. Ignatius in his *Spiritual Exercises* as the basis for a thorough daily examination of conscience, and was explicitly likened to the account book of a careful businessman, logging in losses and gains (a practice similar to the Chinese "ledgers of merit and demerit" *gongguo ge* 功過格). F. de Rougemont's manuscript, in fact, combines the financial and spiritual dimensions of his daily life. The only reason for the survival of this document is that Philippe Couplet, S.J. (1623–1693), another Flemish missionary and friend of de Rougemont, planned to employ its pious contents in a publication for the edification of candidate missionaries and as a tribute to his deceased confrère. Used by Gilles Estrix, S.J. (1624–1694) for an unfinished eulogy of de Rougemont, the manuscript, however, remained unpublished.⁴ The reason might lie in the fact that some pages probably contained "reflections that may have appeared to somebody too blasphemous or compromising for the author or the Society [of Jesus]" (p. 31).

We will never know what such pages may have said. In fact, Golvers observes that some missing portions of the spiritual account could possibly have been torn from the binding by a "pious reader" after 1834, the year in which the book was inventoried and bound in the newly established Belgian Royal Library. What we have today is thus both a personal document of great immediacy and a text somehow doctored to sustain the approval of posterity. In any case, the *Account Book*

remains an invaluable and unique source for reconstructing the life of the China mission in Jiangnan in the last quarter of the seventeenth century.

Golvers, with a mind-boggling penchant for philological accuracy, describes the manuscript (pp. 31–48) and its history (pp. 72–81) in great detail. The *Account Book* covers only two years of de Rougemont's life (1674–1676). The text is written in Latin, but it contains many Chinese sentences, which are sometimes romanized, sometimes written out in characters, and occasionally also passages in Portuguese and Dutch. Out of respect for the integrity of the original manuscript, Golvers has reproduced it “as it is.” This means that readers will have to start from the end of the text, at page 237, and go backwards, since the original is paginated that way. Perhaps here, philological accuracy could have been sacrificed for ease of use. At the same time, it should be pointed out that Golvers has made the text very accessible by supplying us with an English translation of the Latin original.

The largest part of *François de Rougemont, S.J., Missionary in Ch'ang-shu (Chiang-nan)* is made up of Golvers' commentaries (pp. 242–630), which contain abundant information on a wide range of topics, such as the topographical setting of the Jiangnan mission in the early Qing, de Rougemont's movements inside his mission, the social life of the Christian community as well as the priestly and pastoral dimensions of missionary activities, the written and pictorial means for religious propagation, and the mission's material culture and financial structure. Using, in addition to the *Account Book* itself, a vast amount of manuscript and printed Western sources as well as some Chinese sources, the author, who is not a sinologist, admirably draws a complex picture of Christian life in Jiangnan, mainly from the missionary perspective.

Golvers' commentary is a veritable encyclopedia of Christian life, as well as of social and material culture in late imperial China. The author presents us detailed information before he reaches any conclusions. The section on finances, for example, provides valuable data on commodity prices and rates of exchange between Western and Chinese currencies for Jiangnan in the period commonly termed the “Kangxi depression,” on which Chinese sources offer little information.⁵ Readers are well advised, however, to read first the introductory and concluding remarks in the different sections of Golvers' commentary, or else they might experience some difficulty in grasping his argumentation and main findings.

An important addition to the volume is Appendix 2, Adrian Dudink's “The Transcription of Mandarin in the Account Book.” Here Dudink offers a thorough discussion of the transcription system employed by de Rougemont. Additionally, he transcribes de Rougemont's somewhat erratic phonetic rendition of the Chinese language—which is based on the more regular system devised by Nicolas Trigault, S.J., in his *Xiru ermu zi* 西儒耳目資 (The Western literati's aid for the eyes and ears) (Hangzhou, 1626)—into both the pinyin and Wade-Giles romanized

zation systems. Obviously, this contrastive approach offers valuable data for historical linguists.

This volume would have gained in readability if the author and his editors had exercised more discipline in the use of abbreviations and technical terms. Also, Golvers has not always resisted the temptation of a certain enthusiasm for excessive detail. Rather than attempt to read this magnum opus cover-to-cover, readers can employ it in a number of ways. For example, the paleographic and linguistic considerations supplied in great profusion by the author offer profound methodological lessons on how to approach texts that are philologically as sensitive as the fragmentary *Account Book*. Also, the volume can be perused as a reference work on material life in Jiangnan during the early Qing. A number of detailed indexes and glossaries at the end of the volume (pp. 685–748) and the book's fine subdivision into thematic sections greatly facilitate this kind of access.

As pointed out in the beginning, shifts in research paradigms have brought about a new way of looking at documents that have often been available to scholars for decades but were never taken seriously enough. This is certainly the case with the *Qiongli xue*, whose existence has been known to specialists since the 1930s. A number of texts contained therein could easily be found elsewhere, but due to historical and also historiographical reasons, research on these texts was not pursued. Only recently—and the scholarship discussed in this review is an example—have researchers begun to reexamine closely the internal dynamics in the transmission of Jesuit “knowledge” to China in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Such an enterprise is a highly complex endeavor that requires a grasp of the intellectual and cultural history of the West and China in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and training in a number of languages and textual traditions. The current reevaluation of the state of Chinese science in the late imperial period and of the reception and appropriation of certain features of “Western knowledge” by Chinese scholars needs to be balanced by a better understanding of how Jesuit science was presented in China, and what its background and context were.⁶ As is well known, Qing “evidential” scholars were appropriating elements of Western knowledge and embedding them in their nativist understanding of nature and in their textual tradition. However, we sometimes tend to forget that such knowledge did not come to them unmediated. They were not absorbing “Western knowledge” from the original Greek, Latin, or French sources: they were getting a (mainly) late-Ming Chinese translation of the Jesuit understanding of the Western scientific and philosophical traditions.

Such translation was always the fruit of a joint effort between Chinese scholars, some of them converts, and Jesuits. In the process of translation, a new creature was produced, shaped by the concern of both the Western priests and the Chinese collaborators working with them. Some translations and compilations (like the *Qiongli xue*) never reached a large public, and only certain topics

(e.g., astronomy, mathematics, and geography) truly became popular among literati. But to reduce the Jesuit project to the transmission of “science” would be inaccurate: in their organic vision, “natural philosophy” was premised on their metaphysics and theology. In the seventeenth century, this vision was shared by converted literati, and a more profound understanding of the relationship between what we term “science” and “religion” can help us understand not only the position of a Xu Guangqi 徐光啓 or a Li Zhizao, but also the Chinese nativist reaction to Western knowledge and the tactical deployment of pious “traps” by the Jesuits. As observed by Golvers, the study of this subject is still in its preliminary stages, and much additional careful textual comparison is required to reach a fuller understanding of the translation process and of the Western terminology rendered into Chinese, often using neologisms but also borrowing vocables from the Chinese philosophical repertory (such as *gezhi* 格致 for natural studies).

The integrated nature of Western natural philosophy and religion in the Catholic China mission is also illumined by studies like Golvers’ “micro-history” of the Jiangnan mission. Jiangnan from late Ming times to the Kangxi period was the site of contact between the Jesuits and southern literati interested in Western studies, and research on the social life of the mission contributes to our understanding of how interactions with local scholars might have worked, while showing that many Chinese, some of them literati, were more interested in devotional life than scientific knowledge. It is hoped that the exemplary methodological lesson offered by Golvers will spur others to conduct similar research on different localities in China, an enterprise that is bound to reveal more about the empire-wide political, scholarly, and religious networking of the mission.

In sum, the works under review here have much to offer to scholars interested in the history of “Western knowledge” and of Christianity in late imperial China, supplying at the same time data on the economic, social, and linguistic history of China in the 1670s that are mostly lacking in Chinese sources.

Eugenio Menegon

Eugenio Menegon is a Ph.D. candidate in Chinese history at the University of California, Berkeley, and a research associate at the Ricci Institute for Chinese-Western Cultural History, University of San Francisco. He specializes in the history of Sino-Western relations in the late imperial period.

NOTES

1. Letter of Verbiest to Pope Innocentius XI, 15 August 1678, quoted by Golvers in *The Christian Mission in China in the Verbiest Era*, “Verbiest’s Introduction of Aristoteles Latinus in China,” p. 36.
2. Letter of Andrea Giovanni Lubelli, S.J. (1628–1685) to the Jesuit General in Rome, 15 December 1683, quoted by Golvers in *The Christian Mission in China in the Verbiest Era*, *ibid.*, p. 41.
3. Benjamin Elman, *A Cultural History of Civil Examinations in Late Imperial China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), especially pp. 483–485 on the Qing attitude to

natural sciences in the examinations; and Catherine Jami, "The Jesuits' Role in the Scientific Construction of the Qing State" (paper presented at the Conference "Europe in China III," 22–26 April 1998, Berlin).

4. Estrix planned his *Elogium* in the early 1690s as an apology in defense of Northern European missionaries in China, who had been accused of occupying themselves with scientific work, neglecting their evangelical aims. Unlike the Italian or Portuguese missionaries, F. de Rougemont was the perfect example of a Flemish missionary at the grassroots level.

5. See, for example, the observation of Richard von Glahn on the scarcity of quantitative data for the Kangxi deflationary period in *Fountain of Fortune: Money and Monetary Policy in China, Tenth to Seventeenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 212.

6. A first attempt in this direction is Nicolas Standaert's "The Classification of Sciences and the Jesuit Mission in Late Ming China," in *Linked Faiths: Essays on Chinese Religions and Traditional Culture in Honour of Kristofer Schipper*, ed. Jan M. De Meyer and Peter M. Engelfriet (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 287–317.

Peter N. Gregory and Daniel A. Getz, Jr., editors. *Buddhism in the Sung*. Kuroda Institute: Studies in East Asian Buddhism 13. Honolulu: Kuroda Institute/University of Hawai'i Press, 1999. 646 pp. Hardcover \$47.00, ISBN 0-8248-2155-6.

This is volume 13 of the Kuroda Institute's excellent Studies in East Asian Buddhism series. The present volume grew out of the conference "Buddhism in the Sung," hosted by the University of Illinois in April 1996. Peter Gregory, in his fine introduction, "The Vitality of Buddhism in the Sung," clearly outlines the major interests of the essays in this volume. The title of his own essay is indicative of the rejection of the idea that Buddhism entered a period of decline during the Sung dynasty (960–1279 C.E.). The other essays, by noted scholars, amply reveal "the vitality of Buddhism in the Sung as well as its embeddedness in the social and intellectual life of the time" (p. 2). T'ien-t'ai, the other major Buddhist school, for example, "virtually recreated itself in the Sung" (p. 5). "Proponents of T'ien-t'ai and Ch'an were not only involved in lively dialogue among themselves but were also engaged in complex interactions with Sung society at large. These interactions were seen as being mutually beneficial and the forms that they took were basically transactional, although what was understood as being transacted varied according to the circumstance and the people involved. The different forms these interactions took reveal the variety of ways in which Buddhism had become a part of Chinese culture" (p. 11). Gregory concludes his introduction by saying that the