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Prologue

Until recently, most researchers have concentrated their attention on the Jesuit mission in China, largely neglecting sources produced in the context of the missionary work of Franciscans, Dominicans, and other congregations.¹ These

1 A first version of this paper was prepared for the Conference "Europe in China III: Between Ming and Qing: The Jesuits, Dynastic Decline, Internal Strife, and the Establishment of a New Order in Seventeenth-Century China," Berlin, April 22-26, 1998. I would like to thank for their assistance in Fuzhou Profs. Lin Jinshui 林金水, Lin Guoping 林國平 and Fang Pinguang 方品光, and Dr. Zhang Xianqing 張先清; Mr. Feng Keguang 冯克光 (Fu'an), Mr. Miao Zai-zuo 程載佐 (Muyang), and Mr. Miao Pinmei 程品枚 (Ningde). Thanks also to Profs. Benjamin Elman, Nicolas Standaert, and Liam Brockey; Drs. Allison Rotman, Ad Dudink, and Richard Chu; and the personnel of the Archives, Libraries, and Government Offices I visited in Europe, China, and the Philippines.

¹ Recent works on local Chinese Christianity outside the Jesuit missions before the Opium War are, e.g., Entennmann, “Catholics and Society in Eighteenth-Century Sichuan” (Mission Étrangères de Paris, Sichuan); and Mungello, The Spirit and the Flesh in Shandong, 1650-1785 (Franciscans, Shandong). An assessment of the literature on Christianity in local contexts, in-
sources offer a picture of Christianity in a popular milieu and in a rural context. The Jesuits were also present in such environment since the late sixteenth century, but their reports published in Europe mostly privileged their mission to the élites, and, as a consequence, their encounter with literati and imperial culture has drawn the attention of most modern historiography.\(^2\)

In this essay, I will focus my attention on the Dominican mission of Fu’an 福安 county (north-eastern Fujian) during the Manchu conquest. The Dominicans were witnesses of the dynastic change, and they have left a number of sources on that dramatic moment. However, and more significantly for my purpose here, the Ming–Qing transition represents an excellent historical juncture to investigate the nature of the relations between the Christian community and Chinese society in a rural context. The split in loyalties occasioned by the Manchu conquest exacerbated social conflicts and tensions that had been developing in Fu’an since the mid-1630s between Christians and non-Christians. Such conflicts emerged against a background of struggle for dominance among local lineages, of patriarchal domination over women, and of a diverse religious landscape. Using Western and Chinese sources to go beyond a mere history of the mission, this essay offers a preliminary exploration of the lives of Christian lower-degree literati and women from a marginal region like Fu’an, contributing to the still limited literature on Ming–Qing Christianity at the local level.

**Dominican Hagiographies As Historical Sources:**

**Riccio’s “Hechos”**

In this essay, I rely heavily on one major source, the first detailed history of the Dominican mission of Fujian, “Hechos de la Orden de Predicadores en el Imperio de la China” (“Feats of the Order of Preachers in the Empire of China,” 1667), by Father Victorio Riccio (1621–1685), a member of the Philippine Province of the Most Holy Rosary and a missionary in Fujian in the period 1655–1666.\(^3\) Riccio describes the life of the Dominican mission in Fujian during the

---


\(^3\) After over a decade of work in China, Riccio moved back to the Philippines, where he lived until his death (1666–1685). In 1667, he wrote “Hechos” (hereafter cited as RH) in the Convent of San Juan del Monte, near Manila, following the orders of his Provincial. He not only used the archival holdings of his Province, but also related his personal experience. The manuscript has survived in three copies, all kept in the Archives of the Dominican Province of the Holy Rosary (Archivo de la Provincia del Santo Rosario [APSR], Avila and Manila), and has never been published. The first two copies are a seventeenth-century draft and an original (?), the third is a nineteenth-century copy (393 folios), made for the archives of the church of San Gabriel in the Parián, the Chinese quarter of Manila. Here I have used this copy for its legibil-
1630s and 1640s, and by doing so, he provides precious data about the region during the Ming–Qing transition, when a series of Southern Ming regimes tried to resist the Manchu invasion and Fu’an became an object of dispute between the two camps.

“Hechos” contains abundant descriptions of social conflict between Christians and non-Christians in Fu’an – e.g., physical attacks against the missionaries and their converts, male abuse of women who converted, destruction of churches or converts’ property, and legal disputes in the county or subprefectural yamen. The causes for such clashes were multiple and complex, but tensions over social mores (respect of ancestral rituals and of gender hierarchies) seem to have been the most common. When the Friars recorded these conflicts, however, it must be remembered that they viewed them through their own mental schemes and with only a limited understanding of the Chinese contexts in which the events occurred.

Riccio’s “Hechos” can be fruitfully analyzed through the heuristic category of hagiography. “Hechos” is in fact a collective hagiography, a series of edifying biographies of priests and lay Christian women and men set against the historical and social context of Fujian between 1632 and the late 1650s. However, besides reproducing Western hagiographic conventions and offering cameo portraits of converts too stylized to retain any sign of Chinese identity, “Hechos” also offers historical and ethnographic information worth exploring. In Riccio’s work, “history” constantly contends with “hagiography” for narrative space. For contemporaries, obviously, there was no question of employing a different narrative mode: since the “feats” of the Dominicans and their converts were just an expression of a providential plan of salvation, both history and hagiography could be employed to represent the struggle between the power of God and his preachers on the one hand, and the obstacles posed by the devil, assuming the forms of anti-Christian foes, on the other.

This dichotomy between the forces of good and evil that runs through Riccio’s writings, however, reveals a picture, albeit incomplete, of the social reality of Fu’an Christians. The conflicts between the people of God and their opponents – seen in Cerseau’s words as “social figures of the devil” – which is at the heart of the providential history of the mission, had in fact deep roots in the social structure of Fu’an. The pages of Riccio, occasionally describing the interaction of
Christians with society at large, illuminate our understanding of the conflicts between Christians and non-Christians, and of the shifts of local loyalties between Ming and Qing forces. Riccio’s narrative, indeed, shows the resourcefulness of converts, especially of those local Christian literati who used their family ties, as well as their connection to the missionaries, to rise to prominence in the Ming loyalist ranks. In so doing, they also enhanced the position of Christianity in Fu’an, and tried to overcome anti-Christian opposition by gaining local political power.

However, while managing to temporarily hurdle the obstacles in the public realm, Fu’an Christians still faced underlying tensions in the domestic sphere. The strong opposition levied by local men against the conversion of women to Christianity and their contact with the foreign priests is one example of such tensions. These male reactions expressed a strong anxiety over challenges to the gender conventions of local society. Conversion to Christianity and Christian devotional life represented, indeed, a challenge, since they granted local women some limited control over their body and lifestyle, as other native religious traditions also did, and, more generally, opened the way to a slow process of negotiations over local social mores within the Christian community that lasted well into the eighteenth century. These two aspects of the Christian experience during the Ming-Qing transition in Fu’an highlight an undercurrent of tension. On the one hand, converted literati and missionaries wished to gain a legitimate place on the local scene, remaining within the boundaries of accepted political and social life. On the other hand, however, new religious concepts and obligations introduced by the Dominicans could and did create ruptures in the local social compact, likely following already existing fault-lines of familial, social, and gender conflict.

Chinese Christians in the Dominican Mission: A Narrative of Conflict

Beginnings: The Context of Early Christian Activities in Fu’an

Some of the people from Fu’an mentioned in “Hechos” also appear in Chinese sources. Among them, the most well-known are the gongsheng 龔生 Guo Bang-yong 郭邦雍 (Joaquin Ko) and the juren 舉人 Miao Shixiang 繆士瑋 (Juan Mieu). Guo and Miao were among the small group of Christians, formerly baptized by the Jesuits in Fuzhou 福州, whom the first Dominican missionary, Fr. Angelo Cocchi (1597–1633), joined in Fu’an in the summer of 1632. Guo and Miao had converted in the late 1620s, probably while taking part in one of the sessions of the provincial examinations held in Fuzhou. The Jesuits used such occasions to

---

6 An English-language biography of Cocchi in DMB, pp. 409-410. Cocchi arrived on the Chinese mainland in January 1632 (not 1631, as often stated), as proved in GH I, p. 49n33. He remained in Fuzhou until the late spring of 1632, and he must have reached Fu’an by the early summer of 1632.

7 Manuel Dias Jr. in the Jesuit “Carta Ámua” of 1627, fol. 188r, observes that “[Aleni] baptized two people native of the town of f6 gân [Fu’an]. ... They were there in Fuzhou for their busi-
make themselves known to the large number of provincial literati gathered for the examinations, and to attract some of them to Christianity. These men, instructed in the fundamentals of the faith, once back in Fu’an probably felt isolated and lacking in spiritual guidance and assistance, since no priest resided there, nor had one ever visited the region. Thus, when they first encountered in Fuzhou the Dominican Cocchi, a religious master eager to join them, they did not miss the opportunity. They literally negotiated – Riccio’s word – the transfer of the “religious expert” they needed from Fuzhou to Fu’an. Cocchi was initially dependent on them, relying on their social network and linguistic intermediation to establish the mission. He must have limited himself to fulfill the necessary liturgical and sacramental functions of the priest, leaving most of the instruction of neophytes to the converted literati, who “used to respond to the doubts proposed by the gentiles instead of Father Angel, since his language was still faulty.”

The content of this early instruction must have been in line with that offered in Fuzhou by the Jesuit Giulio Aleni (1582–1649). Fu’an converts owned and reprinted in their native place some of the religious books published by the Jesuits in the provincial capital, books that covered topics such as the confession, the mass, and the lives of saints. Since the Dominican wore the literati’s robe, the Fu’an converts must have perceived him as they perceived the Jesuits. Like others in Fujian, they had found in the Christianity presented to them by the Jesuits a ready-made network of literati yearning for the moral and political regeneration of their times, as well as a complex of religious practices and devotions that offered nourishment to their private religious experience.

Besides the converts’ pleas, simple jurisdiction also led the Dominican to Fu’an. The Friars, as latecomers, could only go where space was left available, since the Jesuits were reluctant, to put it mildly, to share their flocks. One of the few areas left in the province was the region of Funing (today known as Mindong 閩東), where Fu’an is located.

ness. ... One [bore] the surname Guè [Guo], and the Christian name Joakim ...” (cf. Dudink, “Giulio Aleni,” p. 198n166); the other could have been Miao Shixiang. Miao mentioned in a letter to Aleni, possibly penned in 1635, that he had been Christian for around ten years, i.e., since at least 1626 or so; see “Carta de Juan Miu al P. Julio Aleni,” in BC, ms. 1073, fol. 21v. Provincial exams, the likely reason of the two literati’s travel to Fuzhou, were indeed held there in 1627, see Liu – Zhuang, Fujian jiaryu shi, p. 149.

8 For reference to a similar sense of spiritual crisis in the Jesuit convert Li Jiugong, see Dudink, “Giulio Aleni,” pp. 157-158.

9 RH, fol. 233v: “Juan Mieu [= Miao Shixiang], together with Joquin Ko [= Guo Bangyong] and other Christians negotiated (negociarum) and accomplished the transfer of the holy man [Angelo Cocchi] to the town of Fu’an, where no minister had ever set foot.”

10 RH, fol. 233v.

11 On the reprinting by Fu’an literati of Jesuit tracts, see “Carta Àmua” of 1627, fol. 188r: “W[ith] the intention of propagating [the Christian teachings, two students from Fu’an] took with them to their native place a large quantity of our books, which they ordered to be printed again by carving new printing blocks.” On the religious experience of Fujianese Christian literati, see Zürcher, “Confucian and Christian Religiosity,” passim; Menegon, Un solo cielo, pp. 71-90.
Quite likely, the main reason for the Jesuits' neglect of that region was its marginality, both in geographical and socioeconomic terms.\footnote{On the activities of Aleni and other Jesuits in late Ming Fujian, see Zürcher, "Giulio Aleni et ses relations"; Lin, "Ai Rulüe yu Mingmo Fuzhou shehui"; Menegon, Un solo cielo; several essays in Lippello - Malek (eds.), "Scholar from the West"; and Zhang, "Ai Rulüe yu Mingmo Fujian shehui."} Mindong, unlike the culturally and economically advanced areas of Fuzhou and Minnan 闽南, had seen its heyday before the Yuan period. From the Tang to the Song, the major commercial venue for the agricultural products of the region and the home-base of the lineages producing higher-degree holders had been the Mushui 穆水 valley.\footnote{Fujian Liancun, p. 3.} Liancun 廉村, together with the other villages of Muyang 禹陽 (also 穆洋) in the upper reaches of the valley, and Suyang 蘇陽 along the coast of the Baima 白馬 harbor, formed a commercial axis that controlled the flow of people and merchandise from the coast towards the interior. Between the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries, out of the seventy-six jinshi-holders from Fu’an, fifty-six were members of the important lineages of the Mushui valley, such as the Xue 薛 and Chen 陳 of Liancun, the Liu 劉 of Suyang, and in lesser numbers, the Miao 繆 of Muyang, the lineage of Miao Shixiang. Fu’an became the main commercial and political center of Mindong only in the Ming-Qing period.\footnote{Miao Zaizuo, "Mushui," p. 1; Liu - Zhuang, Fujian jiaoyu shi, pp. 7-8.}

Overall, the region experienced a gradual decline in importance from the Song period on, and it was a backwater by late imperial times. A measure of this marginality is the fact that for the period from the Wanli to the Chongzhen reign (1573–1644), only five jinshi 進士 and 17 juren 舉人 came from the whole sub-prefecture of Funing, the lowest rate of success of Fujian.\footnote{Funing's five jinshi and 17 juren represented only 0.6% and 0.7% of the Fujian provincial totals respectively. Liu - Zhuang, Fujian jiaoyu shi, pp. 152 and 160.} This cultural marginality was reflected in the social standing of Dominican converts during the Chongzhen reign: while some were lower-degree holders (mainly gongsheng 貢生 and shengyuan 生員), only Miao Shixiang would eventually earn a juren degree.

Conflict
The peaceful development of the Dominican Fu’an mission was soon shattered by a succession of conflicts between Christians and non-Christians, which reached its apex during the period of struggle between Ming loyalists and Qing forces. The first serious friction developed soon after the arrival of a reinforcement of four Friars, both Dominicans and Franciscans, who joined Cocchi between 1633 and 1634. By 1634, there were around 160 converts in Fu’an and the surrounding villages, and thus the Dominicans consented to split the area with the Franciscans. In late 1634, the church of Fu’an was first seriously damaged by a mob, and then totally destroyed, in retaliation for an attack by some Christian converts
on a local religious shrine—an action probably excited by the anti-idolatric stance of the Friars. Soon numerous people asked for the expulsion of the Friars, and although the county magistrate Wu Sanzhu 巫三祝 punished the instigators of the destruction of the church, he also ordered that the missionaries be expelled and that the remaining church in Dingtou 頂頭, seat of a flourishing Christian community on the coast, be turned into a Confucian school. This order, however, was never carried out.16

Soon after, the Friars discovered that six Christian literati of the Miao lineage had participated in the ancestral cults of their family, a practice tolerated by the Jesuits, but that the Friars found superstitious and idolatrous. Following long discussions and arguments with the Miao, other local Christian literati, and the Jesuits in Fuzhou, in early 1636 the Friars decided to denounce these “superstitions” in a series of reports to the ecclesiastical authorities of Manila, the first move in the long history of the Chinese Rites Controversy.17

Tension continued to mount, and soon anti-Christian writings were circulated in Fu’an by a local degree-holder, Chen Hanxun 陳翰迅, who also figures prominently in Riccio’s narrative. When Chen travelled to Beijing in 1637 and presented an anti-Christian memorial at court, some of the Friars decided to follow him and to try to stop his attacks. The Jesuit court astronomer Adam Schall (1592–1666) attempted to contain the damage in Beijing and to prevent a general persecution: the literatus was silenced, and complacent officials quietly shipped the Friars back to Fujian. In the meantime, a new contingent of Spanish missionaries had reached Fu’an. Alarmèd, the provincial authorities in Fuzhou ordered the Friars arrested, and all missionaries in the province, Jesuits included, expelled. These conflicts, which had initially been limited to Fu’an, were soon linked in the minds of literati and authorities to the heterodox activities of the White Lotus and Wuwei 無為 (Non-Action) groups in Zhejiang and Fujian, and a general province-wide crackdown on Christianity followed. While the Jesuits left Fuzhou and went into hiding, most of the ten Friars then in Fu’an were arrested and expelled through Macao, and by 1640 none were left in Fu’an.18

After recovering physical strength in the Spanish base on northern Taiwan, the Dominican Juan García (1606–1665) returned to Fu’an in May 1641. In March 1642, he was joined by two other confreres, Francisco Diez (1606–1646) and Francisco Capillas (1607–1648), who were accompanied by Guo Bangyong. Guo had sailed away to the Philippines with the Friars from Macao between 1638 and

16 See GH I, pp. 91–93, original account in RH, fols. 78r–79v. On Wu Sanzhu, see GH I, pp. 92–93; RH, fol. 79v; Fu’an xianzhi, j. 18, p. 300.
17 For a contemporary description of this well-known episode, see, e.g., GH I, p. 117; cf. Margiotti, “L’atteggiamento.” On the Miao lineage, see Fu’an xianzhi, j. zhong 终, p. 421.
18 For more details on these incidents, see Menegon, “Jesuits, Franciscans and Dominicans in Fujian,” in: Lippiello – Malek (eds.), “Scholar from the West,” pp. 219–262; see also Furtado, Informatio, p. 4. On Chen Hanxun, see Fu’an xianzhi, j. 19, p. 335, and j. 20, p. 371; Menegon, ibid., p. 235n45.
1640, and was by now a former degree-holder, having lost his degree in 1637 in the wake of the anti-Christian repression.\(^{19}\)

The number of converts had lessened considerably, due to many apostasies, and the missionaries became more like vagrant monks than resident priests. They moved from one hamlet to the next, preaching in public and residing with the few remaining Christian families. At times, however, the Christians sheltering them would explicitly ask them to keep quiet to avoid further retaliations from the authorities. Among the provisions the local authorities enforced to keep Catholicism at bay were the recitation of the Village Compact, registration of all strangers, monitoring of the population though the baojia system, public abjuration from any heterodox religion, and loss of gentry status if discovered harboring missionaries or practicing the forbidden religion.\(^{20}\)

However, these measures seem to have been rather ineffective in curbing the public activities of the Friars. Besides their persistence, the main reason for such unabated proselytizing work was the presence of some loyal Chinese supporters, who, in spite of the restrictions, did not abjure. In the face of government repression and physical attacks, why did some Fu’an people continue to offer their support? One explanation could be that some of the male converts were commoners or low-ranking gentry who did not have important roles in their lineages. They might, thus, have been able to eschew ancestral rituals without incurring the censure of their elders. In a few cases, however, converts decided at some point to accept the radical point of view of the Friars, no matter what the consequences. Guo Bangyong, for example, allegedly dared to argue in front of the Coastal Circuit Intendant who had arrested him in 1637 that “to honor the dead by conducting sacrifices to them] is an empty act.”\(^{21}\) He finally took the dramatic decision to leave Fu’an for more than three years, following the Friars into exile to Macao and the Philippines, a unique example among the late Ming degree-holding converts. In Manila he underwent a formal period of novitiate and entered the Third Order, a lay branch of the Dominicans, signalling his full adherence to the Friars’ positions.\(^{22}\)

Nevertheless, converts like Guo were a minority. Miao Shixiang, for example, for all the spiritual anguish he might have felt over the Friars’ prohibition of ancestral rites, continued his studies in earnest, gaining his juren degree in 1639. As someone aspiring to an official career, Miao could hardly escape a role in the

---

\(^{19}\) GH I, pp. 167-169; on Guo’s loss of his status as stipend student (linsheng 崇生), see Garcia, “Relacion de la vida,” p. 15, and an anti-Christian Chinese-language memorial authored by members of the Chen lineage of Fu’an in 1645 or 1646, in Morales and Bottigl, “Información del Maritirio,” fol. 403v.

\(^{20}\) Xu Changzhi, [Shengchao] Po xie ji, j. 2, p. 34a.

\(^{21}\) Xu Changzhi, [Shengchao] Po xie ji, j. 2, p. 33b.

\(^{22}\) Biographical details on Guo can be found in RH, fols. 234v-239v, “Deeds and death of the Servant of God Joaquin Kò, of the Third Order of St. Dominic”; cf. also Fu’an xianzhi, pp. 335 and 449n32; DMB, pp. 24 and 1075; Dudink, “Giulio Aleni,” p. 198.
ritual life of his lineage, and thus his obligations might have cooled his enthusiasm for the brand of Christianity imported by the Friars.23

The larger portion of the conversions in the early 1640s was to be among common villagers, and in particular, women. One missionary explained that “women live very honestly and free from the occupations of the world, due to the cloistered life they conduct according to the rules of this kingdom; thus [when men] were barred [from receiving the spiritual gifts of God], the Lord gave them to [women].”24 In turn, women’s conversions provoked an even stronger reaction from the local elite. The years 1644–1645 were characterized by attacks and denunciations spearheaded by members of the most influential lineage of Fu’an, the Chen, and one of the hottest topics of controversy was the contact of the Friars with young virgins during confession. The Chen lineage organized a public display of protest against the Christians couched in forms common to popular religious festivals. Missionary sources defined it as a “farce,” a “masquerade,” or a “procession of hell.” A crowd of more than three hundred men paraded around Fu’an in “Christian costumes,” some posing as women. Leading the procession was a man dressed as Christ, followed by a crowd brandishing crosses, rosaries, and copies of the recently published catechism by Juan García (i.e., Tianzhu shengjiao rumen wenda 天主聖教入門問答, 1642), and reciting the Hail Mary that they had memorized for the occasion. Among them were the caricatures of the three Friars stationed in Fu’an, wearing “some hideous masks, with one-palm-long noses.” Among the people targeted for ridicule were converted women, the most important Christian literati and some beggars, all wearing boards with their names. While converted literati were accused of having pooled their resources to feed the foreigners, and beggars and widows of following the Friars in exchange for material support, the converted young girls were shown pregnant and engaged in lascivious behavior with the three long-nosed foreigners.25

These scenes of young female converts engaged in explicitly sexual behavior with the missionaries occupied the center stage, and indicated that the suspect liaison between the priests and local women was at the core of the gentry’s preoccupations. Riccio, indeed, observed that “important people” approvingly applauded the scene from the sides of the street. Still, wealthy and influential men like the Fu’an literatus Chen Wanzhong 陳萬鐘 continued to offer funds and shelter to the priests.26 The hostility of prominent members of the Chen lineage,

---

23 Miao wrote a letter to Aleni, expressing his anguish over the prohibition of the ancestral rites prescribed by the Friars (see note 7 above); cf. also Biermann, Die Anfänge, p. 47168.

24 García, “Relación de la vida,” p. 22.

25 RH, fols. 175v-176v.

26 Chen Wanzhong Ruowang 若望 (Juan), zi Jiechen 介臣 (in missionary sources “Kiay Chin”), native of Shanghang ward in Fu’an, was born around 1615; see Morales – Bottigli, “Información del Martirio,” “Letrado y graduado,” in the first year of the Kangxi era (1662), thus in his late forties, he received an engongsheng 恩貢生 degree; see Fu’an xianzhi, j. 20. p. 343. In
therefore, could not end with the mocking procession. After failing to win the support of officials in 1645, members of the Chen lineage who identified themselves as “Students of the Confucian School” robbed and set on fire the house of Chen Wanzhong, accusing him of sheltering the foreigners and of encouraging women to act wickedly.\(^{27}\)

In the mid-1640s, then, the Friars’ mission seemed fraught with uncertainty. The calamity of the Manchu conquest, however, opened up new opportunities for the Dominicans and their converts in Fujian and brought about an apparent change in the situation of Fu’an’s Christian community.

**Manchu Conquest and Ming Resistance:**

**A “Golden Age” for the Mission?**

While the Friars and their converts were contending with their opposition in Fu’an, the dynasty was fighting for its survival in the north. Fujian soon became one of the strongholds of the Ming loyalists, and the Qing advance there progressed slowly. The Longwu 隆武 Emperor, enthroned in Fuzhou in 1645, turned to the Catholic missionaries for military assistance from the Portuguese in Macao against the Qing. The Jesuit Francesco Sambiasi (1582–1649), who had already been deputized by the defeated Hongguang 弘光 Emperor as his envoy to Macao, received in early 1646 a confirmation of that position from Longwu in an official letter, and a pressing invitation to join him in Fujian. Apparently, Longwu had met Sambiasi in Changshu 常熟 in the 1620s, and was now cashing in on his friendship by hinting that he was in need of urgent foreign funds for his troops.\(^{28}\) Probably for the same reason, in December 1645 the Emperor approached the Jesuit Vice-Provincial of South China, Giulio Aleni, and allocated funds to repair the Catholic church of Fuzhou. Moreover, according to Jesuit sources, in January 1646, Longwu issued an edict allowing the building of Catholic churches in Fujian.\(^{29}\)

In this early stage of the Manchu invasion, the Friars remained neutral, even if Riccio – a staunch defender of Ming legitimacy – would eventually act as envoy between the Spanish government in Manila and the Zheng Chenggong 鄭成功 regime in the 1650s. In spite of their neutrality, however, the Friars and their converts unwittingly became part of the diplomatic game, getting involved in the resistance movement led by Liu Zhongzao 劉中藻 in Fu’an.

---

1644, “the houses of the Christian Juan Kiay-chin … were the best [of Fu’an] and he was the richest man in town”; see GH I, p. 195.

27 See GH I, p. 195.


29 The title of this section refers to the period González called the “Golden Age” of the Fu’an mission, i.e., the years 1642-1646; cf. GH I, p. 169. On Longwu patronage, see Gouveia, Cartas, pp. 311-312; Zürcher, “Giulio Aleni’s Chinese Biography,” pp. 115-116, and Dudink, “Giulio Aleni,” pp. 146n63 and 147n68.
Liu Zhongzao

An important military official of the Longwu regime, Liu Zhongzao was a native of Suyang, a village in Fu’an county.30 Liu, who had been in Beijing when the Ming fell, barely escaped with his life and returned to Fujian. He soon became an official in the Longwu regime, and he was charged with the transmission of the imperial edicts to Eastern Zhejiang, where the regime of the Regent Lu 鲁 had been recently established. He was entrusted with the delicate task of gaining the allegiance of the Regent to the Longwu Emperor, but failed in his mission.31 Afterwards, Liu visited in Jinhua 金華 the local warlord Zhu Dadian 朱大典, who treated him cordially.32 Zhu, who served in both regimes, recommended Liu for a higher appointment in the Longwu regime. Soon, Liu was summoned by imperial command and put in charge of patrolling Jinhua 金華 and Quzhou 衢州 Prefectures.

The Longwu Emperor left Fuzhou in early 1646 to establish his temporary capital in Yanping 延平. There, he continued his efforts to enlist the Jesuits in his government. This time, he turned to the famous Martino Martini (1614–1661), who had established his residence in Yanping.33 By suggestion of Zhu Dadian, Liu Zhongzao was personally sent to solicit Martini’s help in matters of defence, and introduced him at court, where the Longwu emperor gave Martini a dragon-embroidered piece of cloth. Then, Martini travelled to Fu’an with Liu.34 The

30 In his youth, Liu was selected by imperial favor as a tribute student in the Imperial University. He earned his juren degree in 1633 in the Shantian Prefecture; Shao, Min sheng xian shu, p. 6 [sic]. In 1640, he passed his jinshi examination. He probably was in Beijing between 1640 and 1644, employed as a messenger, a position for fresh jinshi, who hoped to have access to better positions in the central administration; Hucker, A Dictionary, no. 2575, p. 245.


33 Dehergne, Répertoire, p. 166.

34 See Gouvea, Cartas, p. 330, in “Ânua da Vice-Província da China do Ano de 1646” “[During the audience, Martini and Longwu] talked for a while, at the presence of a Mandarin [= Liu Zhongzao], subordinate of the Colo [Zhao Dadian]. The King [Longwu] made [Liu] a Viceroy over five districts, and also ordered the Father to go with him, and in case of success [in their mission] he promised he would greatly reward them. When the Father returned to the church [of Yanping], the King sent him a piece of cloth, embroidered with dragons, the royal symbol, something that is given to meritorious persons as a sign of the King’s favor. Therefore, these are not the insignia of a mandarin, which include a belt and cap. [Martini] told the Father Provincial [Aleni] that the royal will was already settled, and could not be changed. Father Martino left for the metropolis [= Fuzhou] a few days before his Viceroy. There he met the Father Provincial, and from him he received orders to keep. He arrived together with the Viceroy in the town of Fu’an, where there are some Dominicans.” Cf. also Biermann, “War Martin Martini chinesischer Mandarin?” pp. 221-225; Biermann, Die Anfänge, p. 76; Dehergne, “Lettres anuelles,” p. 254; Martini, Opera Omnia, 1, pp. 307-308. Martini’s silence in his published works, such as the De bello Tartarico, on the circumstances of this trip under the sponsorship of a Ming pretender was likely due to his strong support of the Qing cause during his European tour in the 1650s, arguing against his confrère Boym, who supported the Yongli court; Sebes,
journey took place in the summer of 1646, and once in the territory of Fu’an, Martini spent around two weeks in Muyang during the month of August.\textsuperscript{35}

When it was learnt in Fu’an that Martini had arrived in the company of local magnate Liu, a commotion among the local Christians must have ensued. Upon the suggestion of some converts – I suspect in particular Guo Bangyong, who knew Liu, and Miao Shixiang, who was Liu’s relative (Liu’s wife was from the Miao of Muyang) – the Friars planned to meet Martini in public to buttress the cause of Christianity among the local people. No doubt, Christians were looking for protection, since in the previous two years they had been subjected to frequent harassment and had been called twice into legal litigation in front of officials of the Longwu Emperor, both in Fuzhou and Fu’an.\textsuperscript{36}

When Fr. Diez went to meet Martini, however, Martini, sitting in a palanquin and dressed in what appeared as a silk official robe, allegedly “went on his way without taking any notice of him, leaving the Friar out of countenance in the presence of a thousand Lookers on, and of some Christians who had expected by that means to have gain’d Credit and Honour to their Spiritual Fathers.”\textsuperscript{37} Martini apparently did not want to be associated with the ragged Friars wearing cotton, at the risk of losing his standing.\textsuperscript{38} Moreover, during an official banquet at which Liu invited prominent Christians, including Guo Bangyong, the Jesuit seems to have been less than diplomatic, suggesting to Liu Zhongzao that an expulsion of the Dominicans from his territory was desirable.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{35} Il ruolo di Martino Martini," p. 449. However, even from Martini’s writings, it is clear that at the time, the only open route to Wenzhou 溫州 through Longwu territories was by way of Fu-ning; Martini, De bello Tartarico, pp. 125-126, and Melis, “I viaggi,” p. 403.

\textsuperscript{36} According to a contemporary Chinese-language letter written by Liu Zhongzao (copied in García, “Carta,” fols. 51v-52r), Martini was in Fu’an in the “fall of the year bingxu” (丙戌之秋 [1646]), which lasted that year from August 8 to November 7. In a Spanish translation of the document in the same manuscript (fol. 52r), a note further specifies that the time of Martini’s visit was “in the year [1646], in the month of August”; cf. Menegon, “I movimenti,” pp. 125-126.

\textsuperscript{37} RH, fols. 182v-183r.

\textsuperscript{38} Navarrete, The Travels, vol. II, p. 167 (English version of Book VI, Chapter XII: “My Stay at Fo Ngan, till I went up to Che Kiang,” pp. 165-181; originally from Tratados historicos, politicos, etnicos, y religiosos de la monarchia de China, Madrid, 1676); GH V, p. 32.

\textsuperscript{39} Significantly, the Jesuit version of the facts is rather different (in Gouvea, Cartas, p. 330): “Since [the Dominicans and their Christians in Fu’an] were being persecuted, and had had their church burned, Father [Martini] attempted to pacify everything. However, he was not successful, since the townspeople were incensed and had on their side a military official (Regulo) and the local magistrate (Mandarin da Villa), who opposed the said Dominicans, because of the nuns and other novelties for which China is not ready yet. The Father dealt with [the Dominicans] very cordially during the days he stayed in the town.” The mention of “nuns” (Freiras) is a reference to the existence of consecrated Christian virgins in Fu’an, on whom see below.

\textsuperscript{36} See Menegon, “I movimenti,” p. 125, quoting the Spanish text in García, “Carta,” fol. 54r: “While the Viceroy [Liu], Father [Martini], and Joakin [Guo Bangyong] were together in a banquet, discussing the differences between [the Jesuits and the Dominicans], Fr. Martino [Martini] said: ‘Send them away, and all will be solved.’ To this, the Viceroy gave no answer, and Joakin kept a straight face. Thus, the Father held his tongue.” The Chinese-language letter
In spite of these tensions, however, the friendly relations between Liu Zhongzao and the Jesuits brought about the protection sought by Fu’an Christians, and gave more freedom to the Friars in their work. Around this time, Liu issued a proclamation permitting Catholicism in the Fu’an region, an extension of the similar one Longwu had issued earlier on in 1646. The increased liberty of movement for the Friars brought new conversions, once again especially women, and such a state of grace might also have enhanced the prestige of men like Guo Bangyong or Miao Shixiang, who finally saw their religious choice vindicated.

The First Manchu Occupation of Fu’an (1646)

After the region of Jinhua was lost to the Manchus, Regent Lu took to the sea to escape the Qing in late summer 1646, while the advancing enemy troops pursued the fleeing Longwu emperor from Yanping, killing him in October 1646. Liu Zhongzao, after escaping to the sea from Pingyang (southern Zhejiang) in front of advancing Qing forces in the summer of 1646, went on to organize the local people for resistance in the border region between Zhejiang and Fujian. To strengthen his forces stationed in Muyang, he decided to enroll among his men six hundred “bandits” living in the mountains, “dangerous men, fearless, and accustomed to being under arms.”

Qing forces had by then taken control of all the region surrounding Fuzhou, and thus some of the leaders of the main lineage living inside the walled town of Fu’an – the Chen we already encountered before – prepared to surrender to the Qing. When Liu sent a platoon of his men to the city to elicit funding for his resistance movement, all his envoys were killed and the houses and properties of Liu and his partisans in the city were plundered. Liu then commanded his troops

---

of Liu Zhongzao to Guo Bangyong (cited in Menegon, “I movimenti,” p. 126) confirms this version: “In the fall of the year bingxiu [1646], Master Wei [i.e., Wei Kuangguo 魏光國, Martini’s Chinese name] expressed his desire that I put an end to all this for the sake of justice, and that I expel this heresy from our land. [This happened] in front of you, and you saw it with your eyes. Did you perhaps forget it?”


41 The capture and execution of Longwu is mentioned in Gouvea, Cartas, p. 317. The 1646 Annual Letter, ibid., p. 330, relating Martini’s travels with Liu, offers the following details: “From... [Fu’an, Martini] left together with Viceroy Liu [Zhongzao] for the city of Wenzhou, at the border of his jurisdiction, stopping a day’s journey from it at the town of Pingyang [in Zhejiang, Wenzhou Prefecture]. The Viceroy received news that the Tartars were approaching Wenzhou, and reneging on the promises he had made to the King, headed for the sea with such fear and haste that he did not even tell the Father, who had been staying in another house. Since [the Father] could not flee any longer, he waited for the outcome, which turned out well. Some Tartars entered the town, but encountered no resistance or rioting. The Father wrote a letter to the Tartar Captain who was in the city [of Wenzhou], telling him who he was, and how he wished to pass to Hangzhou, but that the roads were dangerous. He asked him for an order and a safe conduct pass. The Tartar responded favorably, inviting the Father to the city, where they met and conversed cordially. The Tartar repeatedly offered him banquets and Tartar clothes, and above all, an official safe conduct all the way to Beijing. The Father expressed his gratitude for all these favors by means of a few gold and silver objects, or else he would have not had such success.” On Liu’s subsequent military campaign, see RH, fol. 191v.
to attack Fu’an. In spite of his order to restrain from pillage, the “bandits” among his troops – actually a contingent of men from the She 畲 minority – set on fire most of the town’s buildings.\(^{42}\)

“Hechos” relate that the pillagers left Fu’an loaded with goods and moved toward Funing to continue plundering. On the way they were ambushed and annihilated by Qing troops, who were penetrating into the territory of Funing from the coast of southern Zhejiang.\(^{43}\) Soon after, Qing forces entered Fu’an without resistance and started fortifying it, while Liu’s remaining troops dispersed. Liu probably retreated into the mountains. When this happened, Riccio notes, “the enemies of the Viceroy [Liu], to their delight, took revenge on him by seizing his houses, palaces, properties, and orchards, destroying everything without leaving any memory of him, as if to make it impossible for him to return to power.”\(^{44}\)

**The Chen Lineage: Qing Turncoats and Anti-Christian Literati**

The ringleaders in the attacks on Liu’s property and friends were members of the Chen lineage, who had also assailed the missionaries in 1637 and in the mid-1640s.\(^{45}\) Whether motivations other than a defense of orthodoxy were behind the Chen’s persistent attacks on the Christians, we will probably never know.\(^{46}\) The most powerful surnames in Fu’an, Muyang, and Suyang respectively were the Chen, the Miao, and the Liu. Feuds between different powerful lineages over property or marriages were rather common in Fujian, and the blood ties between Liu and Miao may have antagonized sections of the Chen lineage. This might also explain why they plundered Liu’s properties.

Another reason for the hostility might have been in the realm of religion. The Chen were by tradition linked to Daoism: one of their ancestors in the Song, Chen Ru 陳孺, had been a locally famous Daoist master, and the Chongzhen edition of the Fu’an gazetteer (1638) reports that his arts had been transmitted “up to this day” to all the shamans (wu 巫) in the county. Moreover, two shrines were dedicated to him, one in Shanghang 上杭, the native ward of the Chen inside the

---


\(^{43}\) Martini, *De bello Tartarico*, p. 126.

\(^{44}\) RH, fol. 193r.

\(^{45}\) A note on the lineage in *Fu’an xianzhi*, *j. zhong*, “Shizu 氏族,” p. 740. Not all Chen abandoned the Ming loyalist camp. Chen Hanxun, for example, who had also been one of the main opponents of the Christians, died on the side of the loyalist troops of Liu Zhongzao. Capillas in his “Relación de la Misión de China,” p. 53, says that he was the commander who recruited the six hundred “bandits” in the troops of Liu Zhongzao, and that he was then killed by Qing forces in 1647. The *Fu’an xianzhi*, p. 449h132 (collation from Qianlong edition), says somewhat vaguely that Chen died a loyalist hero’s death at the time of the final fall of Fu’an to Qing forces, that is in 1649.

\(^{46}\) In fact, some important Christians were surnamed Chen, indicating that not all members of that huge lineage were opposed to Christianity.
walls, and the other outside the city of Fu’an. The Friars, implacable enemies of “idolatry,” might have also turned into religious competitors of the Chen.

Against this likely background of hostility, an attack by the Chen lineage was prompted in 1647 by the recent eruption of a series of anti-Qing rebellions – labelled “White Lotus Uprising” by the Qing, but having clear Ming loyalist motivations – in Yanping prefecture and in Gutian 古田 (Fuzhou prefecture). The Manchu Governor-General of Zhejiang-Fujian, Zhang Cunren 張存仁 (d. 1651/1652) issued orders to extinguish the rebellion, and those orders soon reached Fu’an. The Chen rushed to the new local magistrate, the Liaoning Han bannerman, Guo Zhixiu 郭之秀, and denounced the Christians. Their doctrine was “much worse than the sect of the White Lotus, since it taught to disobey one’s elders, to slight the authority of husbands, and it fostered irreverence towards the departed.” In August 1647, the magistrate duly added Catholicism to the list of forbidden groups, ordering the arrest of the missionaries, who went into hiding in Dingtou. They escaped official attention until November, when Francisco Capillas was casually intercepted by a platoon of Qing troops and arrested. He was tortured and closely interrogated on the heterodox practices of the Christians. All the efforts of the converts to petition the magistrate and convince him to free the missionary, including the bribing of local educational officials, failed.

Liu Retakes Fu’an: Death of Francisco Capillas

By early 1647, the Qing had control over most of Fujian, Funing subprefecture included. Only the region of Xiamen 厦门, dominated by Zheng Chenggong and his family, was beyond Qing reach. However, an offensive launched by Zheng Cai 鄭彩, brother of Zheng Chenggong, succeeded in taking from Qing control important positions in Fuzhou prefecture in the summer of 1647. Soon, the provincial capital itself was besieged by the forces of the Ming pretender, Regent Lu.

Successes in the Funing region soon followed. By October 1647 Liu Zhongzao had retaken parts of the counties of Luoyuan 罗源, Ningde 寧德, Zhenghe 政和, and Fu’an. Riccio reports that Liu besieged Fu’an three times, after two initial routs. He personally headed the final siege, which started in December 1647. The Qing resistance weakened somewhat when the Qing magistrate Guo was mortally

47 In Fu’an xianzhi, j. 30, p. 558, we find this note from the Chongzhen edition: “Chen’s arts have been transmitted up to this day to all the shamans in the county.” On the shrines to Chen Ru, see ibid., j. 13, p. 228.
48 Lian, Fujian mimi shehui, p. 5.
49 See RH, fol. 198v; on Zhang Cunren, cf. ECCP, pp. 56-57.
50 RH, fol. 198v. On Guo Zhixiu, see Fu’an xianzhi, j. 16, p. 261. On the Chens’ accusations, see RH, fols. 198v-199r.
51 RH, fols. 210v-217r.
wounded on the city walls. However, when the new military leader of the Qing camp captured a loyalist soldier, he extorted from him the names of the citizens of Fu’an who were collaborating with Liu. Among the most well-known were the converts Miao Shixiang, Guo Bangyong, and Chen Wanzhong, as well as other Christians. The effect of this leak was a Qing retaliation against relatives and friends of the loyalists still inside the besieged town. Among the victims was Fr. Capillas, who was executed due to his connections to the Christian loyalists in mid-January, 1648. In spite of this setback, the siege of Qing-occupied Fu’an continued until March, when the invaders, having exhausted their provisions, quietly left the city at night. Upon entering the city, Liu immediately proceeded to purge the turncoats of the Chen lineage. Summary executions of Qing supporters and confiscation of their property followed.  

The Fu’an Christian Loyalists and the Ming Final Defeat

Miao Shixiang and Guo Bangyong thereafter became military commanders in the army of Liu Zhongzao, who established control in the following months over Mindong and parts of southern Zhejiang. In the meantime, Regent Lu bestowed on Liu the title of Academician of the Eastern Depot and Secretary of the Ministry of War, with the task of defending the positions in north-eastern Fujian. However, the Lu forces lost cohesion due to internal struggles between Zheng Cai and his opponents in the Ming camp. The Zheng armies abandoned the front in northern Fujian, and Fuming soon became isolated and surrounded by the Qing. An expedition led by Liu towards Zhejiang, according to Riccio, met disaster at the provincial border, and Liu’s camp, with all his provisions, ammunition, and funds (worth “two hundred thousand ducados”) fell into enemy hands. Liu retreated into Fu’an, fortifying it in expectation of the Qing attack.

According to most sources, in April 1649 Manchu troops headed by the Acting Governor of Fujian, Chen Jin 陳錦, dug a moat and built a palisade ten li from the city walls of Fu’an, planning to cut off all supplies to the city and starve its residents. In late May 1649, with food exhausted and cannibalism ruled out as a solution, Liu decided to surrender the city to the Qing. When the Qing commander entered the city the following day, he found the body of Liu, who had taken poison, and bowed to it in sign of respect. Then all the remaining loyalist troops were executed, while the civil population was spared. As narrated by Riccio, Miao Shixiang was decapitated shortly after the city fell to the Qing, while Guo Bangyong was able to escape by boat from Dingtou, where he was patrolling.

---

52 On military developments at this juncture, see Xu Zi, Xiaotian jizhuan, j. 40, p. 81; Struve, The Southern Ming, pp. 93, 222n16, 230n2 and 111; ECCP, p. 353. On the death of magistrate Guo, see RH, fol. 208v; Fu’an xianzhi, j. 18, p. 300.
53 On the executions ordered by Liu, see RH, fols. 210r-v; on the occupation of Fu’an, see Yang, Yinwan lu, j. 6, p. 689; RH, fols. 223v-224r.
55 RH, fol. 231v; Fuming fazhi, j. 43, p. 1364.
56 Gao, Xuejiaoting, j. 6, p. 240; RH, fol. 231v.
the river delta, to Funing. There he was arrested by a commander in the Yongli Emperor’s loyalist armies, who indicted him of abuse of power and embezzlement during his official tenure, and immediately executed him with his family.\(^57\)

**Ming Loyalists or Christian Opportunists?**

**An Appraisal**

Their death for the Ming cause earned Guo and Miao a place in loyalist history: they are mentioned in the Fu’an local gazetteer under the biography of Liu Zhongzao, as well as in the chapter listing “Loyal and Upright Subjects” (Zhongyi 忠義).\(^58\) Their association with Liu’s fate is confirmed by the 1776 “imperial canonization” of Liu and Miao as “officials who died out of loyalty to the fallen dynasty.”\(^59\)

Chinese sources reveal little else about them. Their significance in the resistance movement was rather limited, and the historiographical problems surrounding loyalist figures like Liu Zhongzao during the Qing complicated the collection of historical memories on the Ming resistance in Fu’an.\(^60\) It is, therefore, no surprise that information on the last months of the Manchu conquest of the region of Funing are scarce. Fortunately, Riccio’s account offers us details illuminating the relationship between Liu and the Christian loyalists, especially in the biography of Guo Bangyong.

Riccio repeatedly underlines the close ties of Guo to Liu Zhongzao, in spite of the former’s cashiered career. Guo had been stripped of his degree for his adherence to Christianity, and thereafter he had stayed in the Philippines to receive religious instruction. As a consequence, his contacts with the foreigners had been prolonged and constant, and must have been quite troubling to many in Fu’an. Nevertheless, he received exceptional favor from Liu. In Riccio’s account we first see Guo participating in an official banquet offered by Liu in honour of Martini in the fall of 1646. He also obtained an edict of tolerance for Christianity in Fu’an by appealing directly to Liu the same year. Before the first Qing occupation of Fu’an (1646), he received from Liu properties (houses and land) in Mu-

\(^{57}\) RH, fols. 238v-239r; DMB, p. 27.

\(^{58}\) Fu’an xianzhi, j. 23, pp. 458-459.

\(^{59}\) Fu’an xianzhi, j. 22, p. 441. Liu and Miao were included in the list of loyalists Qiding shengchao xunjie zhuchen lu (1776), j. 4, p. 452, and j. 10, p. 625, respectively; on this work see Struve, The Ming-Qing Conflict, p. 63. For his defense of the Christian faith, rather than for his Ming loyalist connections, Fr. Francisco Capillas has been canonized as a martyr of the Catholic Church on October 1, 2000.

\(^{60}\) Although by 1651 the Shunzhi Emperor had granted an amnesty to the descendants of Liu on the ground that he had been loyal to the Ming, and Liu’s biography was included in the Ming History in the Yongzheng period, his role as a “loyal and upright (zhongyi) official” was still disputed in 1762, when the Prefect of Funing Li Ba called Liu “a disorderly bandit,” emphatically asking how he could have been included in the zhongyi section. Only in 1880, the Prefect of Funing, following requests from the local gentry, moved the biography of Liu and his companions from the “Strange Events and Calamities” section to the more proper “Loyal and Upright” section. See Funing fuzhi, j. shou, p. 2; j. 43, p. 1364.
yang. After Liu occupied Fu'an again in 1647, he was assigned the charge of patrolling the delta of the Fu'an valley, and he was put in command of a contingent of soldiers. With that authority, he established a military local government in Dingtou, with power to name subordinates and to discipline military personnel as well as civilians, even by death penalty. He was allocated a considerable sum of money, as Riccio observes that Guo “did not use force [to govern], but money, which is what everybody obeys to.” He also funded the building of a large church in Spanish style, similar to the ones he had seen in the Philippines. Moreover, a number of people, some of them literati, apparently converted at this time under Guo’s influence.61

Guo and Miao were, indeed, committed Christians, as a number of biographical details clarifies, and they and the Christians of Fu’an obviously took full advantage of the favorable occasions afforded them by the Ming–Qing conflict to obtain official permission to spread Christianity, to gain new converts, and to construct an imposing religious structure. They could well be described as “Christian opportunists.” But their link to Liu Zhongzao went beyond their desire to improve the status of Christianity in Fu’an.

In fact, I would suggest that they also sided with the loyalist camp for a number of other reasons. Guo as well as Miao were part of a network of Christians sympathetic to the aims of the Restoration Society (Fushe 復社), and thus deeply committed to the moral and political reform of the Ming dynasty.62 They, like the more famous Fushe members who supported the Ming cause after 1644, might have seen no other possible moral choice than to join the loyalist camp. Moreover, both Guo and Miao had strived to succeed in the examinations, but Guo had been stripped of his degree in 1637, while Miao had failed in the 1643 jinshi examination.63 The loyalist movement offered them an opportunity to rise in the ranks through military merit. Miao, finally, was personally connected by blood ties to the house of Liu, and like Guo, was practically obliged to join the loyalist ranks both by local social and political pressure, as Riccio obliquely observed.64 In sum, Christian loyalist leaders, while sincerely committed to the fallen dynasty, were also clearly striving for the achievement of a safe position for Christianity in China, and for some social promotion in the local scene.

Besides the Christian loyalists’ motivations, we should also consider why Liu Zhongzao invested Guo and Miao with important military responsibilities. In the first place, the number of degree holders in the region of Funing, as already noted, was extremely limited. The volatile situation of the time dramatically curtailed the available talents who would embrace the loyalist cause. The choice of

61 On the church, see Navarrete, The Travels, p. 179. On conversions, GH I, p. 297, based on Navarrete: 1,400 conversions in 1649, among them four military officials, three gongseng, more than 70 shengyuan.

62 Guo and Miao are mentioned among the pro-Fushe contributors to the Pillow Book of the Christian Li Jubiao; Dudink, “Giulio Aleni,” p. 183.


64 RH, fols. 234r and 237r.
the numerous and powerful Chen lineage in Fu’an to side with the victorious Qing was, indeed, an indication that large sectors of the local elite were ready to liquidate the old dynasty for the re-establishment of order. Thus, we can presume that when someone like Guo and Miao joined his ranks, Liu warmly welcomed them. The fact that Guo and the Christians were opponents of the Chen lineage must have made them even better allies in the eyes of Liu.

Secondly, Guo’s connection with the foreign priests was an asset to Liu. In 1646, Liu was in search of Western military know-how and assistance. In exchange for such help, Liu offered Martini his intercession with the Longwu Emperor to obtain “a far-reaching permission to spread the Law of God, and to allow building churches in the whole empire.”65 He might have seen the Christian leaders as good potential commanders of an already existing network of people, cemented by religious ties. Guo’s authority in the coastal village of Dingtou, for example, was truly remarkable, and Riccio specifies that Guo chose Dingtou as the seat of his tribunal because of the florid state of its Christian community. He also selected mostly Christian converts as militia chiefs in his jurisdiction.66

Finally, long-standing political affinities between Liu, Guo, and Miao might have played a determining role. As already pointed out, Guo and Miao were part of a Christian network sympathetic to the Restoration Society, and it appears that Liu himself was close to the Society, as suggested by a number of poems he exchanged with Fushe members, such as Zeng Yizhuan 曾異撰 (from Jinjiang 晉江), Yu Yang 余鴻 (Putian 莆田), and Zhou Zhikui 周之慶 (Minxian 閩縣).67

However, in spite of all the favor shown by Liu to the Christians, an episode that occurred days before Liu’s final defeat calls into question the feasibility of any lasting alliance between Liu and the Christians. The matter was not military or political, as one might expect in time of war, but was related to Confucian family mores. This event, described below, uncovered once again the tension between the aspiration of Christian literati to become respected local leaders, and their new religious ideas, which potentially created a fracture with Fu’an’s social context.

**Fu’an Women, Their Men, and Their Friars: Tensions in the Loyalist Camp**

A few days before Liu Zhongzao’s departure on his last expedition, an incident involving one of his four consorts disturbed the harmony in the loyalist camp. This concubine surnamed “Vuang” (Wang 王?) had come into contact with some local Christian women in Muyang in 1646, and had soon been baptized by Fr.

---

66 RH, fol. 237r.
67 For connections between Christians, missionaries and Fushe members, see Lin, “Ai Rulüe yu Fujian shidafu jiaoyou biao,” p. 186, and Dudink, “Giulio Aleni,” p. 183. Poems offered to Liu by other literati, some of them acquaintances of Aleni and Li Jiubiao, are preserved in Liu’s “Ge yi ji,” Appendix, pp. 20a-21a, and reproduced in Fang Hua, Liu Zhongzao, pp. 55-60.
Juan García, followed by her close relatives and a female servant. After the reconquest of Fu’an in 1648, Liu established a residence for his family in Funing, and had all the members of the family recalled there. When the concubine arrived, she appeared before Liu in unusual attire – a veil and a simple cotton dress. She soon refused sexual intercourse, on the ground that concubinage was not acceptable for Christians. Then, the concubine and her entourage refused to participate in the preparations of a solemn ceremony for Liu’s ancestors. Liu, oblivious to Confucian gravity, entered the women’s apartments and beat Wang and a servant. Soon after, she and her maid were put on a palanquin and sent to Dingtou to join Fr. García, with a small amount of rice provisions, an act that could be interpreted as repudiation. Liu also issued an official document, ordering that all Christian women taking vows of chastity be denounced by their families and exiled to Dingtou.

Guo Bangyong wrote to Liu, remarking that this was a turnaround in his policy towards Christianity. Liu angrily responded that in his past meetings with the Jesuits Aleni and Martini, as well as in his readings about Christianity, he had never come across teachings like those taught by the Friars on matters of female chastity and ancestral cults. A few days after this exchange, Liu was routed by the Qing at the Zhejiang border, and unfortunately, nothing further was recorded about the incident.

The concubine’s case is emblematic of the kind of gender conflict that Christianity provoked in Fu’an. One of the characteristic features of the Fu’an Christian community was the prominent role of women in religious activities, and their strong ties to their religious masters, the Friars, as the episode of the masqueraded procession of Fu’an already indicated.

Such closeness contrasted starkly with Jesuit practices. Due to the strict customs segregating the two sexes, the Jesuits were very cautious in ministering to women, maintaining private chapels for them and conducting confessions only in places easily monitored by males of the family. When the Dominicans arrived in Fujian, they initially held ceremonies in common spaces for both men and women, and this led to sharp criticisms, both from the Jesuits and from Chinese

---

68 In his 1671 “Declaración y manifiesto,” Varo identified the concubine of Riccio’s account as “Bibiana Vuang,” which should correspond to Wang; see GH I, p. 225. The reference to four consorts is in García, “Carta,” fol. 48r. According to the later funerary inscription of Liu, “Da-xue-shi cih i jiemin Liu gong mu jinming” (Funerary inscription of Grand Secretary Liu [Zhongzao] . . . , 1750; in Liu, “Ge yi ji,” p. 17a; cf. Fang Hua, Liu Zhongzao, p. 54) his wife was named Miao 瑪, while his two concubines were named Wan 懋 and Lin 林. The concubine Wang was repudiated, and thus her name cannot be found on the tomb.

69 RH, fols. 228v-232r. On the status of concubines in late imperial times, see Hsieh, “Female Hierarchy.”

70 A precis of this exchange is in RH, fol. 231r. For the original documents – among them the Chinese letter of Liu – see Garcia, “Carta”; Menegon, “I movimenti,” p. 126.

71 From the lack of her name on the tomb inscription of Liu, we can presume that the concubine never reconciled with her husband.
men. As is well known, one of the most common accusations against heterodox groups was the mixing of sexes. Eventually, the Dominicans started building separate churches for the two sexes, but they continued to have contacts with women to celebrate the sacraments, sometimes at night and in secret, a practice which drew fierce opposition from local men.

Besides certain suspicious religious devotions, it was the vows of chastity taken by some young women that most troubled local men. The Dominicans encouraged the most devout among their female converts to remain virgin if unmarried or to pronounce a vow of chastity if widowed or married, and lead a life of prayer and mortification in their homes. Women leading this form of religious life, which was quite popular in Spain, were known as beatas. The role of the beatas was particularly important in Fu'an. Riccio gives us the biography of a series of women that he defines either as virgins, beatas or healers (taumaturgas). It appears that the institution of the beatas offered women a limited space to exert some independence from the patriarchal structure. As numerous examples related by Riccio illustrate, they tried, at times successfully, to refuse arranged marriage, and they flaunted Confucian modesty by visiting the Friars for confession at night and by leading women’s religious gatherings.

There are even indications that some women where becoming independent religious “entrepreneurs.” The case of a visionary in Fu’an well illustrates the point. The Dominican Tertiary Catalina “Sang-so” of Dingtou, a married woman of poor background, in 1642, three years after her baptism, began having visions and ecstasies. She probably became a Christian medium: her body would become rigid and insensitive during visions, and only the voice of the missionary could restore her senses. Even when the missionary was afar, it would be enough for him to call her mentally, and she would be awakened from her trance and start weeping. During the celebration of the Eucharist, she would see a beautiful baby in the host, and the Virgin Mary appeared to her often. When engaged in domestic work, an angel would materialize to help her. During prayer, moreover, the devil would appear to her in horrible forms and engage in struggle with her. Her powers were so unusual that soon the missionaries started thinking they were coming from the devil, and not from God: “Thus, the Lord enlightened us, so that we would know that the raptures and the extraordinary things happening to Catalina ... were all from the devil, who wanted to disrupt our Church.” The Friars also concluded that another woman of humble origins (cristiana sencilla), who performed some miraculous acts (probably healing) was also a victim of the

---


73 Women’s religious “entrepreneurship” was not necessarily what the Friars desired. In fact, in the sixteenth century the Spanish church had already limited the liberty of individual beatas, who had become too independent to control; Christian, Local Religion, p. 170. For clerical control in the Chinese case, see Entenmann, “Christian Virgins,” pp. 190-191.
devil. They, thus, forbade the Christians from inscribing the woman's visions on a scroll and hanging it in the church, as some wanted.  

Thus, as already shown in the case of lay Buddhism, religious belief could serve as a way for women to establish some independence and assume roles of leadership, besides allowing them to resist marriage. This important topic deserves more space than I can give it here. The sources suggest that shifts in women's social roles preoccupied the local elite more than the refusal to celebrate ancestral cults, since women's religious activities undermined the ideals of "Confucian" female chastity and virtue, and were clearly felt as a threat to the patriarchal order, male dominance and the lineage structure. Thus, Liu Zhongzao, along with many husbands, fathers and brothers of Christian women in Fu'an, showed an urgent concern for the containment of practices like the taking of Christian chastity vows.  

However, the impact of the Qing conquest on Fu'an so deeply affected the local population for a number of years, that all energies in the 1650s were concentrated on survival, and open attacks on the Christians subsided. Moreover, the new lords of China, the Qing, decided to extend their protection to Christianity.  

**Conclusion: After the Qing Conquest**

Through little-known missionary sources, we are able to rediscover how some Christian men and women in Fu'an lived in a time of cataclysmic events like the Ming–Qing transition, and how their religious choice was both a source of conflict, but also of opportunities. Christian literati and their followers, after inviting the religious experts they needed to Fu'an, realized that the Dominicans were a different brand of priests from the Jesuits they had known, and had to reckon with the Dominican religious policy, which was intolerant of certain Chinese rites, and which introduced some new social practices, especially in the realm of gender relations. In the ensuing succession of social conflicts, many Christians forsook their new religion. Others, however, did not, and, like Guo Bangyong, went through a most unusual spiritual journey or, like the concubine of Liu Zhongzao, suffered family abuse and repudiation. However, they remained steadfast in their radical choice.

By contextualizing the conflicts between Christians and non-Christians, I have tried to open up some vistas in the religious and social landscape of Fu'an during
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74 Capillas, "Relación," p. 67.

75 On Chinese women as religious "enterpreneurs," see Overmyer, "Women," and Hong, "Qing-dai"; on marriage resistance, see Siu, "Where Were the Women?" and Teng, "Religion." Since traditional sources offer sparse information on women who did not fit in the Confucian orthodox mold, the information Riccio provides on the "heterodox activities" of Christian women from Fu'an is valuable, and offers a fascinating picture of the personal religious life of Chinese women, while adding a dimension to the study of Christianity in China. Riccio's information is reinforced by eighteenth-century Qing judicial materials preserved in Beijing on the Fu'an "female leaders of the heterodox sect of the Lord of Heaven." Cf. Menegon, "Ancestors, Virgins, and Friars."

76 On the demographic drop in Funing, see Chen, Fujian lidai renkou lun kao, p. 195.
the Ming–Qing transition. The arrival of Christianity in Fu’an provoked tensions in the realms of ancestral cults and gender relations. However, while encountering resistance, the iconiclastic and heterodox teachings brought by the Westerners found also positive reception among certain sectors of the population: local students, some higher-degree holder, women, and commoners. In fact, the social and religious scene existing prior to the arrival of the missionaries might have favored the development of Christianity in Fu’an at this early stage. The new religion apparently could position itself in the interstices created by the friction between powerful lineages, by the religious competition in the realm of folk cults, and by women’s use of religious activities to gain more autonomy.77

The conflicts that had characterized the life of the Christian community in the late Ming slowly subsided in the early Qing. In spite of the bloody end met by the most prominent Christians and by Capillas during the Manchu conquest of Fu’an, missionary work proceeded in Fu’an uninterrupted into the 1650s, and the growth of the community accelerated over the years.78 In the fall of 1649, only Fr. Juan García was still in Fu’an. However, by the end of October 1649, Frs. Gregorio Luo Wenzao 羅文藻 (a native of Luojiaxiang 羅家巷, in Fu’an county, and the first Chinese Dominican) and Francisco Varo also reached the region, followed in December by Frs. Juan Bautista de Morales, Manuel Rodrigues, and Timoteo Bottigli.79

The winds of war did not completely abate. In November 1651, a fleet under the banners of the Yongli emperor appeared at sea. The next day, a group of assailants targeted the large church built by Guo Bangyong in Dingtou and burnt it down, maybe a retaliation against the change in loyalties of the Christians in occupied China. Again, in 1655, a large fleet commanded by Zheng Chenggong made an incursion in the bay of Fu’an.80

However, the Friars tried to keep the mission neutral. When in 1653 a local Christian became involved in a small anti-Qing revolt, the Friars tried to dissuade him from participating in an enterprise that – as they rightly predicted – was easily quelled by the authorities. Then, in March 1654, an edict by the Governor of Fujian, Tong Guoqi 佟國器 (?–1684), officially allowed the practice of Christianity on the ground that in Beijing it had also been approved.81 A few peaceful dec-

77 More on these topics can be found in Menegon, “Ancestors, Virgins, and Friars.”
78 In 1649, before the Qing conquest, the Christian communities in Mindong counted between 6,000 and 10,000 converts; in 1741, they were around 8,600. Considering that a strict prohibition of Christianity was enforced in 1723, the numbers for the 1740s are still surprisingly high; see GH I, p. 297, and II, p. 283.
79 RH, fols. 246r-v; cf. GH I, p. 285.
80 RH, fols. 249r-v; DMB, pp. 1075-76.
81 GH I, p. 299, quoting RH. Tong's wife was Christian, and the governor himself was very sympathetic to Christianity, so much so that he eventually converted in 1674. During his tenure in Fujian Tong showered his protection on the local Christian community, funding the reconstruction of the church of Fuzhou in 1655, and authoring a eulogistic preface to a popular catechism published by the Jesuit Antonio de Gouveia in Fuzhou. Following his example, a number of officials in the provincial administration extended protection to the Jesuits and to those “Fujianese
ades followed, interrupted only by the anti-Christian movement of the Oboi Regency (1665–1670). The local magistrates of Fu’an showed much leniency to the now-favored missionaries, and local literati relented in their attacks on the Christians.

Thus, the exhaustion of war and the favor bestowed on Christianity from the center allowed the Dominican Christian community of Fu’an a slow process of recovery. But what kind of Christianity developed in Fu’an? The number of beatas increased, and ancestral cults continued to be prohibited to Christians. In spite of these signs of continuing heterodoxy, however, the Christian community thrived like never before. Apparently, some people could adhere to the Friars’ stricter form of Catholicism, which challenged the most important foundations of Confucian society, and continue to be part of local society. Thus, over the time between the latter part of the Kangxi reign and the Qianlong reign, this brand of Christianity became part of the religious and social landscape of Fu’an. The obligations of the Christians just became common-place, as the words of Li Ba 李拔, Prefect of Funing in the late 1740s, confirm: “How is it possible that the people of Fu’an be influenced by the deceptive lies [of the missionaries], disregard the laws, follow those teachings and recite prayers, and consider [all this] a normal (guanchang 慣常) thing to do?!”

Already in 1706, the Kangxi Emperor had expressed his surprise and reproach at hearing about the religious prohibitions enforced by the Dominicans in this corner of Fujian. Later on, the Yongzheng and Qianlong Emperors blasted their local officials for letting such perverse customs thrive undetected for so long in Fu’an. Christianity in Fu’an had indeed taken roots, and future tensions would come more in the form of inquisitions from the imperial government, than from friction with local society.83

**Bibliography**

**Abbreviations**

- APSR Archivo de la Provincia del Santo Rosario (Avila, Spain – Manila, Philippines).
- ARSI Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (Roma).
- BC Biblioteca Casanatense (Roma).

---

82 *Funing fuzhi*, j. 40, pp. 1213-1214.
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明清之際福建地方的天主教愛國者、西班牙修士與童貞聖女

梅歐金

迄今為止，相當多的研究者主要關注耶穌會在中國的活動，而忽略了方濟各會、多明我會及其他來華修會在華活動時所產生的大量史料，這些史料為我們描述了天主教在民間底層的鮮活畫面。盡管從十六世紀末起，耶穌會士也活躍於相類似的環境，但是在歐洲出版的該會報告中，主要描繪的是耶穌會
與上層知識精英的關係，如此一來，耶穌會士與儒士及帝國文化的相遇問題，理所當然成為許多當代的歷史研究者熱衷於討論的對象。

在本文中，我將集中探討清軍橫掃東南時期閩東北福安縣地方多明我會的活動。這些多明我會神父目擊了明清王朝更替，為我們留下了衆多反映這場劇烈社會變動的史料。然而，對於本文來說，更重要的一點是，這種明清轉變為我們提供了一個深入研究基層處境中天主教群體與地方社會之間實質關係的絕佳歷史結合點。清軍的進逼，引發了地方紳士之間的分裂，由此也進一步惡化了自十七世紀三十年代中葉以降愈演愈烈的教徒與非教徒之間的社會沖突與緊張關係。這類衝突是在地方宗族爭奪社會控制、對婦女的夫權支配以及宗教信仰分歧等背景下發生的。

本文之目的並非僅限於討論教會史，而是試圖結合中西文獻史料，從福安這個邊緣地區入手，對下層天主教文人與婦女信徒的生活進行初步探索，從而有助於推進明清基層天主教這個目前仍然有待深入的問題的研究。