

The Jesuits' Latin Translations of the *Zhongyong* 中庸 during the 17th and 18th Centuries

LUO Ying

Abstract

The translation and overseas spread of the Confucian classics has been long regarded as a significant subject in cross-cultural research. The Jesuits, who came to China under the reign of Kangxi 康熙 (1654-1722), produced Latin translations of a number of significant Confucian works, especially the *Four Books*, not only facilitating a cultural exchange between China and the West, but also exerting a great impact on European enlightenment thinkers. By going through the most famous 17th and 18th Century Latin translations of the *Zhongyong* 中庸, namely *Sinarum Scientia Politico-Moralis* (Guamcheu-Goa 1667/1669), *Liber Secundus of Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (Paris 1687) and *Immutabile Medium of Sinensis imperii libri classici sex* (Pragae 1711), this article sketches an outline of the genealogical relationship among these early editions. Special focus is devoted to these three translations' structural and textual characteristics, in addition to providing an introduction to the Jesuits' practice of "technical innovation" in printing the Chinese-Latin bilingual text of their Confucian translation during the Qing dynasty 清 (1636-1912).

Keywords: *Zhongyong*, Jesuits, Cross-cultural translation, Confucian concepts, Bilingual text

* LUO Ying: Associate Professor, International Institute of Chinese Studies, Beijing Foreign Studies University (luoying0227@hotmail.com)

** This research is supported by the National Social Science Foundation and the Young Faculty Research Fund of Beijing Foreign Studies University. 本研究為國家社科基金青年項目(項目編號: 15CZJ012) 的階段性成果並獲“北京外國語大學基本科研業務費青年學術創新團隊支持計畫”資助(項目名稱: 1990年以來歐美儒學研究的新進展及理論回應, 項目批准號: 2016JT001).

1. Jesuit Translations and Publications of the *Four Books* during the Late 16th and the Early 17th Century

1.1. The Jesuit Study of Chinese and Their Early Representative Translations of Confucian Classics

In 1624, Manual Dias (1559-1639), superior of the Jesuits' Mission in China, drew up a four-year study program (*Ratio studiorum*) for training missionaries in Chinese language and culture, which included the study of the *Four Books* 四書, the *Shujing* 書經 (*Book of History*) etc.¹ Responding to the need for Chinese study, the Jesuits in China began to translate the *Four Books* as Chinese classics primers for newly arrived missionaries. Correspondence between Matteo Ricci (1552-1610) and other Jesuits makes it clear that Ricci had studied the *Four Books* under the guidance of Chinese literati. This correspondence also indicates that from December 1591 to November 1593, Ricci was at work on a translation of the *Four Books* (undertaken in order to teach the newcomer Francesco de Petris (1562-1593) Chinese and under order of Visitor Alessandro Valignano (1539-1606)) and that Ricci had plans to send his version back to Rome.²

1 Brockey, *Journey to the East: The Jesuit Mission to China, 1579-1724*, 255-268. "Ratio Studiorum" (Ratio atque Institutio Studiorum Societatis Jesu) was the Jesuits' education program, formally established in the 16th century. It consisted of three phases: humanities study for five to six years, three years of philosophy study and four years of theology study. The humanities study in the first phase focused primarily on the learning of classical languages with an emphasis on Latin study, including courses on grammar, rhetoric, etc. The phase of philosophical study was obviously marked by Aristotle's thought system in which Logic, Natural Philosophy, Metaphysics, and Ethics were taught. The theological study in third phase was mainly based on scholastic philosophy, especially on the works of Thomas Aquinas. The Jesuits' education program accepted students from different social strata. It emphasized spiritual experiences, took the military training mode and aimed at the cultivation of elite leaders within the Catholic Church. The establishment of this education scheme also set up a positive example for the internal reform of the Roman Catholic Church. See Kasper, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 842-843. Ferdinand Verbiest (1623-1688) wrote in a letter that The Collegio de São Paulo founded by the Jesuits in Macau inherited their European education system. Although the mission in China later attempted to establish the study of Chinese classics to take the place of Western classics, such plans never came to pass. See Golvers, "An Unobserved Letter of Prospero Intorcetta S.J. to Godefridus Henschens S.J. and the Printing of the Jesuit Translations of the Confucian Classics (Rome-Antwerp, 2 June 1672)," 679.

2 Ricci was the first to use the term "Tetrabliblion" (a Latin term transcribed from Greek, literally meaning "four books," originally used in reference to Claudius Ptolemy's 2nd century work on the philosophy and practice of astrology) as the translated name the *Four Books*. In his letters, he also used the Italian phrase "Quattro Libri" several times to indicate

Pasquale D'Elia and David Mungello both think that subsequent generations of Jesuits in China improved their translation of the *Four Books* based on Ricci's version and finally completed *Confucius Sinarum philosophus* (Paris 1687) as a masterpiece of their collective translating activity.³ Although no copy of Ricci's version has been found as yet, it's still possible that Ricci's translation work was preserved in the form of an unsigned manuscript through its being transcribed and handed down as a primer for Jesuit study of the *Four Books*. Since there are no known extant copies of Ricci's translation, Knud Lunbaek has proposed instead that the first translation of the Confucian classics in Europe was accomplished by Michele Ruggieri (1543-1607) and partly published by Antonio Possevino (1533-1611) in his *Bibliotheca Selecta* (Rome, 1593).⁴ However, there are three Confucian translations in Latin that had greater influence in Europe during the 17th and 18th Century: *Sinarum scientia politico-moralis* (Guamcheu-Goa 1667/1669), the first Latin translation of *Zhongyong* 中庸; *Confucius Sinarum philosophus* (Paris 1687), including the Latin translations of *Daxue* 大學, *Zhongyong* and *Lunyu* 論語; and *Sinensis imperii libri classici sex*

the Chinese *Four Books*. See D'Arelli, *Matteo Ricci Lettere (1580-1609)*, 184, 192n, 315n, 337n, 349, 364n, 518n; D'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane I*, 330 and *Fonti Ricciane II*, 33; and Pfister, *Zaihua yesu huishi liezhuan ji shumu · shang*, 46.

- 3 D' Elia, *Fonti Ricciane II*, 33; Mungello, *Curious Land: Jesuit Accommodation and the Origins of Sinology*, 250; and Mungello, "The Seventeenth-Century Jesuit Translation Project of the Confucian Four Books," 252.
- 4 Lunbaek, "The First Translation from a Confucian Classic in Europe," 1-11. I found Possevino's *Bibliotheca Selecta* in the Jesuit Archives in Rome and in its *Liber Novus* (pp. 581-586), it quoted a Latin paraphrase on moral doctrines translated from a Chinese book (*Liber Sinensium*). According to the content we can tell that it's the opening passage of *Daxue* 大學. Possevino's collection never mentions that Ruggieri translated this passage, however, but instead proceeds to describe Ruggieri's efforts to compose a Chinese Catechism after a lengthy in-depth study of Chinese culture (Catechismus, quem idem Rogerius Superiorum permisso edidit characteribus Sinensibus. . .). Lunbaek also found a Latin manuscript of the *Four Books* dated 1591-1593 (FG [3314]1185) with the collector's signature of Michele Ruggieri in the National Central Library of Rome. The paraphrase of *Daxue*'s published by Possevino is almost the same as in this manuscript except for small changes made to individual words. D'Elia was the first scholar to conduct research on Ruggieri's manuscript. He made some notes on the cover of this manuscript in 1936 and claimed that Ruggieri would not have been able to translate the *Four Books* in view of his Chinese knowledge at that time, so D'Elia presumed that Ruggieri might have transcribed Ricci's translation and brought a copy back to Italy with him. By 1942, D'Elia had changed his opinion and firmly believed that Ruggieri had translated the *Four Books* in Latin. See D'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane I*, 43 note 2. Another Italian scholar, Francesco D'Arelli opposed D'Elia's view and continued to consider Ricci the most likely original translator of the major part of this manuscript. See D'Arelli, "Matteo Ricci S.I. e la traduzione latina dei *Quattro Libri (Sishu)*: dalla tradizione storiografica alle nuove ricerche," 163-175.

(Pragae 1711), the first complete Latin translation of the *Four Books*. Very few printed copies of this last book can be found today. Some speculate that after its publication the Jesuit superiors suppressed this work because of its debatable content during the “Rites Controversy,” which restricted its circulation.⁵ But this Confucian translation still exerted a profound influence on the German enlightenment thinker Christian Wolff (1679-1754) and his *Oratio de Sinarum philosophia practica* (Francofurti ad Moenum 1721).⁶

1.2. Jesuit Motives for Translating Confucian Classics

The Jesuits in China devoted themselves to translating the Confucian classics and to publishing them in Europe, mainly considering these translations as achievements in their missionary work in China. On one hand they brought these versions back to Rome for reporting; on the other hand, they often used these as gifts to convey thanks to their benefactors, or to court the nobility who might give some form of assistance to their mission in the future. For example, Prospero Intorcetta (1626-1696) presented his *Zhongyong* to Emperor Leopold I (1640-1705) in Vienna. Philippe Couplet (1624-1692) also donated Jesuit publications to satisfy (or perhaps increase) the curiosity of Louis XIV of France (1638-1715) and King James II (1633-1701) regarding China. Considering that the Jesuits’ readership included not only priests and novitiates in European Jesuit communities, but also other intellectuals who were inquisitive about the distant and mysterious China, their motivation for translating Chinese classics can be summarized as follows:

- i. Many Jesuit translators were also active initiators for the establishment of a Chinese local church. Like the above-mentioned, Intorcetta and Couplet, they both were selected as procurator of the mission in China (*Sinensis missionis procurator*) and came back to Rome to make a work report to the Pope. In their trip they brought many letters of fellow Jesuits and works on China, including the translation of the *Four Books*. They aimed to request papal approval to accept and to train Chinese native priests so that the Jesuit mission in China could preserve permanently the results of their work in the face of continuing litigation against the foreign

5 The French Sinologists Guillaume Pauthier and Abel Rémusat are of this opinion, but the Australian Sinologist Paul Rule deems that there’s no evidence for this. See Rule, “François Noël SJ and the Chinese Rites Controversy,” 159. I found *Sinensis imperii libri classici sex* in the National Library of the Czech Republic. Compared to the elegant edition binding and the large folio format of *Confucius Sinarum philosophus*, its physical size (quarto), the leather used for its cover, and the binding style are far more simple.

6 About François Noël S. I.’s works (translator of *Sinensis imperii libri classici sex*) as cause of Wolff’s interest in China, especially in Chinese philosophy and religion, see Ching and Oxtoby, *Moral Enlightenment: Leibniz and Wolff on China*, 49-60. Far more references on this subject can be consulted in work of Donald F. Lach, David E. Mungello, Henrik Jäger, Yoshitsugu Igawa, etc.

missionaries in China. Their Latin translations on Confucian thought could also be used to prove that converting an ancient country like China, which paid so much attention to moral cultivation and had a profound culture full of political wisdom, could contribute in promoting the Christian religion.

ii. Through introducing the Confucian doctrines in “politico-moralis,” the Jesuits hoped to display their insight into Chinese culture and missionary achievement to defend for their cultural accommodation policy in China against the censure by the Mendicants in the Chinese Rites Controversy,⁷ and to win the support of public opinion; for another, the Jesuit mission also wanted to encourage the recruitment of new missionaries to China. Meanwhile, in the climax of Rites Controversy, different Procurators from the Vice-Province of China also brought a large number of Chinese classics, testimony and translations back to Europe, to make sure that the Chinese texts and testimony on Chinese culture and rites would be translated correctly and not be misquoted deliberately by their opponents. For instance, almost 70% of the Chinese books and documents in the Jesuit Archives in Rome may have been brought back by two Procurators François Noël (1651-1729) and Kaspar Castner (1665-1709), when they returned to Rome in 1701 and reported to the Pope on the issue of Chinese Rites Controversy. In most of these Chinese works, notes in the handwriting of them both can be found on the title page.⁸

iii. By attracting the attention of European nobles and intellectuals, the Jesuits tried to raise more financial and social support for their mission in China.

7 The Chinese Rite Controversy involved three topics of debate: the rites honoring one's ancestors, honoring Confucius and disputes over the translation of specific terms. In particular, the Chinese translation of *Deus* became a perennial subject for argument among different Catholic societies and led to internal differences within the Jesuit mission in China. For example, Ricci used *shangzhu* 上主, *zhu* 主, *zhu Yesu* 主耶穌, *tianzhu* 天主 and *shangdi* 上帝 to translate *Deus*, but his successor Niccolò Longobardo (1565-1655) and another Jesuit João Rodrigues (1561-1634) from Japan expressed strong opposition to Ricci's use of the Chinese expressions *tianzhu* and *shangdi*, insisting instead on rendering *Deus* with its Chinese transliteration. In order to resolve the internal dissent, Visitor André Palmeiro (1569-1635) ruled in 1629 against the use of *shangdi* and *tian*, ruling that *tianzhu* was the only legitimate translation for *Deus*. But there were still some Jesuits (like Philippe Couplet, one of the translators of *Confucius Sinarum philosophus*) inclined to use the translation *shangdi*. So in 1693, Charles Maigrot (1652-1730), the administrator of the missions of China and vicar apostolic of Fujian, reiterated the prohibition against the use of *shangdi* and *tian*, and permitted only the translation *tianzhu*, usage of which has been retained until the present. For more on Longobardo and Rodrigues' arguments against the use of Chinese terms from Confucian classics as translations of *Deus*, see Qi Yinping, *Yuandong yesuhui yanjiu*, 114-165; and Hsia, “Tianzhujiao yu mingmo shehui,” 51-67.

8 Standaert, *Chinese Voices in the Rites Controversy*, 84-87.

It's notable that the context for these translation efforts was the most contentious stages of the Rites Controversy and that the translators of the versions described above were all staunch advocates of Ricci's cultural accommodation policy. Either in view of the publishing opportunity or in response to doubt and questions against the Jesuits, each of these translations were playing more or less a self-defending role. That each of these translations sought to employ persuasive arguments to prove the rationality and necessity of their mission policy was increasingly evident, especially in the prefaces and textual interpretation apparatuses composed by the Jesuit translators to accompany the translations. Because these Jesuit produced translations all comprise the Latin translations of *Zhongyong*, in the following section, we will conduct a comparative review of three *Zhongyong* translations as representative results of the early stage of "Transmission of Confucian Learning to the West" during the mid-Qing dynasty.

2. Three Significant Latin Translations of the *Zhongyong* in the 17th and 18th Century

2.1. *Sinarum Scientia Politico-Moralis*⁹ (The Moral and Political Science of China, *SSPM*)

This text, which contains 31 leaves in Chinese binding, is the earliest Latin translation of the *Zhongyong* published in Europe. The title page gives clear indication of the translator's identity: Prospero Intorcetta from the Sicilian Jesuit Society. The second leaf lists the names of four senior Jesuits credited with approving the translation, while an additional twelve Jesuits were credited with collectively revising Intorcetta's translation.¹⁰ The publishing permission from

9 I've found two editions of this work. One is included in the volume *Jap-Sin III* 3. 3a, 3b under the title *Xiwen sishu zhijie* 西文四書直解 (Straightforward Interpretations on the *Four Books* in Western Language) in the Jesuit Archives in Rome. For a more detailed description of this edition see Chan, *Chinese Books and Documents in the Jesuit Archives in Rome*, 477-479. The second is document No. 732 in the microfilm produced by the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. They both contain the same bilingual translation of *Zhongyong*, but the latter also includes an 8-page *Vita Confucii* (biography of Confucius), a re-examination statement and publishing permission received in Goa with the translator's private seal in Chinese. Hence it can be seen that the former in Rome is incomplete.

10 The four approvers were Inácio da Costa (1603-1666), Jacques Le Faure (1613-1675), Matias da Maia (1616-1667), and Feliciano Pacheco (1622-1687); the twelve credited with revising the translation were António de Gouvea (1592-1677), Pietro Canevari (1596-1675), Francesco Brancati (1607-1671), Gianfrancesco De Ferrari (1609-1671), Humbert Augery (1616-1673), Adrien Greslon (1618-1696), Jacques Motel (1619-1692), Giandomenico

Feliciano Pacheco (1622-1687), Superior of the Jesuit Vice-Province of China at that time, is printed on the third leaf in which he emphasized that this work “was approved by me and recognized by the other 12 priests of our society in China, and it was adjudged worthy of publication.”¹¹ Pacheco’s permission ends with “July 31. 1667, in the capital city Guangzhou of Province Guangdong,”¹² which is in accord with Joseph Dehergne S.I.’s account that Father Feliciano Pacheco served as superior of the Jesuit mission in China from 1666 to 1669 in Nanjing.¹³ However, at the end of 1664, because of the so-called “Calender Case” 曆獄, Pacheco and the other missionaries of different societies were sent to Beijing under escort for trial, and were later exiled to Guangzhou until 1671. During their collective exile, they held the “Guangzhou Conference” (from 18th Dec. 1667 to 26th Jan. 1668) to discuss their differing opinions regarding the Chinese Rites.¹⁴ Making the most of this opportunity, 12 Jesuits (including

Gabiani (1623-1694), Manuel Jorge (1621-1677), Philippe Couplet (1624-1692), François de Rougemont (1624-1676), and Christian Wolfgang Henriques Herdrich (1625-1684).

- 11 “[...] meis approbatum, & à duodecim aliis Patribus Societatis nostrae in Sinis recognitum, & publica luce dignum judicatum fuit.” See Intorcetta, “FACVLITAS R.P. Viceprovincialis,” *SSPM*, fol. 3.
- 12 “In urbe Quamcheu metropolis Sinensis provinciae Quantum die 31. mensis Iulii. Anni 1667,” *SSPM*, fol.3.
- 13 Dehergne, *Zaihua yesu huishi liezhuan ji shumu bubian* ·xia, 474.
- 14 Regarding the number of missionaries exiled to Guangzhou, there are two opinions among scholars. Metzler has numbered the exiles at 23, see Metzler, *Die Synoden in China, Japan und Korea, 1570-1931*, 23; while Chan is of the opinion that the exile comprised 25 persons, including 21 Jesuits, three Dominicans and one Franciscan, see Chan, “Towards a Chinese Church: the Contribution of Philippe Couplet S.J. (1622-1693),” 60. I read a hand-copied book entitled *Taixi Yinjuesi xiansheng xinglüe* 泰西殷覺斯先生行略 (Biography of Prospero Intorcetta from the West) collected in the French National Library (CHINOIS 1096), and its anonymous author mentioned that Father Intorcetta and the other Jesuits (25 persons altogether) were called to Beijing on imperial orders and later settled down in Guangdong (“詔旨命先生及同會諸友進都。隨奉旨恩養廣東共二十五位”). When P. Intorcetta went back to Rome as Procurator, he submitted a brief report to the Holy See about the status of mission work in China from 1581-1669 (*Compendiosa Narratio de statu Missionis Chinensis ab anno 1581. Usque ad annum 1669*), in which was introduced a named list of 30 priests (25 Jesuits, four Dominicans and one Franciscan) who were sent to Beijing under escort. Among these, Adam Schall S.I. (1592-1666) and Domenico Maria Coronado Spanuolo O.P. passed away during the trial, Lodovico Buglio (1606-1682), Gabriel de Magalhães (1610-1677) and Ferdinand Verbiest (1623-1688) were ordered to work in Beijing after the trial, and the others were sent in exile to Guangzhou. Later during the exile, Inácio da Costa and Michel Trigault (1602-1667) also died in 1666 and 1667, respectively. Judged by these materials I tend to believe that there were 25 foreign missionaries exiled in Guangzhou who took part in the “Guangzhou Conference.”

Pacheco) who had previously separated in various missionary districts of China congregated at that time and participated in the revision work for Intorcetta's translation. No previous Jesuit publication of material from Chinese sources had enjoyed such a large group for textual examination, and similar opportunities for collective work at this scale were very rare thereafter. After the Conference, Intorcetta was appointed "Sinensis missionis procurator," which entailed giving a report on the status of missionary work in China to the pope. He left Macau to do so on January 21, 1669. According to the historical research done by Louis Pfister S.I., the first half of Intorcetta's translation was printed in Guangzhou in 1667, followed two years later by the publication of the second half in Goa. For this reason it was called "Goa Version," and the entire text consisted of a translation of the *Zhongyong* followed by a biography of Confucius.¹⁵ What this likely means is that Intorcetta had just finished the printing of the first part of the text during their exile in Guangzhou when he was suddenly assigned as Procurator and had to hurry off to begin his long journey. While in Goa en route to Rome, he finally found the opportunity to finish the printing of his whole translation. This explanation is consistent with both the re-examination statement and the date of publishing permission received in Goa (Goae Iterum Recognitum, ac in lucem editum. Die. 1. Octobris. Anno 1669. SUPERIORUM PERMISSU.) on the last page of *SSPM*.

In the preface written by Intorcetta on the fourth leaf (AD LECTOREM), he states that the aim of this publication is to help hasten the acceptance of their missionary work (ut scilicet publico Missionis bono propius ac citius consuleretur). Besides a brief introduction of the author and description of the major themes of the original book, Intorcetta explained the stylistic rules and layout of his *Zhongyong* translation. He also clearly stated that his Latin translation was based on Zhu Xi's 朱熹 (1130-1200) *Sishu jizhu* 四書集注 (iuxta ordinem impressionis Nan-kim editae, Authore Chu Hi, qui liber vulgo dicitur Su Xu cie chu).

The main body of this book was bilingual, printed both in Chinese and Latin. As was true of Intorcetta's earlier work, he translated *Zhongyong* literally (Versio Literalis) in a plain and clear style. His Latin translation was printed in Western typesetting on the left side of every page spread with the original Chinese text of *Zhongyong* printed with Chinese typography on the facing side. The Chinese pronunciation and an Arabic number were set aside each Chinese character, so one can find the corresponding Latin translation of this character via reference to the given number. In addition to the literal translation, Intorcetta also added his own commentary, most of which relates to Western rules of grammar and patterns of expression, in order to make his Latin translation complete and fluent. Such kinds of amplification included the relative pronoun "quod" to lead a clause, the

15 Pfister, *Zaihua jesu huishi liezhuan ji shumu · shang*, 331.

demonstrative pronoun (*hic/haec*) and personal pronoun (*ego/is/ipse*), the conjunctions (*si/nec/ut/sed/et/atque/ac/nam*), prepositions (*de/in/ad/inter*), adverbs (*etiam/tam/tantum/deinde/ibi*) and the copula “*esse*” etc. In ancient Chinese the use of these function words was not so common or explicit as in Western languages. Intorcetta also needed to make regular use of notional words to explain the meaning of the original Chinese sentences that became disjointed in Latin due to his literal translation method.¹⁶

The spread of Intorcetta's translation in Europe made the *Zhongyong* known to Westerners. Using Chinese xylographic techniques, with the assistance of Chinese Christian converts around him,¹⁷ Intorcetta creatively combined the Chinese vertical layout with Western horizontal typesetting in order to successfully realize the publication of a Chinese-Latin bilingual text. For this, he can be regarded as an innovative pioneer in bilingual printing. Besides his provision of a literal translation of the text, his decision to mark the pronunciation for every Chinese character based on the phonetic system invented by the Jesuits in China, meant that the work could serve as a textbook or even a bilingual dictionary of Confucianism and was the first effort to systematically introduce the form, pronunciation and meaning of Chinese characters to Europe.

16 For instance, Intorcetta translated “小人之中庸也。小人而無忌憚也” (“The mean man's acting contrary to the course of the Mean is because he is a mean man, and has no caution.” Translated by James Legge) into “*Improbis etiam habet medium quod reneat; sed quia improbus, ideo non veretur illud preuaricari.*” The words in italics are amplification made by Intorcetta, in order to bring the fragmental and isolated Latin vocabularies translated literally from Chinese into a complete and meaningful Latin sentence. For the first Chinese sentence, he added a predicative verb “*habet*” for the subject “*improbis*” and a relative clause “*quod reneat*” for the antecedent “*medium*,” so that the Western readers could understand this sentence was about the mean man's attitude toward the Mean. For the second Chinese sentence, Intorcetta divided it into two Latin sentences: He did so first by adding the conjunction “*sed*,” employed “*quia*” with the omissible linking verb “*est*” to build up a sentence for cause; then added an accusative subject “*illud*” and an infinitive passive “*preuaricari*” after the verb “*veretur*” as an indirect statement to explain the mean man's acting as result: the mean man doesn't dread to go against the Mean. This intentional change obviously coincides with the reading habit of the Westerners.

17 According to the research of C. R. Boxer, the man who assisted Intorcetta in printing his *SSPM* in Goa was a Christian convert named “Paul” whom he brought from China. Having finished the printing work, Paul returned to China alone. I presume this convert was Wan Qiyuan 萬其淵 (Paul Banhes, 1631-1700) who kept close contact with Intorcetta as his disciple and was later ordained as a priest by the first Chinese bishop, Luo Wenzao 羅文藻 (Gregorio Lopez, 1616-1691), in Nanjing on 1 August 1688. See Boxer, “Some Sino-European Xylographic Works, 1662-1718,” 202 and Standaert, *Handbook of Christianity in China, Volume One: 635-1800*, 463.

2.2. *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (Confucius, Philosopher of China, CSP)

Confucius Sinarum philosophus is a leather-bound folio that was published in Paris in 1687.¹⁸ On the title page, a name list presents its Jesuit translators in proper order according to their significance in this collective work, namely Prospero Intorcetta, Christian Wolfgang Henriques Herdrich, François de Rougemont and Philippe Couplet. Differing from the ordinary rules of Jesuit publication in China, this text emphasizing that the publishing of this work was undertaken under orders from the French king Louis XIV (JUSSU LUDOVICI MAGNI), and instead of the permission from the superior of the Vice-Province of China and a name list for text examination and revision, the text contains only a letter of thanks in Couplet's name addressed to the "most Christian" (Christianissimus) king Louis XIV for his generous support.

Besides this letter, full of compliments, the main contents of CSP include: a preface that runs to more than 100 pages (*Proëmialis Declaratio*) about Chinese culture, co-written by Intorcetta and Couplet; a biography of Confucius (*Confucii Vita*) composed by Intorcetta with a portrait of the master, which might be the first depiction of Confucius imported into Europe; Latin translations of three of the *Four Books: Daxue, Zhongyong, Lunyu*; and a chronology of Chinese history, a synopsis of China's noteworthy features, and a map of the Chinese Empire, all compiled by Couplet. Due to the limitations of European printing technology, plans to include all of the Chinese characters appearing in the original manuscript were canceled during the printing, so that only the Latin translation remained in the final publication. Furthermore, no translator's signature was included for any of the three volumes of Confucian works. Two pieces of evidence strongly indicate Intorcetta as the author of the Latin translation of the *Zhongyong* in CSP, however: first, the handwritten manuscript of the *Zhongyong* translations used in this text shares

18 The original manuscript for this text is conserved in the National Library of France (Ms. Lat. 6277/1 et 2). As a significant work in the age of Enlightenment, this book is held in the collection of various European libraries. Until now I've read five editions that are located respectively in the National Central Library of Rome, the National Library of France, the Austrian National Library, the Library of University Erlangen-Nuremberg and Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel. All these editions have the same publication time and place, agree with each other in their content, but the sequence of different parts in the book differ slightly among copies. Besides this, page numbering varies for different parts in one book, with some numbers overlapping or being otherwise incoherent. All these details suggest that the different parts of this book were typeset and printed separately, and were later pieced together or bound in a single volume. In a discussion with Dr. Noël Golvers via email, I was also informed that in 17th century Europe, "books" were typically sold unbound, so the buyer could choose the form and material of the cover and arrange the order of the book's content as they wished. This may be the reason why there are different content orders for CSP.

similar letter morphology and habits of abbreviation as a number of autograph letters sent by Intorcetta from China which are presently kept in the Jesuit Archives in Rome; second, diction and content choices of the *Zhongyong*'s translation in *CSP* make it obvious that Intorcetta's earlier translation *SSPM* provided the basis for the text of this new publication.

Intorcetta added a great deal of interpretative commentary (rendered in italics) which had not appeared in *SSPM* to his new *Zhongyong* translation in *CSP*, primarily to express subjective viewpoints about Confucian thought from a Jesuit perspective. In this commentary, he never mentioned that his earlier translation was based on Zhu Xi's *Sishu jizhu*, but instead claimed that Zhang Juzheng's 張居正 (1525-1582) *Sishu zhijie* 四書直解 served as the main reference for his translation (Nos hic eam verbis Cham-colai, sed in compendium redactis explicabimus). Zhang's work was a simple rewriting of Zhu's *Sishu jizhu*, undertaken to explain the main idea of *Sishu* for the ten-age young king Wanli 萬曆 (1573-1620). So to a large extent, Zhang followed Zhu's annotations and opinions concerning *Sishu*. Another Jesuit translator, Couplet, explained in the preface to *CSP* why they read and made reference to Zhang's work in translation: Zhang's notes and commentaries were more recent and credible.¹⁹ The preface also implied that Zhang's text was more straightforward for beginners. In the chapter "Chinese Character and Language" of *Nouvelle Relation de la Chine* (Paris 1688) composed by the Jesuit Gabriel de Magalhães, he copied down the opening paragraph of the Jesuits' *Daxue* translation and mentioned that the order of characters and annotation for this classic were excerpted from two Chinese interpreters, one, named Zhu Xi, who had lived about three hundred years previous; the other a Colai 閣老, called Zhang Juzheng.²⁰ Magalhães also described Zhang's commentary on the Confucian classics as "the best among all the works on this subject written by the Chinese themselves... in learning Chinese our Jesuit fathers used his work a lot."²¹ Magalhães remarks indicate the significance of Zhang's annotation for the Jesuits of the 17th Century in China, showing that he had already become their most important guide for understanding Confucian works. Furthermore, the Jesuits also stated clearly that they used Zhang Tongchu's 張侗初 (d. 1629) annotation for reference in their *Zhongyong* translation (Mirificè favet huic Interpreti Interpres alter, paris cum Colao autoritatis; et ipse

19 *CSP, Proëmialis Declaratio, Conclusio*, cxiv. Both Mungello and Lundbaek pursued studies on the Jesuits' translation reference for *CSP*, especially about which edition of Zhang Juzheng's commentary they were most likely to have made use of at that time. See Mungello, "The Jesuits' Use of Chang Chü-cheng's Commentary in their Translation of the Confucian Four Books (1687)," 12-22; and Lundbaek, "Chief Grand Secretary Chang Chü-cheng & the Early China Jesuits," 2-11.

20 Magalhães, *Nouvelle Relation de la Chine*, 52-53.

21 Magalhães, *Nouvelle Relation de la Chine*, 128.

Cham dictus, cognomento tum-ço: hic autem in vigesima circiter editione Commentariorum suorum in modo explanatam Confucii sententiam sic scribit).²²

It is quite ironic that Intorcetta not only kept silent about the use of Zhu Xi's *Sishu jizhu* for his *Zhongyong* translation, but also fiercely criticized the Cheng brothers 程頤 (1033-1107) 程顥 (1032-1085), Zhu Xi and the Neo-Interpreters who composed the famous work *Xingli daquan* 性理大全 in the Song dynasty 宋 (960-1279) by following Cheng and Zhu's viewpoints, accusing them of deviating and distorting the true meaning of ancient classics.²³ The belittling of the *Xingli daquan* seems to be intended as a response to and refutation of Niccolò Longobardo's (1565-1655) opinion, as Longobardo had previously ranked *Xingli daquan* third in his list of four categories of authoritative Confucian works.²⁴ It was, in fact, criticism and pressure from Longobardo and the Mendicants in the Rites Controversy which forced the Jesuit translators to defend themselves by various means and led to inconsistencies in *CSP*.

In their textual interpretation, Intorcetta and the other Jesuit co-translators directly expressed their own views regarding the features of Chinese rites and responded to accusations against the Jesuit cultural accommodation policy in China. In his earlier translation *SSPM* Intorcetta never equated the Chinese term *tian* 天 to *Deus* in Christianity, but translated it with "caelum," viz. heaven/sky in the natural world. For example, in the sentence "By the ceremonies of the sacrifices to Heaven and Earth they served *shangdi*"²⁵, he dealt with the sensitive term *shangdi* 上帝, a supreme sky deity in indigenous Chinese religions, by using the literal translation "supremus Imperator" (the highest emperor). But in *CSP*, Intorcetta and Couplet, as final reviser for Intocetta's translation, made it clear in the interpretation that the Chinese *shangdi* here was indeed *Deus*.²⁶ Intorcetta and Couplet revealed a similar opinion in their

22 Today Zhang Tongchu's commentary on the *Four Books*, *Xin ke Zhang Tongchu xiansheng yongsizhai sishuyan* 新刻張侗初先生永思齋四書演 (Jap-Sin I,3) is still kept in the Jesuit Archives in Rome.

23 *CSP*, *Proëmialis Declaratio*, xxxvij.

24 "Los libros autenticos de esta Secta se reduzen a quatro ordenes, el primero es, de las doctrinas antiguas, le King, Xi King, &c.[...] El Segundo es, el Comento de estas doctrinas [...] El tercero orden de libros es, los que contiene la Suma de su Philosophia moral, y natural, que llaman Sing Li. [...] El quarto orden, son los libros originales de estos Autores, que florecieron despues de la quema universal, los quales se emplearon, parte en explicar las doctrinas de los primeros Philosophos, y parte en componer diversas materias ex proprio marte [...] Navarret, *Tratados Históricos, éticos y Religiosos del Gran Imperio Chino*, 256.

25 *Zhongyong*: "郊社之禮，所以事上帝也。"

26 "Hic locus illustris est ad probandum ex Confucii sententia unum esse primum principium;

preface to the document, claiming that the all of the founders of the Chinese nation, from Fuxi 伏羲 to Confucius himself, recognized the existence of God by virtue of their excellent reason.²⁷ They argued that due to the development of Buddhism and Daoism and the misunderstanding of the “Neo-Interpreters” (“Neoterici Interpretes,” namely Confucianists of the School of *Li* 理學家, whom the Jesuits sometimes referred to as “atheo-politicus”), the innocent belief in God among the Chinese was corrupted (obscurassent ac foede contaminassent), which led to the fall of men and the rise of superstitions in the country. Actually the initiator for such an approach was Ricci. In the second chapter of his Chinese work *Tianzhu shiyi* 天主實義, Ricci drew support from the distinction between essence and accident by Aristotle, and he asserted clear opposition to the “Neo-Interpreters” and their theory about the materialistic origin (*taiji* 太極 or *li* 理) of the universe. He used many citations from the *Five Classics* to confirm his opinions and refute Zhu Xi’s commentary.

The translators of *CSP* all advocated Ricci’s cultural accommodation measures. They continued to differentiate between Original Confucianists and Neo-Confucianists, laying emphasis on the ancient as opposed to the contemporary. In their translation, they used Aristotle’s doctrine of the Four Causes to interpret ancient Chinese philosophy (equating *taiji* with the material cause, using formal cause to understand *li*, regarding *shangdi* in the Chinese classics as efficient cause etc.); they described Chinese philosophical issues and concerns from a Western perspective and through the lens of their particularly Western value judgments, which included such things as referring to Neo-Confucianists as “atheist politicians,” referring to China as a monarchy and naming as the founder of this monarchy (monarchiae sinicae conditor). Furthermore, Western theological formulations like “Lex naturae” were also used to describe ancient Chinese history, so that the Jesuits could classify the ancient Chinese as being free of the influence of Buddhism and Daoism, and calling it a nation in the era of natural law, to shoehorn them into Christian history and bring them into the accepted categories of theological discussion. Through such kinds of transformations, full of scholastic interpretations, *CSP* sought to prove *shangdi*, an object of worship among the ancient Chinese, to be the Christian *Deus*. Although the final result turned out to be adverse for the Jesuits in the controversy, their viewpoints represented in the translation made a direct impact on Gottfried

am cum dixisset esse duo sacrificia, caeli et terrae, non dixit, ad serviendum caelo et terrae, nec ad serviendum coeli et terrae distinctis numinibus, sed ad serviendum superno seu supremo Imperatori qui est Deus [...],” *CSP*, 59.

27 The margins of Intorcetta’s original manuscript, which is conserved in the National Library of France, are full of quotations from the *Four Books* and the *Five Classics* as proof for his argumentation. See Ms. Lat. 6277/1, i-xxxii.

Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) and his discourse on the natural theology of the Chinese.²⁸ Voltaire (1694-1778), Charles Secondat de Montesquieu (1689-1755), Pierre Bayle (1647-1706), William Jones (1746-1794) and many other European enlightenment thinkers also read *CSP* and constructed their own thought and theories by using Confucian doctrines introduced by the Jesuits in China as an important *other* against which they could profoundly rethink Western culture and philosophy.

2.3. *Sinensis Imperii Libri Classici Sex* (the Six Classics of the Chinese Empire, *SILCS*)

The *Sinensis Imperii Libri Classici Sex* (Six Classics of the Chinese Empire, *SILCS*), translated by the Belgian Jesuit François Noël (1651-1729), was published in Prague in 1711.²⁹ The manuscript for the text is now conserved in the Royal Library of Brussels, and contains all the Latin translations of the *Four Books*, the *Xiaojing* 孝經 (*Book of Filial Piety*) and the *Xiaoxue* 小學 (Little Learning). It is the first complete *Four Books* translation among all the Western publications concerning China. Noël used both Zhu Xi and Zhang Juzheng's annotations as references for his translation, which can be clearly seen by Noël's decision to translate the full text of Zhu Xi's preface for his *Zhongyong zhangju xu* 中庸章句序, followed by a sentence by sentence translation of each of the 33 chapters divided by Zhu Xi in his *Zhongyong zhangju* 中庸章句. Except for a clear statement at the beginning of his *Zhongyong* translation (sic huius textum fusius explicat Cham Kiu Chim [Zhang Juzheng explains this text like this]),³⁰ most of the time Noël absorbed Zhu Xi and Zhang Juzheng's annotations directly in his translation without indicating the source. Besides this, in the manuscript there is a segment of translation that was deleted and its source is marked as *Su Xu Mum In* 四書蒙引 written by Cai Qing 蔡清 (1453–1508), the famous Confucianist of the scholar of *li* in the Ming dynasty 明 (1368-1644).

Although there are no Chinese characters in the final publication, Noël's manuscript actually adopted bilingual typesetting in Latin and

28 Li Wenchao, "'Ziran shenxue' wenti: Laibunici he wo'erfu," 280-284.

29 A digital edition of *SILCS* can be found and read in Google Books.

30 Mungello has mentioned in his studies on *SILCS* that Noël used the annotations from Zhu Xi, Zhang Juzheng and other scholars in the School of *Li*, but "while Noël referred to Chu Hsi and other members of the *li-hsüeh* by name, he did not refer to the name of another commentator he was using: Chang Chü-cheng." See Mungello, "The First Complete Translation of the Confucian Four Books in the West," 529. According to my reading, however, while Noël did use Zhang Juzheng's commentary in his translations of *Daxue*, *Lunyu* and *Mengzi* without referring to the authorship, in Noël's *Zhongyong* translation he does clearly indicate his reliance on Zhang Juzheng's name by citing him by name. See *SILCS*, 41.

Chinese. The original text of *Zhongyong* (including Zhu Xi's preface and his *Zhongyong zhangju*) is copied in black calligraphy (the Chinese characters seem to be written by two different men. Most chapters share the same handwriting with commas in red. But there are two individual chapters transcribed in more graceful handwriting without any commas. These two chapters were separately bounded, which indicates that they were inserted or replaced afterwards). The serial number for each chapter was marked by Noël himself following the chapter division and punctuation definitized by Zhu Xi in his *Sishu zhangju*. Comparison with Noël's holographs conserved in the Jesuit Archives in Rome, confirms that Noël was not the author of the first half of the Latin translation manuscript. This part, in a more graceful handwriting, was deleted and reformulated extensively (the chirography of the revisions does seem to mark them as being made by Noël). It's possible that the first part was translated by others, or someone transcribed Noël's earlier translation, there's also the possibility that somebody recorded Noël's dictation. The extensive revisions indicate that Noël was obviously not satisfied with the translation and altered it considerably before publishing. The second half was written down directly by Noël with very few modifications, it seems that this part was accomplished at full stretch after deliberateness. Comparing the manuscript of the *Zhongyong* to the formal version published in *SILCS*, most of the abridgements made before publication were confined to the translator's notes.³¹ Besides that, in order to make the translation more concise and precise, Noël canceled some redundancies which had resulted in florid rhetoric and repetition, added some modal particles, conjunctions and some notional words based on the context to make the sentences more fluent, and amended several errors present in the earlier translation.³² Along with the other changes, the replacement of

31 In the manuscript, after translating the opening sentence of *Zhongyong* “天命之謂性” (“What Heaven has conferred is called THE NATURE.” - Translated by James Legge), Noël borrowed Zhang Juzheng's explanation about *Li*'s capability “在天為元亨利貞，在人為仁義禮智” (In the Heaven it [*Li*] is the four virtues: supremacy, success, potentiality and perseverance; in humans it becomes the cardinal virtues of benevolence, righteousness, propriety and wisdom.) to illustrate how the Heaven endowed human beings with *Li* to accomplish their nature, and this was removed before publishing. In translating “致中和，天地位焉，萬物育焉” (Let the states of equilibrium and harmony exist in perfection, and a happy order will prevail throughout heaven and earth, and all things will be nourished and flourish. - Translated by James Legge), on one hand Noël made use of the terms “appetitus rationalis” (will) and “appetitus sensitivus” (sense) from *Summa Theologiae* to correspond to the properties of Heaven and Earth; on the other hand he brought in the traditional Chinese metaphor “Heaven as father and Earth as mother” to explain the relationship among Heaven, Earth and human beings. This annotation was also deleted prior to the work's final publication.

32 In the manuscript, *xing* 性 was translated sometimes as “natura,” sometimes as “natura rationalis;” in the published version, it was consistently rendered as “natura.” In the preface

synonyms and the adjustments of the sentence patterns in Noël's modification indicate his considerable deliberation in word usage attention to rhetorical effect and literary grace.

Noël's translation has two distinguishing features. First, all the terms are translated with certainty and systematization. During the 16th and 17th century, the Jesuits in China preferred to select different Latin words to translate the same Confucian concept based on its context in the Classics. For instance, in the *Zhongyong* translation of *CSP*, the corresponding Latin translations of the concept *dao* 道 included: *regula* (rule), *via* (way), *vigeant virtus & leges & ipse Magistratum gerat* (may the virtue and law bloom and he could become a magistrate) and *ratio* (reason). Whether the Jesuits thoroughly understood the multiple-layered meanings of the concepts in Confucianism, or this variance came from the detailed explanation and analysis of their Chinese teachers, objectively speaking, translating a single term with an abundance of corresponding words reflects the rich connotation of Confucian concepts. Conversely, variance of use may also impress on Western readers that the significance of Confucian terms are inherently ambiguous and changeable. Unlike his predecessors, Noël preferred to translate one Confucian concept with one fixed Latin word, slightly adjustment of the meaning only when appeared in certain cases according to Zhu Xi's or Zhang Juzheng's annotations, which helped to set up a distinct philosophical system based on the strong association of Confucian concepts with explicit and consistent signifiers.

Secondly, Noël continued to use his predecessors' translation techniques in drawing analogs between Chinese and Western cultural images. For example, in the opening passage of *Zhongyong* Noël quotes Zhang Juzheng's viewpoint to annotate the text as follows:

“In producing the human being, after Heaven used the air [aer] or some perceptible material to shape the human body, it pours reason in to create human nature. This reason, while existing in Heaven, is called the First Principle or the great, shareable, guiding, complete principle. While existing in the human body, it turns into piety [pietas], justice [aequitas], respect [honestas], prudence or congenital intelligence

Zhongyong 中庸 was first translated as “*immutabile rectae rationis medium*” (the unchangeable Mean of the proper reason), but in order to make it consistent with the title translation, it was changed to “*Immutabile Medium*” (The unchangeable Mean). In many places, pointless adverbs and conjunctions like “*etiam*,” “*igitur*,” etc. that had appeared in the manuscript were excised. Some notional words were added for the convenience of the reader's understanding, like changing “*illi enim Sapientes*” (those wise men) to “*Prisci illi Sapientes*” (those wise men in ancient time). Some mistakes were also corrected in the revision before publishing, for example: in translating “子曰，武王周公，其達孝矣乎” (“The Master said, “How far-extending was the filial piety of king Wû and the duke of Châu!” Translated by James Legge), the translator had mistranslated Zhou gong as “grandson” (nepos) of Wu wang, later Noël corrected it for “brother” (frater).

[prudential].The pouring-in and receiving of reason is equal to the law and teaching imposed on human beings by Heaven. Therefore the nature of human being is the law of Heaven (certainly it is also included in the first act).³³

Here Noël seems to follow the relevant annotation by Zhang Juzheng, but his word choices for the Latin translation were branded with distinctive theological meanings. If it is still acceptable to use the Latin word “aer” (air) to correspond the concept *qi* 氣 of the School of *Li*, then choosing the word “ratio” (a significant term in Aristotle and even more so in Thomas Aquinas’s theological theory) to translate *li* 理 of Zhu Xi and Zhang Juzheng takes the concept too literally and could be accused of intentionally obscuring or reconciling the differences between these two concepts. In fact, while similar techniques had already been used in Intorcetta’s earlier translation, the real initiator of this practice was Matteo Ricci. It was he, after all, who first used the Latin word “Tetrabiblion” (the Latin translation for a four-volume Greek work entitled *Apotelesmatiká* (Ἀποτελεσματικά) written by Claudius Ptolemy (c. 90–c. 168) on the philosophy and astrology) to translate the *Four Books*. Essentially, employing Western theological terms to translate and explain Confucian concepts represents a zealous attempt by the Jesuits in China to mediate the cultural differences between China and the West and to help Westerners understand the Chinese classics. This approach to translation was later carried forward by Figurism, whose representatives were Joachim Bouvet S.I. (1653-1730) and his Jesuit disciples and assistants. Because the Figurists treated the analog between Chinese and Western cultures as credible evidences for theological interpretations, and such kind of behavior was thought to finally exceed the boundaries of legitimacy in Catholicism, the Church prohibited them from publishing their opinions and their books were sealed up. The interesting point is that while Noël was indeed regarded as active advocate of Figurist thought, there is no evidence to prove that Joachim had direct contact with Noël, and other prominent proponents of “Figurism,” like Joseph Henry-Marie de Prémare (1666-1736) and Jean-François Fouquet (1665-1741), only met Noël in the early days after their arrival in China.³⁴

33 “Coelum in producendo homine, post quam illi aerem seu materiam sensibilem indidit ad formandum corpus, tum eidem rationem ad perficiendam naturam infundit; haec ratio, quatenus in Coelo residet, dicitur principium primum seu magnum, communicativum, directivum, perfectivum. Quatenus autem in homine existit, dicitur pietas, aequitas, honestas, prudentia, seu intelligentia congenita. Hujus rationis infusio & receptio est instar legis ac praecepti a Coelo impositi. Idcirco dicitur: natura est Coeli lex; (scilicet in actu primo.) [...]”, see *SILCS*, 41. Zhang Juzheng’s annotation here was a quotation from Zisi 子思: “蓋天之生人, 既與之氣以成形, 必賦之理以成性, 在天為元亨利貞, 在人為仁義禮智, 其稟受付畀, 就如天命令他一般, 所以說, 天命之謂性。” See Chen Shengxi, *Zhang Juzheng jiang ping Daxue and Zhongyong*, 55.

34 See Mungello, “The First Complete Translation of the Confucian Four Books in the West,”

In his annotation of the text, Zhang Juzheng followed Zhu Xi's understanding of *li* as the perfect existence endowed by Heaven (or more precisely by *taiji*), which shines upon human beings. In Zhu Xi's theory, *li* and *qi* were two aspects of one being and existed in an interdependent relationship. As foundation, *li* had no evil and no deviation. Zhang's annotation “蓋天之生人，既與之氣以成形，必賦之理以成性” claims that it was the mixed formation of *Li*, which was endowed by Heaven, and *qi* in the earthly world which became *xing* 性 (the nature) of human beings and all living things. The original meaning of the Latin word “ratio” used by the Jesuits to translate the term *li* refers to a kind of active cognitive ability with which every person is born, and by virtue of which, human beings can realize the meaning of different things and understand their causes.³⁵ However, this concept of *ratio* diverges widely from the connotation of *li* in Confucianism.

Besides this, Noël also used the Latin expression “*principium primum*” [“the first principle”] to refer to *li* in his translation. This is a deeply loaded term, since Thomas Aquinas argues famously that God is the first principle in his *Summa Theologiae* (Ia, Q4, a.1.). In addition, Noël translated *tianming* 天命 in the original text (subject-predicate structure, here *ming* 命 is a verb meaning order/command) as “*lex coeli*” (law of Heaven); and even the additional remark “it is also included in the first act” at the end of his translation are branded with theological interpretations and can be identified as quintessential exemplifications of the desire to draw comparative analogies between Chinese and Western cultures.

3. Conclusion

Each of the three editions of the *Zhongyong* translated by Jesuits in the middle period of the Qing dynasty affirmed and appreciated the inner reason of the Chinese culture. The method of literal translation (*Versio literalis*) combined with the provision of the pronunciation for every Chinese character in *Sinarum Scientia Politico-Moralis* (1667-1669) reveals that Intorcetta wanted to imitate Zhu Xi's train of thought in his *Sishu jizhu*. This approach intends to link up each character with its phonology and connotation in a specific context. Although there were still some misunderstandings as to the literal sense of words, Intorcetta's translation was generally very faithful to the original Chinese text and obviously had the practical function of serving as a textbook or bilingual dictionary on Confucian thought. In *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (1687),

525-526 and Pfister, *Zaihua yesu huishi liezhuan ji shumu* · shang, 419. Fernando Bortone also pointed out the explicit Figurist tendencies of Noël and his devotion in rediscovering the Christian truth in the Chinese classics, see Bortone, *I Gesuiti alla corte di Pechino*, 139.

35 Kasper, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 842.

Intorcetta changed his translation strategy. Basing the work on his earlier translation of the *Zhongyong*, he inserted a substantial amount of subjective interpretation of Chinese culture and quoted the other classics extensively in attempt to corroborate his claim of the Chinese ancestors' belief in the true God, an approach which was quite similar to the method of Biblical hermeneutics developed by the early apologist fathers of the church. One of the most striking features of *CSP* was Intorcetta and his Jesuit co-translator Couplet openly indicating that the term *shangdi* in the *Zhongyong* was equivalent with the Latin *Deus*, the supreme being of this universe with diverse appellations in different cultures. In *Sinensis Imperii Libri Classici Sex* (1711) Noël returned to the method of literal translation of a source text, faithfully following the chapter order decided by Zhu Xi. He even marked his Latin translation to correspond with its Chinese counterpart sentence by sentence and paragraph by paragraph. But though his translation is generally reliable and fluent, we can still see from his word selection that he continued in following his predecessors' approach in seeking to explain and interpret Confucianism with scholastic terms to find the common ground between the two cultures.

Although the Jesuits' original purpose was not to propagate Confucianism abroad (quite the opposite, in fact), their cross-cultural translating activities indeed produced a number of profound and unanticipated effects on Western enlightenment thinkers, and it was through their pioneering efforts and popular translations that Confucian thought first became known in Europe. The reasons for their successful cultural transmission work lie in two aspects: On one hand, their translating activities satisfied the spiritual needs and the general cultural atmosphere in the Enlightenment period; on the other hand, the Jesuit translators had profound training both in Chinese and Western cultures, thus they could base their work on the mainstream values of Western society (they were versed in using the analogy between Chinese and Western cultures to assimilate material from heterogeneous cultures and integrate them into the broader structure of Western culture). They were also able to draw support from the prevailing Western academic discourse of that time (using the key terms in Aristotle's philosophy, the theological framework aimed at heathens by Saint Paul and the theological thought system of Thomas Aquinas to translate/paraphrase Confucian concepts), and transcribed Confucian texts expertly to fulfill their needs. If we say that the Jesuit mission in China during the Ming and Qing dynasties was reliant on a sympathetic understanding of Chinese culture and on Saint Paul's zeal to convert the pagans, they showed themselves to be unusually interested in penetrating the exterior "irrationality" (such as sacrificing to the Heaven and ancestors, divination and fortune telling) in order to discover and even appreciate the inner rationality of Chinese culture. In contrast, most Westerners after the 18th century tended to negate the internal rationality of Chinese culture according to their perception of its deficiency of exterior rationality, concluding that Chinese cultural behavior was incapable of conforming to Western standards for a modern society, from lawmaking and the political

system to the citation format and writing pattern of research papers. How to actively confront the West's questions and return to our own tradition in a most timely way? How to combine attention to historical experiences with the introspection of modern theories, and through the combination begin to think of constructing a modern academic structure or a modern nation's image, one that not only bears the traces of our own mentality but is also adaptable to the globalized world, which not only differs from the Western notion of modernity but also partakes of universal values? This is an important task not only for modern Chinese academics, but also for thinkers in other East Asian countries like Korea, Japan and Vietnam where Confucianism is deeply intertwined with both local culture and the very way of thought.

■ Submitted: 2016.05.25 / Reviewed: 2016.06.07-2016.06.27 / Confirmed for publication: 2016.07.05

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Intorcetta, Prospero. 1667/1669. *Sinarum Scientia Politico-Moralis*. Guamcheu-Goa.
- Intorcetta, Prospero, Christian Wolfgang Henriques Herdtrich, François de Rougemont, and Philippe Couplet. 1687. *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus*. Paris.
- Magalhães, Gabriel de. 2004. *Nouvelle Relation de la Chine*. Translated by He Gaoji and Li Shen. Zhengzhou: Daxiang chubanshe.
- Navarret, Domingo Fernandez. 1676. *Tratados históricos, éticos y religiosos del Gran Imperio Chino*. Madrid.
- Noël, François. 1711. *Sinensis Imperii Libri Classici Sex*. Prague.
- Zhongyong* 中庸 (The Doctrine of the Mean).

Secondary Sources

- Bortone, Fernando. 1969. *I Gesuiti alla corte di Pechino*. Roma: Desclée.
- Boxer, Charles R. 1947. "Some Sino-European Xylographic Works, 1662-1718." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (December): 199-215.
- Brockey, Liam. 2007. *Journey to the East: The Jesuit Mission to China, 1579-1724*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chan, Albert. 1990. "Towards a Chinese Church: the Contribution of Philippe Couplet S.J. (1622-1693)." In *Philippe Couplet, S.J. (1623-1693): The Man Who Brought China to Europe*, edited by Jerome Heyndrickx. Sankt Augustin: Steyler Verlag.
- . 2002. *Chinese Books and Documents in the Jesuit Archives in Rome: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Armonk, New York, and London: M. E. Sharpe.
- Chen, Shengxi 陳生璽. 2007. *Zhang Juzheng jiang ping Daxue and Zhongyong* 張居正講評《大學·中庸》(Zhang Juzheng's Comments on *Daxue* and *Zhongyong*). Shanghai: Cishu chubanshe.
- Ching, Julia, and Willard G. Oxtoby. 1992. *Moral Enlightenment: Leibniz and Wolff on China*. Nettetal: Steyler Verlag.
- D'Arelli, Francesco. 1998. "Matteo Ricci S.I. e la traduzione latina dei *Quattro Libri (Sishu)*: dalla tradizione storiografica alle nuove ricerche." In *Le Marche e l'Oriente: Una tradizione ininterrotta da Matteo Ricci a Giuseppe Tucci*, edited by Francesco D'Arelli. Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente.
- . ed. 2001. *Matteo Ricci Lettere (1580-1609)*. Macerata: Quodlibet.
- Dehergne, Joseph. 1995. *Zaihua yesu huishi liezhuan ji shumu bubian · xia* 在華耶穌會士列傳及書目補編·下 (Repertory of the Jesuits in China 1552-1800, Vol. II). Translated by Geng Sheng. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- D'Elia, Pasquale, ed. 1942-1949. *Fonti Ricciane I & II*. Roma: Libreria dello Stato.

- Golvers, Noël. 2009. "An Unobserved Letter of Prospero Intorcetta S.J. to Godefridus Henschens S.J. and the Printing of the Jesuit Translations of the Confucian Classics (Rome-Antwerp, 2 June 1672)." In *Syntagmata Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund-Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy*, edited by Dirk Sacré and Jan Papy. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Hsia, Ronnie Po-Chia. 2009. "Tianzhujiao yu mingmo shehui—Chongzhenchao Long huamin shandong chuanjiao de jige wenti" 天主教與明末社會—崇禎朝龍華民山東傳教的幾個問題 (Catholicism and the Society in the Late Ming Dynasty—Some Problems in the Missionary Work of Niccolò Longobardo in Shandong under the Reign of Chongzhen Emperor). *Lishi yanjiu* 歷史研究 (Historical Research) 2: 51-67.
- Igawa, Yoshitsugu 井川義次. 2007. "Christian Wolff and Neo-Confucianism: Relating with Ratio in Chinese Philosophy." *Zhexue sixiang lunji* 哲學·思想論集 (Analect of Philosophy Thought) 33:79-86.
- _____. 2013. "Ruxue gudian xinxi yu qi zai ouzhou de huixiang" 儒學古典資訊與其在歐洲的迴響：歐洲啟蒙主義者對中國哲學的接受 (The European Enlighteners' Reception of Chinese Philosophy). In *Gongting dianji yu dongya wenhua jiaoliu guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 宮廷典籍與東亞文化交流國際學術研討會論文集 (Proceeding of the International Symposium Classics in Palace and East Asia Culture Exchange):493-501.
- Jäger, Henrik. 2012. "Konfuzianismusrezeption als Wegbereitung der deutschen Aufklärung." https://www.unihildesheim.de/media/fb2/philosophie/J%C3%A4ger_AZP-Artikel.pdf
- Kasper, Walter, ed. 1993-2001. *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.
- Lach, Donald F. 1953. "The Sinophilism of Christian Wolff." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14: 561-574.
- Li, Wenchao 李文潮. 2002. "'Ziran shenxue' wenti—Laibunici he wo'erfu" "自然神學"問題—萊布尼茨與沃爾夫 (The Problem of "Nature Theology": Leibniz and Wolff). In *Leibniz and China* 萊布尼茨與中國. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe.
- Lundbaek, Knud. 1979. "The First Translation from a Confucian Classic in Europe." *China Mission Studies (1550-1800)* Bulletin I: 1-11.
- _____. 1981. "Chief Grand Secretary Chang Chü-cheng & the Early China Jesuits." *China Mission Studies (1550-1800)* Bulletin III: 2-11.
- Metzler, Josef. 1980. *Die Synoden in China, Japan und Korea, 1570-1931*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.
- Mungello, David E. 1981. "The Jesuits' Use of Chang Chü-cheng's Commentary in their Translation of the Confucian Four Books (1687)." *China Mission Studies (1550-1800)* Bulletin III: 12-22.
- _____. 1983. "The First Complete Translation of the Confucian Four Books in the West." In *International Symposium on Chinese-Western Cultural Interchange in Commemoration of the 400th Anniversary of the Arrival of Matteo Ricci, S. J. in China*, 515-541. Taipei: Furen University Press.

- _____. 1986. Book review of *Rede über die praktische philosophie der Chinesen: Oratio de sinarum philosophia practica*, by Christian Wolff. *Studia Leibnitiana* 18: 120-125.
- _____. 1988. "The Seventeenth-Century Jesuit Translation Project of the Confucian Four Books." In *East meets West: The Jesuits in China, 1528-1773*, edited by Charles E. Ronan & Bonnie B. C. Oh. Chicago: Loyola University Press.
- _____. 1989. *Curious Land: Jesuit Accommodation and the Origins of Sinology*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Pfister, Louis 費賴之. 1995. *Zaihua yesu huishi liezhuan ji shumu · shang* 在華耶穌會士列傳及書目·上 (Biography and bibliography of the Jesuits in China 1552-1773, Vol. I). Translated by Feng Chengjun. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Qi, Yinping 戚印平. 2007. *Yuandong yesuhui yanjiu* 遠東耶穌會史研究 (Studies on the History of Jesuits in Far East). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- Rule, Paul. 2003. "François Noël SJ and the Chinese Rites Controversy." In *The History of the Relations between the Low Countries and China in the Qing Era (1644-1911)*, edited by W. F. Vande Walle and Noël Golvers. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Standaert, Nicolas, ed. 2001. *Handbook of Christianity in China, Volume One: 635-1800*. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill.
- _____. 2012. *Chinese Voices in the Rites Controversy*. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu.

十七、十八世紀來華耶穌會士對於《中庸》的譯介

羅 瑩

中文摘要

儒學域外傳播史一直是跨文化研究中的重要課題。康熙朝來華耶穌會士集體譯介儒學典籍的活動及其刊行於歐洲的多個拉丁文譯本，不僅構建出中西文化交流史上的一個高峰，並且深入影響了歐洲啟蒙思想家對於中國的認識。本文擬以《中庸》一書的譯介為例，經由梳理十七、十八世紀最重要的三個《中庸》拉丁文譯本：《中國政治道德學說》（*Sinarum scientia politico-moralis*, Guamcheu-Goa 1667/1669）、《中國哲學家孔子·中庸》（*Liber secundus of Confucius Sinarum philosophus*, Paris 1687）和《中華帝國六經·中庸》（*Immutabile Medium of Sinensis imperii libri classici sex*, Pragae 1711），呈現清中期在華耶穌會士譯介儒學典籍的具體情況以及三個譯本各自的特點。此外，本文亦述及來華耶穌會士在中拉雙語譯本刻印出版方面所進行的開創性實踐。

關鍵詞：中庸，耶穌會士，跨文化譯介，儒學概念，雙語文本