



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2021.5.5>

UDC 94(510)“16/17”:2-788
ЛБС 63.3(5Кит)5-7

Submitted: 04.07.2020
Accepted: 27.08.2020

THE CONFLICTS AMONG RELIGIOUS ORDERS OF CHRISTIANITY IN CHINA DURING THE 17th AND 18th CENTURIES

Anh Thuan Truong

The University of Da Nang, University of Science and Education, Danang city, Vietnam

Abstract. Introduction. The article studies the conflicts between the Spanish Mendicant Orders (Dominican Order, Franciscan Order, etc.) as well as the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris with Portuguese Society of Jesus, which took place during the 17th and 18th centuries in China. *Methods and materials.* To study this issue, the author used the original historical materials recorded by Western missionaries working in China during the 17th and 18th centuries and research works by Chinese and international scholars related to the Chinese Rites Controversy as well as the process of introduction and development of Christianity in this country during the 17th and 18th centuries. The author combines two main research methods of History Science (historical and logical methods) with other research methods (systemic approach, analysis, synthesis, comparison, etc.) to complete the study of this issue. *Analysis.* In the 17th and 18th centuries, the struggle for faith of the peoples in the Far East, especially China, became the desirable goal of religious orders of Christianity. Therefore, during this period, Western missionaries belonging to various religious orders of Christianity, such as the Society of Jesus, Mendicant Orders, Society of Foreign Missions of Paris, etc., gradually entered this country. In the course of evangelization, the struggle for influence as well as the right to manage missionary affairs in China at that time created conflicts among Christian religious orders. It is manifested in the form of a debate about Chinese rituals. In fact, these conflicts not only caused great losses to the missionary career of contemporary Christian religious orders taking place in China but also made the relationship between China's ruling authorities and The Holy See became very tense. *Results.* Based on the study of the conflicts among religious orders of Christianity in China during the 17th and 18th centuries, the article clarifies characteristics, the root and direct causes leading to this phenomenon, making a certain contribution to the study of the relationship among religious orders in the process of introduction and development of Christianity in China in particular and the history of East-West cultural exchange in this country in general in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Key words: China, Society of Jesus, Society of Foreign Missions of Paris, Mendicant Orders, conflict, Christianity, Chinese Rites Controversy.

Citation. Truong Anh Thuan. The Conflicts Among Religious Orders of Christianity in China During the 17th and 18th Centuries. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 4. Istoriya. Regionovedenie. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. History. Area Studies. International Relations], 2021, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 57-71. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2021.5.5>

УДК 94(510)“16/17”:2-788
ББК 63.3(5Кит)5-7

Дата поступления статьи: 04.07.2020
Дата принятия статьи: 27.08.2020

КОНФЛИКТЫ МЕЖДУ РЕЛИГИОЗНЫМИ ОРДЕНАМИ ХРИСТИАНСТВА В КИТАЕ В XVII И XVIII ВЕКАХ

Анх Тхуан Труонг

Университет Дананга, Университет науки и образования, г. Дананг, Вьетнам

Аннотация. Введение. В статье проведено исследование конфликтов испанских нищенствующих орденов (Доминиканский орден, Францисканский орден и др.), а также Парижского общества заграничных миссий с португальским Обществом Иисуса, имевших место в XVII–XVIII вв. в Китае. *Методы и материалы.* Для изучения этого вопроса автор использовал записи западных миссионеров, работавших в Китае в XVII–XVIII вв., а также исследования китайских и зарубежных ученых, связанные со спорами о китайских обрядах

и процессом появления и развития христианства в этой стране в XVII–XVIII веках. Автор объединяет два основных метода исследования исторической науки (исторический и логический методы) с другими методами исследования (системный подход, анализ, синтез, сравнение и др.) для более полного изучения данного вопроса. *Анализ.* В XVII и XVIII вв. борьба за веру народов Дальнего Востока, особенно Китая, стала желанной целью религиозных христианских орденов. Поэтому в этот период западные миссионеры, принадлежащие к различным религиозным орденам христианства, таким как Общество Иисуса, нищенствующие ордена, Парижское общество заграничных миссий и т. д., постепенно пришли в эту страну. Их деятельность по крещению населения сопровождалась борьбой за влияние и за право управлять миссионерскими делами в Китае. Конфликты между христианскими религиозными орденами проявились в форме дискуссии о китайских обрядах. В сущности, эти конфликты не только нанесли большой ущерб миссионерской деятельности современных христианских религиозных орденов, находящихся в Китае, но и сделали отношения между правящими властями Китая и Святым Престолом очень напряженными. *Результаты.* В статье разъясняются особенности, корни и прямые причины, приведшие к развитию конфликтов между христианскими религиозными орденами в Китае в XVII–XVIII вв., что способствует изучению взаимоотношений между религиозными орденами в процессе появления и развития христианства в Китае в частности и истории культурного обмена Восток – Запад в этой стране в XVII–XVIII вв. в целом.

Ключевые слова: Китай, Общество Иисуса, Парижское общество заграничных миссий, Нищенствующий орден, конфликт, христианство, споры о китайских обрядах.

Цитирование. Труонг Анх Тхуан. Конфликты между религиозными орденами христианства в Китае в XVII и XVIII веках // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 4, История. Регионоведение. Международные отношения. – 2021. – Т. 26, № 5. – С. 57–71. – (На англ. яз.). – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2021.5.5>

Introduction. From the first half of the 17th century to the middle of the 18th century “indigenous rites” became the subject of a large-scale controversy among Christian religious orders in China. On the surface, this was a controversy in a cultural aspect but in essence, it’s a scramble for the right to lead the missionary activity among Christian religious orders in contemporary China. In particular, the main contradiction and conflict occurred between the Spanish Mendicant Orders (Dominican Order, Franciscan Order, etc.) as well as the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris with Portuguese Society of Jesus – a force with great merit in bringing Christianity to introduce and develop in China from the late 16th century to the beginning of the 17th century [10, pp. 23-29]. These religious orders, to attack the opponent, establish or maintain and strengthen their leadership in missionary activity, caused the “Chinese Rites Controversy” to increasingly expand in size and eventually pushed it into a conflict of power occurring not only among the Christian religious orders but also among the rulers in contemporary China with the Holy See Rome. That not only caused chaos and weakening of the contemporary missionary work in this country but also was the cause of executing the policy of banning Christianity of the Qing dynasty 清朝, which seriously affected the stable and solid

development of Chinese Christianity, inherently formed during the time of Matteo Ricci¹. Cultural contradictions that were essentially conflicts and disputes over the right to manage missionary activities among Christian religious orders in China in the 17th and 18th centuries could be divided into 2 phases:

Phase 1: From the 30s to the 60s of the 17th century, the Spanish Mendicant Orders openly turned the issue of Chinese Rites into a formal and comprehensive controversy with the Portuguese Society of Jesus.

Phase 2: From the 90s of the 17th century to the first half of the 18th century, the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris brought the Chinese Rites Controversy with the Portuguese Society of Jesus to the climax period.

Research on both phases is essential. That ensures the comprehensiveness and completeness of the article’s content. Therefore, the conflicts between the Christian religious orders in China around the issue of indigenous rituals in the 17th and 18th centuries is essentially a process of continuity and inheritance, growing from low to high on drasticness. Besides, it should be emphasized that the main object of study in the article is the conflict between Christian religious orders about the Chinese rituals that took place in the 17th and 18th centuries. Therefore, the author

focuses on clarifying this content; on the contrary, the author does not study the attitudes of the Ming and Qing dynasties towards the controversy about Chinese rituals deeply. Moreover, at the beginning of the 17th century (i.e. the late Ming dynasty), the controversy of Chinese rituals issue was only taking place within the Jesuits. From the 30s to the 60s of the 17th century, it developed into a conflict between the Mendicant Orders and the Jesuits. However, it never became a conflict between the Ming government and the Holy See. During the research process, the author has made great efforts to find and read the historical sources of China and the West. But so far, the author has not found any document that records the official attitudes and views of the Ming Dynasty on the conflicts surrounding the Chinese ritual issue at that time. During the Qing Dynasty, the conflict between the Chinese rulers and the Roman Pope about the Chinese rituals was most evident during the reign of Emperor Kangxi. It was actually just the consequent of a previous controversy between the Jesuits and the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris about the issue of the Chinese rituals. However, it marked a highly developed period of conflict between these two religious orders. Therefore, although it is not the main research object of the article, to help researchers and readers get an overview of the Qing dynasty's official attitudes and views on the controversy of Chinese rituals took place in this period, the author also selected and presented some essential contents in the evolution of the conflict between Emperor Kangxi and the Holy See about the issue of the Chinese rituals.

Methods and materials. During the study of this issue, the original historical materials recorded by Western missionaries, referring directly or indirectly to the process of conflict between religious orders of Christianity in China in the 17th and 18th centuries, collected, edited, translated and published in a number of works such as *Relation de la province du Japon écrite en Portugais par le pere François Cardim de la Compagnie de Jésus procureur de cette province* [4], *Répertoire des jésuites de Chine de 1552 à 1800* [12], *Histoire générale de la Société des missions étrangères* [23], *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne mission de Chine* [33; 34], *China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journals of Matthew Ricci, 1583–*

1610 [36], etc., played an important role and helped to restore the process of conflict between religious orders of Christianity in China during this period accurately and objectively. In addition, the academic achievements on issues related to the Chinese Rites Controversy as well as the history of Christianity's introduction and development in the country of Chinese researchers [20; 24; 45; 47; 50; 52; 53; 54; 55] and scholars around the world [2; 5; 6; 8; 9; 15; 26; 28; 30], has also provided a necessary background for the author to conduct research on the conflicts among religious orders of Christianity in China in the 17th and 18th centuries. The author combines two main research methods of History Science (historical and logical methods) with other research methods (systemic approach, analysis, synthesis, comparison, etc.) to complete the study of this issue.

Analysis. In China, from the time when the missionaries of Spanish Mendicant Orders² sought to open the work of evangelization in this country in the period from the end of the 16th century to the beginning of the 17th century, the relationship between them and the Portuguese Society of Jesus never went well. Jesuit missionaries were aware that Mendicant Orders would be a direct competitor and smashed the missionary monopoly of the Society of Jesus in mainland China at that time. Therefore, they found every way to prevent the presence as well as the activity of Mendicant Orders in this missionary area. In particular, from the 30s to the 60s of the 17th century, the contradictions and conflicts in the struggle for influence and leadership of the missionary work in China between the Spanish Mendicant Orders with Portuguese Society of Jesus became even more tense and drastic. The direct cause of this situation was the controversy surrounding Chinese Rites.

In 1631–1832, Angelo Cocchi 高琦³ – one of the first missionaries of Spanish Dominican Order was successful in penetrating the South China region [49, pp. 103-110; 17, p. 61], in the course of conducting the missionary work in Fuan 福安 (Fujian 福建), clearly realized that the fact that the Jesuit missionary allowed parishioners to practice rites of worship Confucian and ancestry was contrary to the regulations of the Holy See. Therefore, Angelo Cocchi took the initiative to come into contact with the Portuguese Jesuit

missioner Benoit de Mattos 林本篤⁴, to jointly discuss and resolve the situation of division as well as contradictions in the behavior of two religious orders related to the issue of Chinese Rites. But in the end, he received a frigid and indifferent attitude from this Jesuit missionary [17, p. 67]. In 1633, when the missionary of Spanish Franciscan Order named Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero 利安當⁵ came to evangelize the localities of Jianchang 建昌 and Nanchang 南昌 in Jiangxi province 江西 and Nanjing 南京 of province of Jiangsu 江蘇, he did not receive the welcoming attitude of Jesuit missionaries operating here. Not only that, but Caballero was also arrested, roped, and taken onto the ship for returning to Fujian 福建 [15, pp. 239-241] by the Jesuit Christians in Nanjing 南京.

However, it was only the “prelude” of the “symphony” called “Chinese Rites Controversy” initiated by missionaries of Spanish Mendicant Orders to “perform” in China in the first half of the 17th century. After Angelo Cocchi’s death (November 1633), the missionary of Spanish Dominican Order Juan Bautista Morales 黎玉範⁶, who went Fuan 福安 (Fujian 福建) with Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero following the call of Angelo Cocchi on March 9, 1633, inherited and continued to carry out the missionary work here. With his efforts, he gradually made Fuan 福安 became one of the most important missionary areas of Dominican Order in the early phases of laying the foundation in China. Along with that, Fuan 福安 was also the place where missionaries of Spanish Mendicant Orders with representatives of Juan Bautista Morales and Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero used the Chinese Rites issue as a reason to start a dispute with the Portuguese Society of Jesus over the leadership of missionary work in China at the time.

For the early time to go to Fujian 福建 (from March to October 1633), direct participation in missionary activity helped Juan Bautista Morales and Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero to recognize the solid foundation built by the Portuguese Society of Jesus in China, expressed by the number of followers and their influence in this country. These two missionaries also discovered that the missionary approach employed by the Portuguese Society of Jesus as well as their attitudes towards the issue of “Chinese Rites” were opposed to the traditional viewpoint of the European Congregation.

Juan Bautista Morales and Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero show their disregard for the method of “missionary academic”⁷ and “missionary bibliography”⁸ used by Jesuit missionaries to conquer the faith of the ruling class and intellectuals in Chinese society because it’s considered to be too complicated. Not only that, but two men also criticized some expressions of “adaptation to the indigenous culture” of the Jesuit missionaries such as changing the costume of Chinese Confucians or using words in Confucian bibliography to translate and interpret Christian theological documents [45, p. 21]. In particular, through investigation, Morales and Caballero also learned that many Christians still practiced worshipping Confucius, ancestors, tutelary gods (of village, town) and worshipping in front of the ancestral tablet of the deceased [17, p. 115, 117-118] – Rites were considered as superstitious by two men. It was worth mentioning that the practice of these rites by Chinese co-religionists was allowed by Jesuit missionaries at that time [45, p. 21]. Therefore, Juan Bautista Morales and Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero decided to take advantage of these, to criticize the Portuguese Society of Jesus, to enhance the prestige of the Spanish Mendicant Orders in China, to aim to the ultimate purpose of obtaining the leadership of missionary work in this country.

However, it should be seen that from the beginning, the conflict between Spanish Mendicant Orders and the Portuguese Society of Jesus on the issue of Chinese Rites was not so harsh that it was impossible to dialogue and mediate. In fact, from 1635 to 1640, several opportunities were proactively created by Spanish Mendicant Orders to solve this issue, but in the end, due to various reasons, two sides did not make full use of them. Specifically, on November 22, 1635, Juan Bautista Morales went from Fuan 福安 to Fuzhou 福州 in order to meet Francisco Furtado 傅汎濟⁹ and other Jesuit missionaries to discuss and resolve the divisions and disagreements between two religious orders. However, at this meeting, Juan Bautista Morales proposed to strictly prohibit co-religionists to apply the practice of worshipping Confucius, ancestors, tutelary gods (of the village, town), and, on the other hand, Jesuit missionaries stated that such rites in China were only popular cultural traditions in society, without superstition, therefore parishioners should be allowed to apply [50, p. 61].

It's the existence of so many differences in viewpoint related to the issue of Chinese Rites that caused the conflict between two sides to become more serious, leading to the next escalation of tensions between the Spanish Mendicant Orders and the Portuguese Society of Jesus in China in later times.

In June 1637, a document with 13 contents reflecting the contradictions between the Spanish Mendicant Orders and the Portuguese Society of Jesus over the issue of Chinese rites was completed by Juan Bautista Morales on December 22, 1635, together with a report of the results of two actual investigations into the issue of Chinese Rites was conducted in Fujian 福建 from December 1635 to February 1636 [17, p. 121], through Franciscan Orders missionary, Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero was moved to Manila. A meeting was scheduled to be held here on 4 July, 1637 to resolve the disagreements between the involved parties but was rejected by the Society of Jesus because they considered that the issue of Chinese rites should be resolved internally by each religious order working in this country. Not only that, in 1637, the Society of Jesus in China also sent missionary Alvare de Semedo 曾德昭¹⁰ to Rome to defend the Pope about the appropriateness of the missionary method as well as the policy of "adapting to indigenous culture" being applied by the Society of Jesus in China [50, p. 62]. In this situation, the final decision of the Bishop of Manila Diocese was to report this to the Holy See so that the Pope can make a final decision [17, pp. 122-124; 22, p. 136; 38, pp. 179-180].

From 1638, Christianity in China in general and Fujian 福建 in particular, suffer from the persecution of the Ming dynasty 明朝. In that context, Juan Bautista Morales and another missionary of Spanish Mendicant Orders was deported to Macau – Diocese under the auspices of Portugal. Here, another opportunity to resolve the conflict between the Spanish Mendicant Orders and the Portuguese Society of Jesus over the issue of Chinese Rites re-appeared. Specifically, on June 3, 1639, under the direction of the Superior of Mendicant Orders in Manila, Juan Bautista Morales sent a letter to Manuel Dias S nior 李瑪諾¹¹ – Far East Inspector of Society of Jesus in Macau, in which he presented 12 contradictions between two religious orders

related to Chinese Rites, also proposing a discussion and a definitive resolution of this issue. After receiving the letter of Morales, Manuel Dias S nior moved it to Francisco Furtado – Vice-Provincial of the Society of Jesus in China. However, the unclear attitude, as well as delay of the Jesuit missionaries in China at that time¹², made the settlement of the conflict between this religious order and Spanish Mendicant Orders once again fail to achieve positive results.

For the next 20 years, the Chinese Rites Controversy between the Portuguese Society of Jesus and the Spanish Mendicant Orders took place not only in the missionary areas in the Far East but also spread to the Holy See. Each mission organization sent representatives to Rome to clarify their viewpoints on this matter to the Pope. Specifically, departing from Manila in May 1640, to February 1643, Dominican missionary Juan Bautista Morales went to Rome [17, pp. 248-249], brought the disagreements and conflicts between the Portuguese Society of Jesus and the Spanish Mendicant Orders in missionary areas in the Far East to spread to the Holy See and the whole of Europe. That was an event that marked the comprehensive outbreak of the Chinese Rites Controversy between these two religious orders. During his meeting with Pope Urban VIII on February 30, 1643, Juan Bautista Morales presented 17 questions related to the practice of worshipping Confucius, gods, ancestors, making the ancestral altar, burning incense, etc. [17, pp. 252-254; 22, p. 136; 10, p. 36] that the Jesuit missionaries in China allowed parishioners to apply and petitioned the Pope to quickly decide on these issues. The Pope showed his agreement with Morales when considering that these Chinese Rites were superstitious [9, p. 402]. Immediately, a committee was set up under the Pope's order to deal with the issue of Chinese Rites. After 15 months of investigation, in June 1644, the committee issued a report which largely agreed with the opinions presented by Morales to the Pope earlier and requested the religious orders not to allow parishioners to participate in worshipping Confucius, tutelary gods, ancestors or making the ancestral altar for the deceased. The result of the above-mentioned investigation was presented to the Pope by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith [42, pp. 1-7]. On September 12, 1645, Pope

Innocent X – a successor of Pope Urban VIII ordered the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to issue a decree condemning the Chinese rites and demanding that all religious orders, including the Society of Jesus, regardless of whether they had been evangelized in China or are only preparing to go this country, must strictly follow this decree [42, p. 8]. Thus, the Holy See's decree in 1645 marked the first victory of the Spanish Mendicant Orders in Chinese Rites Controversy with the Portuguese Society of Jesus.

On that basis, after returning to Fujian 福建, China in August 1649, Juan Bautista Morales proclaimed the content of Holy See's decree in 1645 to religious orders operating in mainland China and demanded strict compliance. For Portuguese Jesuit missionaries, a decree seriously compromising the missionary work of this religious order in China was certainly not easily accepted. They said that Juan Bautista Morales was the one who made the Holy See misinterpret the issue of Chinese Rites and thereby made the wrong decision. Therefore, on the one hand, Jesuit missionaries criticized and interfered with the operation of Juan Bautista Morales in China¹³, on the other hand, they found any way to make the Holy See change its decision. To do this, the Society of Jesus dispatched Martino Martini 衛匡国¹⁴ from China (1651) to Rome (1654) to counter the incorrect contents of Chinese rites that Juan Bautista Morales once presented to the Holy See. Regarding the issue of worshipping Confucius, according to Martino Martini, this rite was conducted by Chinese Confucian scholars and literati in Confucian Temple to show their respect to the most famous sage of their nation. It was only a cultural activity of political nature, common in daily life, and completely non-religious. At the same time, Chinese people worshiped their ancestors as a way of showing their respect, filial piety, and memorization to the deceased who gave birth and nurtured them, without a form of worshipping the gods [50, p. 69]. Based on what Martino Martini presented above, in March 1656, the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith of the Holy See issued a decision that allowed Chinese parishioners to practice rites of worshipping Confucius and ancestors and submitted this decision to Pope Alexander VII for approval [39, pp. 119-120; 42, pp. 8-11]. Thus,

with the enactment of decree 1656, the Holy See acknowledged the guideline of respect and adaptation to the indigenous culture previously given by Matteo Ricci and applied by Jesuit missionaries in contemporary China. This created a huge advantage for the Portuguese Jesuit missionaries in the Chinese Rites Controversy as well as competing for influence and missionary rights in the country with the Spanish Mendicant missionaries. Meanwhile, Juan Bautista Morales and other Mendicant missionaries showed their dissatisfaction with such a decision of the Holy See. Therefore, from 1659 to 1664, they conducted many activities to criticize the missionary method and the attitude of the Jesuit missionaries towards Chinese Rites¹⁵. However, this failed to achieve the expected results [28, pp. 31-32, 36]. In particular, at the end of the 17th century, when the understanding of China and influence in the country ever increased, the Mendicant missionaries became more and more deeply aware of the suitability of guidelines of adaptation to indigenous culture as well as missionary method adopted by Jesuit missionaries in China. Therefore, the criticisms of the Spanish Mendicant Orders towards the Portuguese Society of Jesus became less frequent [47, pp. 311-322; 52, p. 246]. However, when the conflict between two religious orders had just subsided, the confrontation between the Portuguese Society of Jesus and the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris flared up from the late 17th century to the first half of the 18th century, which pushed the Chinese Rites Controversy to the climax of drastic and intense conditions accompanied by serious consequences for Chinese Christianity.

In the first half of the 17th century, to realize the intention of gradually restricting and reaching the revocation of missionary privilege of Portugal in the Far East, the Holy See adopted the "Apostolic Vicariate" regime, that is, through the missionaries of a missionary organization appointed and governed by the Holy See, to assert and exercise the supreme leadership and management of the Pope over the working of preaching the Gospel in remote Eastern countries. In particular, one of the first missionary organizations chosen by the Holy See to implement the "Apostolic Vicariate" regime was the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris. In 1659, the Holy See appointed three missionaries of the Society

of Foreign Missions of Paris named François Pallu, Lambert de la Motte, and Ignatius Cotolendi as Vicar Apostolic in Tonkin, Cochinchina and Nanjing¹⁶. This explained the presence and influence of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris in China in the second half of the 17th century.

Despite being the force that came later, it had not yet established a solid base of missionary area nor had a large number of followers as the Portuguese Society of Jesus, but the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris gained the power granted by the Holy See. Therefore, the missionaries of this missionary organization used that power to force other religious orders, including the Society of Jesus, to obey their leadership of missionary activities in China. In particular, the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris was also patronized by France – the country that was competing for missionary privilege with Portugal in the Far East at that time. That increasingly made the outbreak of the conflict between the Portuguese Society of Jesus and the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris backed by France only a matter of time. In fact, until the 80s of the 17th century, the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris followed the Spanish Mendicant missionaries to make use of the issue of Chinese Rites as an excuse to criticize the Portuguese Society of Jesus, pushing the Chinese Rites Controversy to a climax of conflict.

It all started in 1680 when the Pope established the Apostolic Vicariate of Fujian. At that time, two missionaries of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris named François Pallu and Charles Maigrot¹⁷ were in turn appointed as Vicar Apostolic. Based on the Pope's support, after arriving in China, two missionaries strictly asked all missionaries operating in China, regardless of religious orders, to declare swear by their witness that would obey the power of the Pope. This, to a certain extent, helped missionaries of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris to lay the foundations and establish their position for the missionary work in China. But it was a powerful attack of the Portuguese Society of Jesus.

However, in 1690 when the Pope approved Portugal's petition to establish three dioceses in the country¹⁸, the advantage of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris in China was no longer present. At that time, Apostolic Vicariate of Fujian (born in 1680), merged into Nanjing diocese 南京, under the management of Jesuit missionary Joseph

Monteiro¹⁹. In response to such changes, the missionary of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris, Charles Maigrot, who at that time was Vicar Apostolic of Fujian, persisted in defending the power given by the Pope to his religious order in China in 1680. On the one hand, he forced missionary Joseph Monteiro to return to Macau. On the other hand, he took the name of the highest manager of the missionary work in China at the time to issue 7 bans on March 26, 1693, strongly opposing and banning the missionary method of “adaptation to the indigenous culture” as well as the open-minded attitude of the Jesuit missionaries to Chinese Rites [30, pp. 152-154; 42, pp. 17-19]. According to Charles Maigrot, the bans were a measure of temporary direction before the Holy See issued a clear decision on Chinese Rites. He demanded all missionaries in China to strictly obey to end a long period of disagreement, division, contradiction, and conflict between the religious orders in the Far East in general and China in particular [28, p. 37]. This faced strong opposition from missionary organizations in contemporary China. Missioners under various religious orders, especially the Society of Jesus, expressed their deep dissatisfaction with Charles Maigrot – Representative of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris in China, and at the same time conducted a fierce controversy with him. Not only that, to seek support from the indigenous ruler, the Jesuit missionaries in China also submitted a memorial to Emperor Kangxi 康熙, which showed the attitude of criticizing and rejecting seven bans of Charles Maigrot [47, p. 324].

In response to the opposition of the Society of Jesus, Charles Maigrot continued to promote the enforcement of bans in Fujian 福建 diocese, at the same time punishing missioners who opposed his ban by dismissing their religious titles. Not only that, at that time Charles Maigrot also criticized missionary Jean-Paul Gozani 駱保祿²⁰ – Superior of the Society of Jesus in Fujian 福建, to strengthen the influence of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris here and discouraging missionaries from opposing his bans [24, p. 97]. Besides, Charles Maigrot also sent the bans to the Holy See, intending to make use of the Holy See's authority to reinforce the power and status of the society of Foreign Missions of Paris in China. The Bishop of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris also sought to enlist the support

of theologians at the Sorbonne University as well as the French congregation leadership for condemning Chinese Rites [28, p. 89].

The act of condemning Chinese Rites of Chinese rites and criticizing the Society of Jesus by a missionary of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris-Charles Maigrot was very consistent with the intention of the Holy See that was seeking to weaken and gradually restrict and come to revoke the missionary privilege of the Portuguese Jesuit missionaries in the Far East in general and China in particular. Therefore, at that time the Holy See's behavior towards the issue of Chinese rites quickly changed, from the previous hesitant attitude to the attitude of persistent denial and prevention. In late 1699, a committee including cardinals was convened by the Holy See to study the issue of Chinese Rites. After that, on July 2, 1702, Pope Clement XI sent Bishop Charles Thomas Maillard de Tournon²¹ to Beijing 北京 to review and resolve the conflicts surrounding this issue. However, when this missionary had not arrived in Beijing 北京 (4/12/1705), on November 20, 1704, in Rome, Pope Clement XI approved decree *Cum Deus Optimus* [3, p. 463; 10, pp. 37-38] on banning the worshiping of Confucius and the deceased as well as banning the use of Chinese words such as "Tian 天 (Heaven)", "Shangdi 上帝 (Lord Above or Supreme Emperor)" to talk about "Tianzhu 天主 (Lord of Heaven)". Therefore, after Charles Thomas Maillard de Tournon arrived in Beijing 北京, on December 29, 1706, Emperor Kangxi summoned this Apostolic legate and expressed his dissatisfaction with the disrespectful attitude of the missionaries of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris and the Holy See related to indigenous cultural value [23, p. 470]. In particular, when knowing the purpose of Charles Thomas Maillard de Tournon's arrival to China was to announce the decree *Cum Deus Optimus* of the Holy See on condemnation and prohibition of Chinese rites, Emperor Kangxi ordered the deportation against this missionary. However, before leaving China, on January 25, 1707, Charles Thomas Maillard de Tournon summoned all missionaries to Nanjing 南京 to announce decree *Cum Deus Optimus* of the Holy See on banning Christians from attending and practicing the rites of worshipping Confucius and ancestors [10, p. 38]. Emperor Kangxi was enraged, commanding the Portuguese authority

in Macau to imprison apostolic legate Maillard de Tournon until two Jesuit missionaries and one Chinese parishioner²² sent by the Emperor to Rome (1708) to tell the Pope about the nature of the issue of Chinese rites came back. However, these missionaries remained in Europe for too long, before coming back to China in 1619. Meanwhile, in Macau, Apostolic legate Maillard de Tournon was imprisoned and died in prison on June 8, 1710. In fact, after this incident, except for several Jesuit missionaries who had a license to stay in China, to serve in the court²³, the remaining missionaries, including Bishop Charles Maigrot, were expelled from this country and later returned to Europe [32, p. 152].

Despite this, the conflict between Emperor Kangxi and the Holy See over the issue of Chinese Rites still had not stopped here. In 1715, Pope Clement XI issued a decree *Ex illa die*, reiterating the bans of Chinese Rites in decree *Cum Deus Optimus* issued in 1704 [25, pp. 180-181; 10, p. 39], at the same time, requesting all missionaries operating in China at that time to vow to obey the content of this decree and if refusing to vow, their missionary right would be forfeited by the Holy See. At that time, Jesuit missionaries, the only remaining force in China, did not take vows to avoid being deported by the Qing dynasty. They also stopped the missionary work in this country so as not to be contrary to the orders of the Holy See. The negative impact of this can be seen immediately afterward. The evangelization as well as the celebration of the sacraments for Chinese Catholics completely stopped because there was no one to perform. In Rome, meanwhile, the Holy See and Bishop Maigrot realized the detrimental effects of too aggressive and extreme measures in dealing with Chinese rites. Therefore, Apostolic legate Carlo Ambrogio Mezzabarba²⁴ was dispatched to China in 1720, to express the Holy See's concession to the Chinese ritual, in the hope of improving the relationship between the Holy See with Chinese rulers at that time. From December 1720 to February 1721 he had many times an audience with Kangxi in Beijing and was given a great reception. However, when asked by the emperor about his purpose to go to China, Carlo Ambrogio Mezzabarba replied that he had come here to ask the faithful to abide by the decree issued by the Holy See in 1715 with the content of condemning

the Chinese ritual. The Emperor told Mezzabarba that, if so, he and the other missionaries should arrange their belongings to return to Europe immediately. In such a situation, Mezzabarba made concessions by sending Kangxi a statement allowing Chinese Christians to practice worshipping Confucius and ancestors. However, that did not satisfy Kangxi either. Mezzabarba realized that the failure to ease the conflict between The Pope and The Kangxi Emperor over the Chinese ritual issue was inevitable. In March 1721, he left Beijing for Macao. Before boarding a sea ship in Macau for his return to Europe, in November 1721, in a letter to missionaries operating in China, he mentioned “eight permissions” regarding the issue of Chinese Rites. In it, he allowed Chinese Christians to create ancestral tablets bearing the names of their ancestors to worship at home. They are allowed to participate in social and non-religious ceremonies, such as worshipping Confucius. Christians are also entitled to prostrate, offer fruit, light incense, light candles before the ancestral tablets, coffin, or in front of the grave of the deceased, provided that they declare alienation and break from all superstition [41, p. 140]. However, this last effort by Mezzabarba did not save the situation. Because at that time Kangxi was too angry and tired of the Chinese Rites Controversy between the Portuguese Society of Jesus and the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris as well as between him and the Holy See [23, p. 487]. In particular, in 1742, Pope Benedict XIV issued the decree *Ex quo singulari*, denied the “eight permissions” of the envoy Mezzabarba, and asked missionaries in China to abide by the content of the decree *Ex illa die* issued in 1715 [13, pp. 341-349; 23, pp. 389-395, 466-489; 14, p. 196]. This was the final decision of the Holy See in the 18th century on the issue of the Chinese Rite²⁵. But it was the beginning of a tragic period of Christianity in China for more than 100 years later under the prohibition and ill-treat of the Qing dynasty [10, pp. 39-40]. The direct cause for this outcome was within the scope of the contradiction and conflict between the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris and the Portuguese Society of Jesus which took place from the 90s of the 17th century to the first half of the 18th century.

Results. To sum up, in the 17th and 18th centuries, Christian religious orders, typically

the Society of Jesus, Mendicant Orders, and the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris were present respectively in China to carry out the preaching of Gospel. During this period, “national mission” became a fairly common phenomenon. That meant that each religious order received a great deal of support in many ways, especially financial matters from a Western country (either Portugal, or France, or Spain), and in return, they had to carry out missionary work under the direction and for the interests of that country. At that time, in the Far East in general and China in particular, the Society of Jesus was backed by the power of the Portuguese, the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris was backed by the dominant force of France and the Mendicant Orders was backed by the Spanish court. It was worth mentioning that in the contemporary period, there was a fierce competition between three patronizing countries to gain control over the territories in the Far East and great economic benefits as well as fight for the right to manage the missionary work in this area. That made the meeting between the Society of Jesus, the Mendicant Orders and the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris in China fail to bring any benefit to the evangelization from the beginning, apart from the conflicts and confrontations among them, which in essence were the dispute and conflict of interest among the nations patronizing those religious orders. In fact, the conflict among the Portuguese Society of Jesus and Spanish Mendicant Orders as well as among the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris and the Portuguese Society of Jesus in China took place in the form of controversy over indigenous rites. In particular, the “periodicity” of the contradictions and conflicts among religious orders in China was manifested quite clearly. From the 30s to the 60s of the 17th century, the Chinese Rites Controversy mainly took place between the Spanish Mendicant Orders and the Portuguese Jesuit missionaries. After that, from the 90s of the 17th century to the first half of the 18th century, the Chinese Rites Controversy only took place between two missionary organizations, namely the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris and Portuguese Society of Jesus. And along with that, the drastic nature of this conflict was then pushed up higher and higher. That caused a great disturbance in the relationship between the Christian religious orders and left negative consequences for the missionary process in China during this period.

NOTES

¹ Matteo Ricci 利瑪竇 (1552-1610) was an Italian Jesuit missionary. He evangelized mainland China from 1583 to 1610. During this time, with the missionary method of “adaptation to the indigenous culture”, he laid the solid foundations for the introduction and development of Christianity in China. He also contributed greatly to bringing Western science and technology to the Chinese during the period from the late 16th century to the beginning of the 17th century. See [12, p. 219; 33, pp. 22-42; 36, pp. 131-132, 137, 205-207].

² The mission of the Spanish Mendicant Orders in China in the period from the end of the 16th century to the beginning of the 17th century was mainly conducted by Franciscan and Dominican missionaries. In 1578 five Franciscan missionaries named Pedro de Alfaro, Giovanni Battista Lucarelli, Sebastian of Baeza, Augustin de Tordesillas, and Estevan Ortiz traveled from the Philippines to Guangdong province 廣東省, marking the beginning of the missionary process of this religious order in China. Meanwhile, from the time of arriving in the Philippines (from 1587 to 1626), Dominican missionaries approached mainland China seven times. See [17, pp. 33-36, 40-44; 43, p. 222].

³ Angelo Cocchi 高琦 was an Italian Dominican missionary, born in Florencia in 1597. He joined Dominican Order in his homeland but was sent to Spain to study theology in Salamanca. In 1622, he went to the Philippines and Taiwan 臺灣. He was considered a person laying the foundation for the missionary work of Spanish Dominican Order in China during the first half of the 17th century. In 1631, going from Taiwan 臺灣, he went to mainland China with another missionary. In 1632-1633, his mission in Fujian 福建 began to yield some initial results. In November 1633, he fell ill and died here. See [6, p. 215; 48, pp. 128-130].

⁴ Benoit de Mattos 林本篤 was a Portuguese Jesuit missionary, born in 1600 in Vidigueira. He joined the Society of Jesus in 1615, went to China to evangelize in October 1630. From then to 1634, he operated in Fujian 福建. In 1635, he was sent to Hainan Island 海南島 to evangelize and obtained some positive results. In 1641, he went to Cochinchina (Vietnam) with the missionary Alexandre de Rhodes. In 1644, he returned to Macau, then returned to Hainan Island 海南島 to evangelize and died here in April 1652. See [4, p. 106, 114; 33, pp. 208-211].

⁵ Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero 利安當 was born in 1602 in Baltaná, Spain, and was considered a person laying the foundation for the missionary work of Franciscan Order in China in the first half of the 17th century. He joined the Franciscan Order in 1618. In 1633, he traveled with Dominican missionary Juan Bautista Morales to China, mainly operating in Fujian 福建 and Jiangnan 江南. In 1643, he was appointed as

a leader of Franciscan Order in China and during this time, his missionary work in Shandong 山東 gained achievements. He died in Canton, China in 1669. See [5, p. 170; 17, p. 51, 65; 21, p. 18, 37].

⁶ Juan Bautista Morales 黎玉範 was a Dominican Order missionary, born in 1597 in Andalusia, Spain. In 1614, he joined Dominican Order. In 1620, he and some other missionaries boarded a train to Asia to conduct evangelization. He arrived in the Philippines in 1622 and remained working in the country until 1632. In 1633, he went with the Franciscan Order missionary Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero to China where he carried out his missionary work in Fujian diocese 福建. There, he participated in a controversy with the Jesuit missionaries on the issue of Chinese Rites. He died in Funing 福寧 (Fujian 福建) on September 17, 1664. See [11, p. 16; 17, p. 51, 65; 46, pp. 628-630].

⁷ Missionary academic 學術傳教 is a term employed by Chinese researchers to refer to Jesuit missionaries using Western cultural and scientific achievements in fields of astronomy, geography, mathematics, physics, chemistry, military weapons, painting, literature, etc. to attract classes in Chinese society, especially the upper classes, to the faith in Christianity in the 16th and 17th centuries. According to scholar Shi Jinghuan 史靜寰, the initiator of this missionary method was Jesuit missionary François Xavier – the pioneer missionary in the Far East in the first half of the 16th century. From the end of the 16th century to the beginning of the 17th century, the “missionary academic” continued to be inherited and thoroughly applied by Jesuit missionaries, typically Matteo Ricci, Michele Ruggleri, contributing to the great success in the propagation of Christianity in China. See [20, pp. 74-75; 54, pp. 130-135].

⁸ Missionary bibliography 書籍傳教 is a term used by Chinese scholars to refer to the fact that Jesuit missionaries brought Western-origin documents and books into China or in the process of preaching the Gospel in this country, Jesuit missionaries compiled and translated Western documents of various fields such as religion, philosophy, politics, morality, education, language, dictionary, literature, art, psychology, geography, map, astronomy, mathematics, irrigation, physics, geology, biology, medicine, military, etc. into Chinese language, in order to achieve the purpose of attracting social classes, especially the dominant class to believe in Christianity. See [44, p. 22; 55, pp. 2-8].

⁹ Francisco Furtado 傅汎濟 was born in 1587 in the Acores Islands, Portugal. He joined the Society of Jesus in 1608. In 1618, he followed missionary Nicolas Trigault to the Far East to evangelize and arrived in Macau in 1620. After a period of language learning, he went to Hangzhou 杭州 to evangelize. In 1630, he

moved from Hangzhou 杭州 to Shanxi 陝西 and operated there for about 6 years. From 1641 to 1651, he held many important Jesuit positions in China. He died in Macau on November 21, 1653. See [33, pp. 151-153].

¹⁰ Alvare de Semedo 曾德昭 was a Portuguese Jesuit missionary born in Nizea. He joined the Society of Jesus on April 30, 1602. In 1613, after completing his study of philosophy at Goa Archbishopric, he went to Nanjing 南京, China to evangelize. From then to 1630, he operated in various localities in mainland China such as Zhejiang 浙江, Jiangxi 江西, Jiangnan 江南, etc. In 1637, he returned to Europe to present the Holy See on Chinese Rites. After returning to China in 1644, he undertook a number of important Jesuit positions in China. He died in Guangzhou 廣州 on July 18, 1658. See [29, p. 75; 33, pp. 143-147].

¹¹ Manuel Dias Sénior 李瑪諾 was a Portuguese Jesuit missionary, working in the Far East in general and China in particular during the first half of the 17th century. He was born in 1559 in Aspalham of Portalgre diocese. On December 30, 1576, he joined the Society of Jesus. In April 1585, he boarded to the Far East to evangelize and set foot in Goa in 1586 after experiencing a terrible shipwreck accident off the coast of Safala (Africa). After a period of time in India, in August 1593, he arrived in Macau, but not long after, in 1594, he returned to Goa. In April 1596, he went to Macau for a second time to carry out his missionary work in China. He started paying his visits to missionary areas in mainland China in 1601, arrived in Beijing 北京 on August 9, 1602, and stayed there for about 2 months. From 1603 to 1609, he undertook missionary work in southern China and achieved satisfactory results in Shaozhou 韶州, Nanchang 南昌, and Nanjing 南京. From 1611 to 1636, he worked in Macau. Acting as an Inspector of the Society of Jesus in the Far East, he paid visits to various dioceses in China and other countries in order to grasp and solve problems arising during the mission. He died in Macau on November 28, 1639. See [11, p. 20; 33, pp. 74-77; 35, pp. 79-94].

¹² After receiving the letter and request for resolving the contradictions over Chinese Rites between the Portuguese Society of Jesus and the Spanish Mendicant Orders of Juan Bautista Morales, Inspector of the Far East of the Society of Jesus in Macau named Manuel Dias Sénior sent this letter to the Vice-Provincial of the mission in China Francisco Furtado. However, Furtado transferred this issue to the Jesuit missionary Alfonso Vagnone 高一志 who was doing missionary work in the Shandong region at the time. The reply of Alfonso Vagnone from Shandong 山東 took six months to reach Macau, by which time Juan Bautista Morale had returned to Manila (1640). See [15, p. 298].

¹³ In 1649, when returning to China, Juan Bautista Morales foresaw the difficulties caused by the Portuguese Jesuit missionaries. When he set foot in Anhai 安海 (Fujian 福建), he used to provide financial support to the Jesuit missionary Pierre Cunevari who was doing missionary work in here at that time. However, when Juan Bautista Morales proclaimed Decree 1645 of the Holy See to Pierre Cunevari, he received a harsh reaction from this Jesuit missionary. After that, Pierre Cunevari, on the one hand, banned believers in Anhai from having contact with Juan Bautista Morales, on the other hand also used apart of extremist co-religionists to hinder missionary activities of Juan Bautista Morales. See [8, pp. 84; 17, p. 284].

¹⁴ Martino Martini 衛匡國 was an Italian Jesuit missionary, born in 1614 in Trento. He joined the Society of Jesus on October 8, 1631. In 1640, he went to the Far East to evangelize and reached Macao in 1642. From 1643 to 1646, he penetrated mainland China and operated in Zhejiang 浙江, Beijing 北京, Hangzhou 杭州, Fujian 福建. From 1650 to 1656, acting as a Jesuit delegate in China, he returned to Rome to talk to the Pope about the Chinese Rites Controversy between the Society of Jesus and the Mendicant Orders, as well as the viewpoint of adaptation to indigenous culture and open-minded attitude of Jesuit missionaries in China towards Chinese Rites. After returning to China (1658), he evangelized in Hangzhou 杭州 and died here on June 6, 1661. See [29, pp. 106-110; 31, pp. 19-37; 33, pp. 256-262].

¹⁵ In 1661, Juan Bautista Morales along with Spanish Mendicant missionary in China held a conference in Lanxi 蘭溪 (Zhejiang 浙江), continued to criticize the Chinese Rites, insisting that the worship of Confucius and the ancestors of the Chinese people was heavily religious and superstitious behavior, therefore such a worship must be strictly prohibited. After that, they also planned to send people to Rome to express this viewpoint to the Holy See. See [17, pp. 399-401].

¹⁶ François Pallu was appointed as Vicar Apostolic of Tonkin to manage the missionary work in the Kingdom of Tonkin (North and North Central Vietnam today), Laos, along with five provinces in China, namely Yunnan 雲南, Guizhou 貴州, Huguang 湖廣 (Hunan 湖南 and Hubei 湖北 today), Guangxi 廣西, and Sichuan 四川. Lambert de la Motte was appointed Vicar Apostolic of Cochinchina to manage the missionary work in the kingdom of Cochinchina (Central and Southern Vietnam today) as well as the provinces of Zhejiang 浙江, Fujian 福建, Guangdong 廣東, Jiangxi 江西, and Hainan Island 海南島 of China. Ignatius Cotolendi was appointed as Vicar Apostolic of Nanjing 南京 to manage missionary work in Beijing 北京, Jiangsu 江蘇, Henan 河南, Shanxi

山西, Shandong 山東, Shanxi 陝西, and the Kingdom of Korea, Liaodong 遼東, and Mongolia. See [1, p. 494; 18, p. 255].

¹⁷ Charles Maigrot (1652–1730) was a missionary of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris. In 1681, he joined the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris and went to the Far East to evangelize and operate for some time in Siam before going to Fujian 福建, China with missionary François Pallu in 1684. From late 1684, after the death of François Pallu, he assumed the responsibility of managing this missionary area and in 1687 was appointed as Vicar apostolic of Fujian by the Holy See. In 1793, the Chinese Rites Controversy was re-launched by his, to criticize the missionary method as well as the open-minded attitude and guideline of “adaptation to the indigenous culture” of Portuguese Jesuit missionaries, making this from the scope of a dispute between two Christian religious orders grown to a climax period, become a confrontation between the Chinese emperor and the Holy See. Also because of this, in 1707, Charles Maigrot was expelled from China. He returned to Europe, working at the Holy See until he died in 1730. See [11, p. 72, 126-127; 23, pp. 333-335; 27, pp. 368-380; 30, pp. 149-183].

¹⁸ In 1690, Pope Alexander VIII announced to separate the Apostolic Vicariate of Nanjing and the Apostolic Vicariate of Beijing from the management of previous Macau diocese and upgraded to become Beijing diocese and Nanjing diocese. Thus, at that time in China, there were three dioceses. See [26, p. 1259].

¹⁹ Joseph Monteiro, born in 1646, was a Portuguese Jesuit missionary. He joined the Society of Jesus on December 17, 1661. In February 1680, he set foot in China, was sent to Wuchang 武昌 to evangelize. In 1683, he moved to Jiangxi 江西. From 1687 to 1693, he operated at Fujian 福建 and was appointed as Vicar General of the Society of Jesus here (1693). During this time, he was criticized by the missionary of the Society of Foreign Missions of Paris Charles Maigrot. He died in Macau on December 31, 1718. See [11, p. 27, 73; 33, p. 394].

²⁰ Jean Paul Gozani 駱保祿 was an Italian Jesuit missionary, born in 1647 in the citadel of Casal. He joined the Society of Jesus on October 15, 1674. In 1694, he went to China to evangelize and in 1698 he worked in Kaifeng 開封. From 1699 to 1702, he evangelized in Fuzhou, Xinghua 興化 of Fujian 福建 Province. In 1710-1717, he was appointed as Inspector of two missionary areas namely China and Japan and was also the head of the Society of Jesus in Beijing 北京. In 1724, he was sent to Guangzhou 廣州, surreptitiously operated, and was deported back to Macau shortly thereafter. He died in Macau in 1632. See [33, pp. 469-471; 51, p. 179].

²¹ Charles Thomas Maillard de Tournon was born on December 21, 1668, in an aristocratic family in Torino,

Italy. He studied theology (1688) and canon law (1690) at the University of Nice, before being ordained priest on June 12, 1695. From then to 1700, he moved to Rome to work at the Holy See and took over on some important positions. In 1701, he was sent by Pope Clement XI to the Orient to solve the issue of Indian and Chinese rites. On December 4, 1705, he went to Beijing 北京, China. However, he was soon expelled because Emperor Kangxi 康熙 realized his purpose of coming here to convey the decree of the Holy See on the prohibition of Chinese rites. On his way from Beijing 北京 to Guangdong 廣東 to board to Europe, he proceeded to announce the decree of the Holy See on prohibiting Christians from attending and practicing rites of worshipping Confucius and ancestors in Nanjing 南京. Emperor Kangxi knew about this and ordered the Portuguese government in Macau to arrest him. He died in Macau on June 8, 1710. See [16, pp. 107-110; 19, pp. 38-45, 115-150].

²² In 1708, to resolve conflicts and disagreements with the Holy See over the issue of Chinese rites, Emperor Kangxi sent two Jesuit missionaries named Joseph Antoine Provana, Raymond Joseph Arxo and Louis Fan – a Chinese co-religionist baptized by Joseph Antoine Provana to go to Rome for presenting the Pope about the nature of this issue. On January 14, 1708, they departed from Macau, at which time another missionary François Noël accompanied him to Europe. In September 1708, they reached Lisbon and met King João V of Portugal. In February 1709, they arrived in Rome but could not change Pope Clement XI’s thinking about the issue of Chinese rites. Then, for various reasons, they stayed in Europe for quite a long time. It was not until 1719 that, of three people of envoy delegation, only Joseph Antoine Provana and Louis Fan returned to China, because Raymond Joseph Arxo died in 1711. However, during this journey, Joseph Antoine Provana died near the Cape of Good Hope on February 7, 1720, only Louis Fan came to Macau. See [2, pp. 191-192; 7, pp. 87-89; 33, pp. 413-420, 477-480; 34, pp. 664-666; 53, p. 36].

²³ When the conflict between Emperor Kangxi and the Holy See over the issue of Chinese rites took place fiercely in the early 18th century, Emperor Kangxi commanded the missionaries operating in this country that, if they wanted to obtain a permit from the authority to stay in China, they must declare to follow “the rules of Matteo Ricci”, that is to commit to implementing the guideline of adaptation to indigenous culture and have an open and respectful attitude towards Chinese cultural values. See [3, p. 463].

²⁴ Carlo Ambrogio Mezzabarba was born on April 30, 1685, in Pavia, Italy. He was ordained priest on May 1, 1718. In September 1719, he was appointed as Titular Patriarch of Alexandria by the Holy See. In 1720, acting as an Apostolic legate, he went to China to solve the

issue of Chinese rites. When the mission failed, he left China for Europe in December 1721. On July 23, 1725, he was appointed as Bishop of Lodi diocese and took over this position until his death on December 7, 1741. See [37, p. 77, 238; 39, pp. 342-390].

²⁵ The content of the decree *Ex quo singulari* on the Chinese ritual issue has been practiced for almost two centuries. It was not until December 8, 1939, that the Congregation for the Evangelization of the Holy See announced the decree *Plane compertum est*, abolishing the prohibitions inscribed in the decree *Ex quo singulari*, and allowing Chinese Christians to revere Confucius and worshiped their ancestors as infidels. At this point, the debate on the Chinese Rites Controversy was entirely over. See [40, pp. 24-26].

REFERENCES

1. Benedetto R., ed. *The New Westminster Dictionary of Church History*. Louisville-London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2008, vol. 1. 768 p.
2. Brockey L.M. *Journey to the East: The Jesuit Mission to China, 1579-1724*. Cambridge, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007. 512 p.
3. Brown S.J., Tackett T., eds. *Cambridge History of Christianity*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006, vol. 7. 678 p.
4. Cardim A.F. *Relation de la prouince du Japon ecrite en Portugais par le pere François Cardim de la Compagnie de Jésus procureur de cette province*. A Tovrnay, De l'Imprimerie d'Adrien Qvinque', 1645. 308 p.
5. Chan A. *Chinese Materials in the Jesuit Archives in Rome*. New York, London, Routledge, 2002. 626 p.
6. Charbonnier J.P. *Christians in China: A.D. 600 to 2000*. San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 2007. 664 p.
7. Chatterjee K., Hawes C., eds. *Europe Observed: Multiple Gazes in Early Modern Encounters*. Lewisburg, Bucknell University Press, 2008. 279 p.
8. Cummins J.S. *A Question of Rites: Friar Domingo Navarrete and the Jesuits in China*. Aldershot, Scolar Press, 1993. 349 p.
9. Cummins J.S. *Palafox, China and the Chinese Rites Controversy*. Revista de Historia de América, 1961, no. 52, pp. 395-427.
10. Datsyshen V.G. *Christianity in China: History and Modernity*. Moscow, Scientific and educational forum on international relations, 2007. 240 p.
11. De Moidrey P.J. *La hiérarchie catholique en Chine, en Corée et au Japon (1307-1914)*. Changhai, Imprimerie de l'Orphelinat de T'ou-sè-wè, 1914. 301 p.
12. Dehergne J. *Répertoire des jésuites de Chine de 1552 à 1800*. Roma, Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu; Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1973. 430 p.
13. Delacroix S. *Histoire universelle des missions catholiques, tome 2*. Paris, Grund, 1957. 413 p.
14. Dubrovskaya D.V. Jesuits and the Enlightenment: The New Vision of China from Matteo Ricci to Adam Smith. *Orientalistica*, 2018, 1 (2), pp. 194-208.
15. Dunne G.H. *Generation of Giants, The Story of the Jesuits in China in the Last Decades of the Ming Dynasty*. Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1962. 389 p.
16. Duteil J.P. *Le Mandat du ciel: le rôle des Jésuites en Chine, de la mort de François-Xavier à la dissolution de la Compagnie de Jésus (1552-1774)*. Paris, édition Arguments, 1994. 411 p.
17. González J.M. 1964. *Historia de las misiones Dominicanas de China, 1632-1700, tomo 1*. Madrid, Imprenta, Juan Bravo, 1964. 720 p.
18. Hoster B., Kuhlmann D., Wesolowski Z., eds. *Rooted in Hope: Festschrift in Honor of Roman Malek S.V.D. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Oxon-New York, Routledge, 2017, vol. 1. 534 p.
19. Jenkins R.C. *The Jesuits in China and the Legation of Cardinal de Tournon: An Examination of Conflicting Evidence and an Attempt at an Impartial Judgment*. London, David Nutt, 1894. 165 p.
20. Jinghuan S. Tan Ming Qing zhi ji ru Hua Yesu huishi di xueshu chuanjiao [The Missionary Academic Ways of Jesuits into China at the End of the First Period of Qing Dynasty]. *Neimenggu Shida xuebao* [Journal of Inner Mongolia Normal University], 1983, vol. 3, pp. 73-78. (in Chinese).
21. Kaijian T. *Setting Off from Macau: Essays on Jesuit History During the Ming and Qing Dynasties*. Leiden, Brill, 2016. 331 p.
22. Latourette K.S. *A History of Christian Missions in China*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1929. 930 p.
23. Launay. A. *Histoire générale de la Société des missions étrangères, tome premier*. Paris, Tequi, Libraire – éditeur, 1894. 594 p.
24. Liwei W. Wenhua zhengyi hou de quanli jiaofeng – “Liyi zhi zheng” zhong de zongjiao xiuhui chongtu [Power Confrontation After Cultural Disputes – Religious Order Conflicts in the “Chinese Rites Controversy”]. *Shijie lishi* [World History], 2004, vol. 3, pp. 91-100. (in Chinese).
25. Mantine F. *Monseigneur Pigneau de Béhaine évêque D'Adran Dignitaire de Cochinchine*. Paris, Eglises d'Asie, 1999. 256 p.
26. Melton J.G. *Faiths Across Time: 5000 Years of Religious History (4 Vols.)*. Santa Barbara, ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2014. 2023 p.

27. Miller P.N., Louis F., eds. *Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China, 1500-1800*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2012. 426 p.
28. Minamiki G. *The Chinese Rites Controversy: From Its Beginning to Modern Times*. Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1985. 353 p.
29. Mungello D.E. *Curious Land: Jesuit Accommodation and the Origins of Sinology*. Hanolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1989. 405 p.
30. Mungello D.E. *The Chinese Rites Controversy: Its History and Meaning*. Nettetal, Steyler Verlag, 1994. 356 p.
31. Mungello D.E. *The Forgotten Christians of Hangzhou*. Hanolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1994. 248 p.
32. Peter Tze Ming Ng. *Chinese Christianity: An Interplay Between Global and Local Perspectives*. Leiden, Brill, 2012. 258 p.
33. Pfister L. *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne mission de Chine, vol. 1*. Shanghai, Imprimerie de la Mission catholique, 1932. 561 p.
34. Pfister L. *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne mission de Chine, vol. 2*. Shanghai, Imprimerie de la Mission catholique, 1934. 430 p.
35. Pina I.M. Manuel Dias Sénior // Li Manuo (李瑪諾). *Bulletin of Portuguese Japanese Studies*, 2007, vol. 15, pp. 79-94.
36. Ricci M., Trigault N. *China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journals of Matthew Ricci, 1583-1610*. New York, Random House, 1953. 616 p.
37. Ritzler P.R., Sefrin P.P. *Hierarchia Catholica medii et recentioris aevi, volumen V*. Patavii, Messagero di S. Antonio, 1952. 457 p.
38. Ross A.C. *A Vision Betrayed: The Jesuits in Japan and China, 1542-1742*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1994. 216 p.
39. Rosso A.S. *Apostolic Legations to China of the Eighteenth Century*. South Pasadena, P.D. and I. Perkins, 1948. 502 p.
40. *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide. Instructio Circa Quasdam Caeremonias et Iuramentum Super Ritibus Sinensibus*. Acta Apostolicae Sedis, 1940, Annus XXXII, series II, vol. VII, pp. 24-26.
41. Senfu Y. *Zhongguo Jidujiao shi* [History of Christianity in China]. Tapei, Taiwan shangwu yin shuguan, 1978, 419 p. (in Chinese).
42. St. Sure D.F., Noll R.R. *Zhongguo liyi zhi zheng Xiwen wenxian yibai pian (1645-1941)* [100 Roman Documents Concerning the Chinese Rites Controversy (1645-1941)]. Shanghai, Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 2001. 178 p. (in Chinese).
43. St. Thecla A.D. *Opusculum de Sectis Apud Sinenses Et Tunkinenses*. Ithaca, New York, Southeast Asia Program Publications, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, 2002. 239 p.
44. Standaert N. Note on the Spread of Jesuit Writings in Late Ming and Early Qing China. *China Mission Studies (1550-1800) Bulletin*, 1985, vol. 7, pp. 22-32.
45. Tiangang L. *Zhongguo liyi zhi zheng – Lishi, wenxian he yiyi* [Chinese Rites Controversy – History, Documents, and Meaning]. Shanghai, Shanghai Ancient Books Publishing House, 1998. 389 p. (in Chinese).
46. Tournon A. *Histoire des hommes illustres de l'ordre de Saint Dominique, tome cinquième*. A Paris, Babuty, rue Saint Jacques, à Saint Chrysofome, 1749. 872 p.
47. Weixiao C. *Ming Qing zhi j Xibanya Fangjihui zai Hua chuanjiao yanjiu (1579-1732)* [The Spanish Franciscan Mission in the Late Ming and Early Qing Periods of China (1579-1732)]. Beijing, Zhonghua Book Company, 2006. 514 p. (in Chinese).
48. Wei-Ying K., ed. *Missionary Approaches and Linguistics in Mainland China and Taiwan*. Leuven, Leuven University Press, 2001. 278 p.
49. Xianqing Z. 2007. Duomingwohui shi Gao Qi ru Hua shi shi kao [A Study on the Historical Events of Dominican Order Missionary Angelo Cocchi's Entering China]. *Wenhua zazhi* [Review of Culture], 2007, vol. 62, pp. 103-110. (in Chinese).
50. Xianqing Z. Duomingwohui shi Li Yufan yu Zhongguo liyi zhi zheng [St. Dominican Juan Bautista de Morales and the Chinese Rites Controversy]. *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* [Studies in World Religions], 2008, vol. 3, pp. 58-71. (in Chinese).
51. Xin X. *The Jews of Kaifeng, China: History, Culture, and Religion*. Jersey, Ktav Publishing House, Inc, 2003. 197 p.
52. Xinping Z. *Xiangyu yu duihua: Ming mo Qing chu Zhong Xi wenhua jiaoliu guoji xueshu yantao hui wenji* [Meeting and Dialogue: Selected Works of International Workshop on Cultural Exchange Between China and the West in the Late Ming and Early Qing Dynasties]. Beijing, Religious Culture Publishers, 2003. 642 p. (in Chinese).
53. Xiping Z. *Following the Steps of Matteo Ricci to China*. Beijing, China Intercontinental Press, 2006. 176 p.
54. Yunhua L. Li Madou deng zaoqi chuanjiaoshi di xueshu chuanjiao celue ji qi wenhua yiyi [Matteo Ricci and the Other Missionaries' Tactical Choice and Its Cultural Values in Late Ming Dynasty]. *Tianjin Shehui kexue* [Tianjin Social Sciences], 2003, vol. 6, pp. 130-135. (in Chinese).
55. Yuxi W. *Ming-Qing zhiji Tianzhujiao "Shuji chuanjiao" yanjiu (1552-1773)* [A Study of Catholic Proselytizing by Means of Books from the Mid-Ming Dynasty to the Mid-Qing Dynasty (1552-1773)]. Beijing, People's Publishing House, 2017. 282 p. (in Chinese).

Information About the Author

Anh Thuan Truong, Ph.D. History, Head of Department for History of Vietnam and History Teaching Methods, The University of Da Nang, University of Science and Education, Ton Duc Thang St, 459, 55000 Danang, Vietnam, tathuan@ued.udn.vn, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9682-882X>

Информация об авторе

Анх Тхуан Труонг, Ph.D по истории, руководитель департамента истории Вьетнама и методов преподавания истории, Университет Дананга, Университет науки и образования, ул. Тон Дык Тханг, 459, 550000 г. Дананг, Вьетнам, tathuan@ued.udn.vn, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9682-882X>