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...but men do not understand what is in front of their eyes. Everything they cannot see seems opaque to them. If a pregnant woman is thrown into prison, and gives birth in a dungeon, her son will grow up knowing neither sun nor moon, ignorant that there are such things as mountains and rivers, a human race, a universe. A large candle serves as his sun, and a small one as his moon. The few people he sees in the prison are the human race to him. He can think of nothing better than this. He is not aware there is hardship in his prison, he stays there peacefully, he does not think of leaving. But if his mother should speak to him of the splendor of the stars, of the fine objects owned by the wealthy, of the wide expanse and wonder of the world, of the loveliness and loftiness of the sky, he will come to understand that he has only seen some pale echoes of the sun, that his prison indeed is narrow, dirty, stinking. From that time on will he not cease wanting to make his home there? Will he not think, day and night of freeing himself and going to live in joy amid his parents and friends?

-Matteo Ricci, True Meaning of the Lord in Heaven
INTRODUCTION

What follows is to some extent a history of Catholicism in China that begins in the fourteenth century and which is prefaced by a presentation of the history of Nestorianism in seventh century China. The main intention of this work, however, is to trace the Catholic Church's understanding of and changing attitude toward the Chinese folk tradition of ancestor veneration and the ramifications it had especially for Catholic individuals of Chinese ancestry on the mainland, in Taiwan and in the United States. In the process of exploring this issue as it develops particularly from the sixteenth century into the twentieth, I am also essentially examining the way in which two radically different mindsets, or worldviews, begin to interact, attempt to understand and eventually learn from each other. Here I refer to the confrontation of the Western missionary with the native Chinese on Chinese soil, to the Chinese fear and misunderstanding - especially evident during the time of Matteo Ricci in the sixteenth century - of the meaning of Christianity as symbolized by the figure of Christ nailed to the cross; to the Catholic ambivalence as to how, exactly, to interpret the significance and function of the ancestral and Confucian rituals in Chinese life; and to the decision of the Catholic Church to simplify the issue of whether to interpret ancestral rites as being secular or religious in nature by declaring them to be the former. I suggest that the Church simplifies the issue of how to interpret the ancestral rites by declaring them to be civil in Plane compertum est in 1939 because there is an
abundance of evidence which has been accumulated by scholars which indicates that there were then and are now a variety of beliefs associated with the ritual - religious and otherwise. Regardless of this fact, however, because the Church declared the rites to be civil, it created an opportunity for the Western as well as the universal Church to learn from the traditional Chinese values expressed through the enactment of the rites. As a result, the Church has been able to recognize the inherent goodness of these rites and compatibility of their values with that of Christian values. Specifically, the Church recognizes that venerating one's ancestors is consistent with the Communion of Saints in Catholic tradition as well as with the Fifth Commandment to Honor thy Father and thy Mother (Fang n.d.). This recognition has enabled the Church to create a new Catholic liturgy which integrates the Chinese tradition of ancestor veneration with the Catholic traditions just named. Since 1974 when the Chinese Bishops' Conference in Taiwan approved this liturgy, many parishes with a significant number of individuals of Chinese ancestry (other than on mainland China) have increasingly begun performing the ancestor memorial service during, before, but typically after a Chinese New Year Mass, and sometimes on other occasions as well. Thus, here I explore how after the initial reaction of fear and confusion on the part of the Chinese in reaction to the Western missionaries, some Chinese have indeed converted to Catholicism.¹ In addition, I here describe how after the confusion and

¹Sister Janet Carroll, Director of the United States Catholic China Bureau (per. com. 1994) reports that although the official number given for Catholics
ambivalence expressed by the Chinese Rites Controversy (1645-1939) amongst different Catholic orders, how the Catholic Church - with Westerners still largely in the role of decision makers - came not only to accept (after carefully imbuing the folk tradition with at first a secular, and then strictly Catholic interpretation) but to integrate the ancestral veneration ceremony into the Catholic liturgy. Finally, I am able to predict, based on evidence already available from United States parishes, that to whatever ends of the globe the Chinese Catholic diaspora reaches, that there the teachings of the Confucian tradition as expressed through the ancestral rites within the context of the Catholic Church will have significance for individuals of the universal Church no matter what their particular worldview or ethnic background - which is an example of one of the major goals of Vatican II: to share, as Catholics, the specific traditions and genius of a particular culture with those of others throughout the globe (Abbott 606).

The methodology used in attempting to achieve an understanding of this topic involved extensive library research, attendance at five ancestral memorial services in northeastern United States' parishes with a significant community of ethnic Chinese, personal and telephone interviews with Catholic clergy

on the mainland is four million, Father John Tang, Director of the Holy Spirit Centre in Hong Kong, estimates there are eight million above ground and underground Catholics on the mainland. Sister also indicates that the official number of Catholic Chinese in Taiwan was 290,000 in 1989; I do not have figures for Hong Kong; Reverend Joseph Chiang, Director of the National Center for the Chinese Apostolate (per. com. 1994), indicates that there are 65,000 Catholics of Chinese ancestry in the United States.
and/or scholars who have knowledge and experience with the development and/or performance of the ancestor memorial service as well as interviews with parishioners who attend these services. I have also corresponded (and had a few telephone conversations) with liturgists, theologians, and missionaries in Taiwan, Hong Kong and Rome. Finally, in January of this year, I composed a survey which consists of thirteen questions concerned with the Catholic performance of the ancestral memorial service and which I sent out to thirty-one parishes with a significant community of individuals of Chinese ancestry all throughout the United States, the names of which I acquired from the San Francisco Chinese Catholic Newsletter.2

To be more specific as to the evolution of my interest in and research of this topic, I first learned about the performance of the ancestor memorial service in the Catholic Church during the years of 1982-1984 when I was living in Hsin Chu, Taiwan. During my first year there, I taught English at a private school and lived with an American Baptist missionary, Beverly Morris, who taught school to three young children of other American and Dutch Baptist missionaries in the one room school which was located in the backyard of our large Western style house. (This living situation had been arranged for me prior to my arrival by Sheila Wan, the owner of the school where I taught.) Because the house Beverly and I lived in was near a large and beautiful Catholic Church, during times of homesickness, quite frankly, I would wander through our

2See Appendix 1 for a copy of the survey and a sample cover letter.
meandering neighborhood alleyways over to that place where I befriended Sister George, a Chinese Catholic nun, who had lived in the United States for about nine years and who was, therefore, completely fluent in English. (I only knew a few words of Chinese at the time.) Sister George was the only nun at this parish, and on occasion I would visit her in her tiny and austere bedroom with a single bed above which hung a crucifix, and in which two wooden chairs were placed next to each other, but facing in the same direction. Here we sat and chatted. It was during these visits that Sister informed me of the performance of the ancestor service in the Catholic Church and of the establishment of the Catholic Church on mainland China in the sixteenth century largely due to the efforts of Matteo Ricci and other Jesuits. These stories made a deep impression on me as I had been raised a Catholic and had never learned of such a performance in the Church, nor had I studied the history of Catholic missions in China. Therefore, it was truly a fascinating experience for me to be learning about such issues while living in Taiwan surrounded by missionaries. In addition to my having met Sister George, I also had the opportunity to visit a large Catholic center which had at one time been the language school for Catholic missionaries. Sheila Wan found my wonderful Chinese teacher for me there: Mr. Lyou, who had been an officer in the Kuomintang army, changed careers to that of a Chinese language teacher when he and his family fled from the mainland to Taiwan with the Communist takeover in 1949. What is of special interest here in regard to Hsin Chu and the Catholic mission there, is that several of the Catholic
clergy whom I have interviewed here in the United States for this project either lived in and/or spoke of Hsin Chu during our conversations about our subject. Sister Janet Carroll of the United States Catholic China Bureau and Reverend Larry Barnett, both former Taiwan missionaries, are two examples I have in mind.

Although I learned about Chinese ancestor veneration in the Catholic Church from personal experience about a decade ago, it was not until I entered the doctoral program in the Department of Folklore and Folklife here at the University of Pennsylvania (Penn) six years ago that I was in a position to study the topic in any depth (this was despite the fact that I had lived in Shanghai for one year in the interim). Because I took Dr. David Hufford's Ethnography of Belief course in the fall of 1988 I was able, within that context, to explore such a topic. At this time, I interviewed two very important individuals who helped to deepen both my knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject: one was Ching Shyong Liu who was a Penn graduate student in engineering at the time; the other was Reverend Paul Tsau, who was temporarily the pastor at Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church in Philadelphia's Chinatown. From Reverend Tsau, I learned about the specifics of the Chinese Rites Controversy in China; from Ching Shyong, I learned about the specifics of his personal experience with the ritual both in Taiwan and at Holy Redeemer Church where he was a parishioner before returning to his native Taiwan after graduation in 1989.

Because of my emotional and intellectual involvement in this topic of ancestor veneration in relation to Catholicism and because of
Dr. David Hufford's overwhelmingly enthusiastic response to the paper I wrote for his class my first semester at Penn, I eventually decided to develop that paper into this doctoral dissertation. After having begun research on a topic which was not appropriate for me, I asked myself the correct questions: Which paper did you find to be the most meaningful and engaging out of all of the papers you have written for your course work? Which paper has the most relevance to your life, and with additional work, could make an original contribution to scholarship?

After my commitment to this topic had been made in January of 1992, I began to frequent Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church. I contacted Reverend Luke Chow, Ph.D., who had replaced Reverend Paul Tsau, and he invited me to attend the ancestor memorial service which was to be conducted during Chinese New Year that year. I accepted his invitation and on Sunday, February 9, 1992 I attended my first ancestor memorial service in the Catholic Church accompanied by two friends and an acquaintance, Cecilia Kim, a Penn student from Seoul, Korea and her friend, and Min-Yin Niau, a doctor from Shanghai. Although Cecilia and I took pictures during this ceremony, none of them came out! However, the following year, on January 24, 1993, I had another opportunity to take pictures and tape-record the ancestral memorial service as it took place after Mass during Chinese New Year at Holy Redeemer. On this day, I was accompanied by another friend, Jian-Ping Cheng, a lawyer from Shanghai. By this time Father Chow had left, and Father Thomas Betz, O.F.M., Cap. and and Father Gregory Chervenak, O.F.M..Cap. said
the New Year Mass in English. (Both of these priests are Caucasian and neither of them understood any Chinese at the time.) However, the main celebrant of the ancestral rite, which was said in Chinese, was Reverend Thomas Sung C.S.J.B., of Elmhurst, New York, a scholar and a priest originally from Taiwan. Reverend Sung is a significant figure in regard to the research for this dissertation for it is he who informed me that the liturgy which he used at Holy Redeemer was from the Chinese Bishops' Conference in Taipei, Taiwan. It was because of this contact that I came to know the source of many of the ancestor memorial liturgies which are used in parishes in the United States. After observing, recording, and taking pictures of the ancestor memorial service at Holy Redeemer in 1993, I interviewed Father Thomas Betz, once in person with my tape recorder and on a couple of occasions on the telephone over the course of the next year and one half. In addition, I also formally interviewed four parishioners from Holy Redeemer: On-Lei Tsang, George Moy, Pauline Li, and Kurt Jung. I also had a few informal conversations with others whom I know from Holy Redeemer such as with Cecilia Moy Yep, my former employer and Director of the Philadelphia Chinatown Development Corporation (PCDC), a grassroots organization which formed to "preserve, protect and promote Chinatown," as stated in the 1992 PCDC Brochure.

Before Father Luke Chow left Holy Redeemer (I had a telephone interview with him this year, incidentally), he recommended that I contact Reverend Joseph Chiang, the Director of the National Pastoral Center of the Chinese Apostolate in New York,
and priest in residence at Our Lady of the Visitation Church in Paramus, New Jersey. I first contacted him on January 15, 1992 and he has been a continual source of information for this project ever since that time. In fact, it is Father Chiang's performance of the ancestor memorial service at his Paramus parish which took place on February 28, 1993 to which I devote most of my attention in describing one service and in analyzing its significance with thoroughness. This February day in 1993 during which I took slides and tape-recorded his entire ceremony, I also interviewed two Catholics who attended his service. One was Gloria Sung-Lee, an immigrant from Taiwan, the other was Nauia Sorhainico, an immigrant from the West Indies.

This past Chinese New Year of 1994, I had the opportunity to take slides of and tape-record two additional ancestral services which were conducted on February 13 in Catholic Churches which are located just within a few blocks from each other in New York City's Chinatown. The first was a small service of about 50 parishioners, all ethnic Chinese, which was held in a library of St. Theresa's Church. Reverend John B. Chiang was the main celebrant. The service was conducted in Chinese; however, the very brief homily was given in English as well as in Chinese. The ancestral service which was performed at St. Joseph's Church in Chinatown an hour later was the largest and most festive production I have observed in my fieldwork. Unlike Holy Redeemer, and Our Lady of the Visitation parishes, which attracted individuals who were predominantly of Chinese ancestry, and unlike St. Theresa's parish which was
composed of only those of Chinese ancestry (except for me), St. Joseph's Church held the service after Mass (as all the others did) but for a congregation in which the parishioners of Chinese descent were not the majority. Rather, out of the 260 or so in attendance, only about 75 were of Chinese ancestry. The rest of the congregation was largely composed of individuals of Italian and Hispanic ancestry. I briefly interviewed Reverend Andrew Brizzolara on this day, the main celebrant of the Mass who gave a homily on the significance of the rites, and who co-narrated the ancestral memorial service in English along with Reverend Peter Tsoi, who was the main celebrant of the ancestral rites and who co-narrated in Chinese.

The interviewing techniques I used for gathering information for this project changed as the development of my main interests became more focused. Before I had read much of the enormous amount of material which is available on the history of Catholic missions in China, I was more concerned with discovering the attitude of the folk toward the ancestor memorial service as it is performed in the Catholic Church and the meaning it has in their lives. Although I have remained interested in these questions, it is not my main focus. As I state above, the main intention of this project is to explore the changing position of the Catholic Church toward this very ancient folk practice of ancestor veneration. Therefore, when I interview the folk (and not too many of them), I ask them about the significance and history of the rites in their lives, and I incorporate this information into my narrative when I can. When I first began interviewing, I had a tendency to use more of the
directed interview technique: I brought my list of prepared questions with me during the interview (MacDonald 420). As my focus changed, and I became less concerned with the folk's view of the situation, my interviewing techniques relaxed and my strategy was more indirect. That is, I would ask a general question about the significance and history of the service in their lives, and they would respond as they saw fit. However, I must state, that even from the start, my interviewing strategy in relation to parishioners was probably a combination of both direct and indirect interviewing. In regard to the way in which I gathered information from Catholic scholars and clergy through interviews, I would just generally talk to them about anything which was on my mind at the moment in reference to the rites, or else I would only ask them specific questions because I knew they had a special expertise in this area. For example, when I phoned the liturgist Reverend Mark Fang at Fujen Catholic University in Taipei, Taiwan, I had one specific question in mind concerning the Salutation which is included in a number of the Chinese American liturgies.

Some of my missionary contacts, both here and abroad, were largely made due to the suggestions of Sister Janet Carroll, Director of the United States Catholic China Bureau. If she had not given me the name of Father Larry Barnett S.S.C., a former missionary in Hsin Chu and presently in a doctoral program at Cornell, I would never have corresponded with Luis Gutheinz, S.J. of the Faculty of Theology at Fujen Catholic University, Taipei, and as a result, have him send me a

3See Appendix II for the list of questions.
copy of his article in German entitled "Ancestor Veneration in China?" This article, which I had translated by David Odell, Administrator in the Department of Folklore and Folklife, is crucial to this dissertation. This piece describes in detail the very first ancestor memorial service which was conducted by a member of the Catholic clergy. Here I refer to the performance of the ritual in Taipei in 1971 by Cardinal Yu Pin (whom I had heard about repeatedly from Catholic clergy during interviews or in correspondence before having the Gutheinz article sent to me). In addition, if Sister Janet Carroll had not given me the name of Father Larry Lewis, M.M. of the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers, also a former missionary in Taiwan, I would not have had the wonderful luck to have been put in touch with Reverend Edward J. Flanigan, M.M. of the Maryknoll Society House and Director of the Language School in Taichung, Taiwan. Although Reverend Lewis gave me the name of Father James T. Manning in Taichung, to whom I wrote in regard to the history of the service in the Catholic Church after the Cardinal's first performance, it was Reverend Flanigan who responded by sending me a tape-recording of a description of a typical ancestor memorial service which would take place at his parish in Taichung during Chinese New Year. He also informed me in his recording of the history of his experience with the service during his thirty years as a missionary in Taiwan. However, Father Flanigan's contribution to this project - strictly out of the goodness of his heart - did not end there. After I had contacted both the Chinese Bishops' Conference and the liturgist Reverend Mark Fang in Taiwan
(the latter at the recommendation of Father Edward J. Malatesta, Director of The Ricci Institute in San Francisco) with a request that the ancestor memorial service liturgy be sent to me, and after Reverend Fang did indeed send me a copy (and Yves Raquin, S.J. of the Ricci Institute for Chinese Studies in Taipei confirmed through correspondence that he had) and after the Secretary General of the Chinese Bishops Conference, Most Reverend Leonard Hsu, O.F.M. had also sent me a copy of the liturgy (and Reverend Peter Cheng, Deputy Secretary General of the Chinese Bishops' Conference confirmed through correspondence that he had), I had Rosa Chen, a Chinese instructor at Penn, translate it into English. (Interestingly enough, Rosa was a student at Tsing Hua University, Hsin Chu, at the time I was teaching there during my second year in Taiwan although I only met her here when I needed a translator.) However, because this translation was not completely satisfactory largely due to the fact that Rosa, though very competent, is not a Christian, I called Father Flanigan and requested that he please translate it for the sake of the worthiness of this project. He sent me a beautiful translation less than a week later.

Sister Janet Carroll is also completely responsible for the excellent translations which were done of the Chinese American liturgical texts which I accumulated by her assistant, Hu Wei, at the United States Catholic China Bureau. When Sister Janet learned of my experience of having to make a double effort to have the Taiwan Chinese Bishops' Conference Ancestor Memorial Service Liturgy properly translated, she volunteered to have Hu Wei do the
translations of the American versions of the ancestor liturgies that have been used by Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church in Philadelphia (two versions), Our Lady of the Visitation Church in Paramus, the Church of the Saint Joseph and Saint Theresa's Church in New York, as well as a liturgical text from Seattle Diocese.⁴

The first four liturgical texts I collected in person when I attended the ceremonies, as described above. The other two were sent to me when I sent out the survey - which I also briefly mention above - in January of this year. With my thirteen survey questions I included a letter addressed to the pastor of these thirty-one parishes in which I requested that any other relevant information such as Church bulletins or articles on the Chinese American service be sent to me if possible. May Wong was kind enough to respond by sending me the liturgy which Seattle Archdiocese has used; Sister Maria Hsu of the Archdiocese of San Francisco and Reverend Clifford Martin of Saint Anne's Church in San Francisco sent me a copy of the liturgy which was used at St. Mary's Cathedral in 1993. However, St. Mary's liturgy provided both English and Chinese, so no translation was needed. In addition, Bernadette Wang of Plano, Texas, sent me the liturgy for the ancestral memorial service and the outline for the Mass as followed on Chinese New Year by The Chinese Catholics of the Diocese of Dallas. Unfortunately these last texts came to late to be translated for this project.

⁴See Appendix III for the Chinese versions and English translations of these texts. Also find there the Chinese and English translation of the "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy (for Church and Family use)" as published by the Chinese Bishops' Conference in Taipei, Taiwan, 1974.
A further description of the methodology used to gather, synthesize, analyze and present the material found herein also involves translation. Although I have studied Mandarin, I am not fluent. Therefore, I needed assistance when transcribing the recording I had of the Chinese New Year Mass and Chinese ancestor memorial service which I attended on February 28, 1993 at Our Lady of the Visitation Church in Paramus, New Jersey since that is the service to which I have devoted my most detailed attention. Rachael Chen, formerly of Canton, China, with a master's degree from Cheyney University of Pennsylvania, presently lives in Philadelphia's Chinatown with her husband. It was she who listened to the tape with me while I reviewed my notes, examined the slides and the Chinese liturgical text which was passed out prior to the Mass, as well as Hu Wei's translation of it, in a deserted, and therefore quiet, Chinatown restaurant for several hours one day. In this way, she enabled me to describe to the best of our ability exactly what occurred from the very moment the Mass ended and the ancestor memorial service - which was predominantly conducted in Mandarin, but which was prefaced by an English introduction which elaborated upon the significance of the rites - began. (My Walkman did a fairly good job!)

In sum, my methodology for approaching the subject of the changing position of the Church toward the practice of Chinese ancestor veneration which moved from one of acceptance by the Jesuits in the sixteenth century (though this was not absolutely immediate nor completely unanimous) to one of confusion during
the Chinese Rites Controversy, and the ultimate rejection of the rites for Chinese Catholics in 1742, to a secularizing of the ancestral rites in 1939, to a beginning of the process of sacralizing them by Cardinal Yu Pin's 1971 performance, to the culmination of this latter process with the creation and approval of the Chinese Bishops' Conference liturgy in 1974 and to the increase of the Catholic performance of the ritual amongst individuals of Chinese ancestry as well as for those of other groups, was multifarious: I trace this historical development strictly through library research until the momentous year of 1939; then I begin to construct the largely unwritten history (in English, at least) of the development of the performance of this service in the Catholic Church by gathering information through personal tape-recorded interviews, correspondence, telephone conversations, recorded observation, and the distribution of a survey. (Two articles are essential to our understanding of its development after 1939, however - the unpublished article of Reverend Mark Fang entitled "A Short Comment on Ancestor Veneration," and the Luis Gutheinz, S.J. article mentioned above.) My hope is that others will find my presentation of this material to be as worthy of attention as the process of discovery has been fascinating for me. I certainly did not write this history by myself.
CHAPTER 1
NESTORIANS IN CHINA: THE FIRST PERIOD
635 A.D. - 845 A.D.

The Christian missionary scholar Reverend John Stewart states that "tradition" has it that there were Christian missionaries in China as early as 61 A.D. (xxvii:169), and Stewart as well as scholars A.C. Moule and A.H. Rowbotham put forth that the writer Arnobus of 300 A.D. claims that Christianity existed in China during his time (Stewart 170; Moule 1930:22; Rowbotham 3). In addition, Moule and the Nestorian scholar Aubrey R. Vine maintain that the writer Cosmas Indicopleustes, who wrote about 530 A.D., indicates that there were Christians in China during his era (Moule 1930:23; Vine 61). However, all Christian missionary scholars agree that the most reliable extant evidence available for the absolute certain presence of Christian missionaries in China was not until the year 635 when the Nestorian missionary named Alopen arrived from Syria (Cameron 18; Cary-EIwes 14-20; Legge 1966:38; Moule 1930:27; Rowbotham 6-7; Stewart 170; Vine 130; Apren 654; Holm 21-23; Saeki 1916:165; Latourette 1929:53 ). The evidence to which I refer in regard to this early Nestorian missionary activity is threefold: the writings on the 781 A.D. Nestorian Monument of Hsi-an Fu in Shen-hsi, northwest China; Chinese historical documents; and the manuscripts of Tun-Huang cave, also in northwest China, discovered by the scholars Paul Perriot and Sir Aurel Stein in 1908.

The Nestorian Monument at Hsi-an Fu, which was erected in
The Nestorian Monument at Hsi-an Fu, which was erected in 781 A.D. when the Christian religion was favorably looked upon by the Chinese state, is now believed by Sinologists to have been deliberately buried by these Christians when the religion fell into disfavor with the Emperor Wu Tsang in 845 (Legge 1966:50; Cameron 25; Cary-Elwes 28). The monument was not rediscovered until the early seventeenth century when workers were digging for the purpose of building on that spot. In the West, there were many scholars at that time who were skeptical as to whether or not the monument was authentic or a creation of the Jesuits who were in the midst of a great proselytizing effort in China. Men such as Voltaire and La Craze in France, and Bishop Horne in England asserted that the monument was fabricated by these Catholic missionaries in order to demonstrate that their religion was not new, but was part of an ancient tradition, and therefore worthy of being taken seriously by the Chinese (since the Chinese have a tradition of venerating tradition) (Legge 1966:37; Saeki 1916:33). As was anticipated by these Westerners, the historian Mosheim reports that the emperor of China in 1625, Hsi Tsung, felt he was no longer able to argue against Christianity because it was a new religion since the discovery of the Nestorian Monument proved its existence for at least one thousand years. As the missionary scholar Arnold Rowbotham states in Missionary and Mandarin: The Jesuits at the Court of China, "About the year 1625 some workmen, digging near the ancient capital of China...unearthed a large tablet of the kind called by the Chinese pei and used for various commemorative purposes...the discovery was of
inestimable value to the spread of Christianity since it gave to the faith an aura of antiquity in a land where ancient tradition was the basis of all respect and ability" (6). Although scholar James Legge claims that some skeptics still existed at the time of the writing of his work, *The Nestorian Monument of Hsi-an Fu* in 1888, in 1966 Rowbotham concludes that "Scholars today have rendered their verdict and have, by a large majority, accepted the Nestorian tablet as authentic" (7). In addition, William Clark puts forth that "Western scholars frequently doubted the authenticity of the tablet until they had examined it more carefully" (13).

The Nestorian Monument which the Chinese laborers dug up in the city of Chou-chih (which is about thirty or forty miles southwest or west of Hsi-an) in the seventeenth century is approximately nine feet tall, one foot thick, three and one half feet wide, and is made of black oolitic limestone. It consists of two parts: the lower rectangular section - which is about 6 feet, 5 inches high - contains an inscription and list of names (Moule 1930:30-32); the two foot three inch upper section is in the shape of the top half of an oval figure. In the middle section toward the base of the upper part of the monument are nine Chinese characters in rows of three. These nine characters can be translated as "The Illustrious Religion of Ta Ts'in," the meaning of which is described below. Above these nine characters on the head of the monument is a cross which is embedded in a lotus and clouds. On either side of the title, the cross, the clouds, and the lotus, stand dragons, whose arms, reaching up above the cross meet at a point where they hold a pearl. The lower part of the monument contains
inscriptions on the two sides and front face in Chinese and Syriac characters.

After the monument, which was a piece of "beautiful workmanship and in a perfect state of preservation," was completely uncovered, the governor of the area had the carved stone moved to a Taoist temple not far from the west gate of Hsi-an (Moule 1930:28). There it was seen by a scholar named Cheng Keng-yu, who, due to the fact that he had met the Italian Jesuit missionary Matteo Ricci years before, was able to recognize the message of the Chinese characters to be a Christian one. Cheng immediately made a rubbing of the inscription and sent it to his Christian friend, Li Chih-tsao in Hangchow (Moule 1930:29; Cary-Elwes 18; Legge 1966:35). Moule reports that Li "lost no time in having the inscription, which can hardly have reached him before the latter half of April, printed with an explanatory note which bears a date corresponding to 12 June, 1625" (1930:30). Li Chih-tsao was accompanied in Hangchow by Alvarez Semedo, Procurator of the Provinces of China and Japan. In his book History of the Great and Renowned Monarchy of China, published in 1626, he reports that copies of the inscription were published and circulated by Christians throughout the empire with much happiness (Legge 1966:35-36). The Japanese scholar P.Y. Saeki reports that the inscription was first translated into French. He also speculates that the Italian version was made from Portuguese by Semedo (1916:28).

The nine characters which are located in the middle section of the monument which translate as "The Illustrious Religion of Ta
Ts'in," as mentioned above, refers to that manifestation of Christianity known as Nestorianism. Ta Ts'in is believed by most scholars to refer to Syria or to the Near East in general, which is where Nestorianism was primarily centered (Latourette 1929:53). Thus, we learn from the title of the stone slab that the information provided in the inscriptions concerns a religion which comes from this geographical location. Scholar Mar Aprem indicates that a large proportion of the inscription is written in the Chinese language, while the Syriac writings are located on the extreme right of the tablet above and below the Chinese. He reports that in Chinese is written in one column, "Composed by Ching-ching, monk of the Ta chin (Syrian) monastery" (68). In Syriac it is also written, "Adam, Priest, Corepiscopos and Faqshi (teacher of the doctrine) of Sinestan (China)" (68). Thus, the author of the work is commonly known as Adam Ching-ching (Cary-Elwes 14). Aprem also indicates that altogether the inscription contains two-hundred and fifty lines, with ten stanzas at the bottom of the monument (68-69). After the verses, the date is given, then the inscription of the man who actually wrote the characters, Lu Hsui-yen. Finally, Aprem states, "After some inscriptions written in both Syriac and Chinese alternately we reach the left face of the Monument where the names of 70 monks and priests are given in both languages" (69).

James Legge efficiently categorizes the inscription into three parts: the doctrinal, historical, and eulogistic (1966:39). An edited version of Legge's doctrinal summary follows: In this part of the inscription an uncaused personal God, the creator - "Three-in-One" -
is first described (1966:39); the second paragraph describes the creation of man and of the universe; the third tells of "the Fall of the first man, and the subsequent degeneracy of his descendents"; the fourth how God intercedes to help humankind and is born of a Virgin in Ta Ts'in. Legge then claims that the work of Jesus on earth is told, but that the "crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection are not mentioned" (1966:40). The last part of the doctrinal section describes the communities of the Messiah's ministers and how their purpose "is to diffuse harmony, goodness, and prosperity" (Legge 1966:41).

The historical section of the inscription is fascinating for here we learn when, how, and by whom Christianity was first introduced to China; however, in this examination of the history of the introduction of Christianity to China, I will go beyond the information provided on the monument according to Legge when other scholars provide further details. The carvings on the monument indicate that Alopen, from Syria, introduced Nestorianism to China in 635 A.D. as stated above. (As Nigel Cameron points out, Alopen was, therefore, the "first Western visitor to China whose name is known" (19).) The emperor of the then thriving Tang dynasty, Tai Tsung, is reported to have sent his brother to have welcomed the foreigner and his embassy (Aprem 65). (Christian historian Kenneth Latourette informs us that the Chinese Empire during this time was one of the largest and the richest in the world. The Emperor had political power to one degree or another over "China Proper, Manchuria, Mongolia, Northern Korea, Tibet, Sinkiang, part of Central Asia, Northern India, Tongking, and Annam" (1929: 51).) After much
discussion with the Emperor, and after Alopen spent three years in the Palace Library translating some of the Christian books he had brought with him, Tai Tsung declared that this religion could be disseminated throughout his empire in an Imperial Edict of 638 (Cary-Elwes 24). He also ordered a monastery to be built in the capital which included a portrait of himself (Latourette 1929: 54). We should keep in mind that the Tang dynasty during this time was extremely tolerant of foreigners. Cameron claims that there were many Westerners who came to Hsi-an Fu in the 600's to do trade. Thus, Alopen "most certainly did not find himself an isolated representative of a foreign land," and he was not the only representative of a foreign religion by any means (Cameron 20-21). In excavated tombs can be found people of the Middle East, Armenia, Greece, and Central Asia (Cameron 20). Foreigners represented Manichaens, Zoroastrians, Moslems, Jews, and Buddhists in this city (Cameron 23; Latourette 1929:52). It is known that Tai Tsung treated the Nestorians with the same amount of openness and toleration as he did the Buddhists even though some scholars such as Cary-Elwes even suggest that this emperor favored Buddhism over Nestorianism (24). Under the rule of Tai Tsung's son, Kao Tsung (650-83), the religion of Nestorianism thrived even more fully than when his father was in command, for he had a monastery built in each of his ten prefectures (Cary-Elwes 24). This is especially interesting to note because this emperor was a Taoist. However, Nestorianism finally began to suffer in China under Empress Wu (684-705). This empress, who had previously been a concubine of Tai Tsung,
temporarily lived in a Buddhist monastery after Tai Tsung's death (Shyrock 132). Because Kao Tsung had a passion for her, he later removed her from the nunnery and took her as his concubine with his wife's approval. However, the Empress Wu, who proved to be extremely evil and covetous of power, is reported to have cut off the hands and feet of Kao Tsung's wife, put her in a vat of wine, and then decapitated her after she was certain she was in possession of the emperor's power (Cary-Elwes 25). Although the inscription on the Nestorian Monument does not go into the gory details as I have just done in regard to Empress Wu, it does state that two of her twenty year reign, the years 698-99, were particularly difficult for Nestorianism in China. Cary-Elwes maintains that because Empress Wu was a Buddhist herself, when her Buddhist supporters spoke against the "Illustrious Religion" in 698-699, Wu attempted to make Buddhism the state religion by setting up numerous monasteries in the empire (25; Latourette 1929:54). Empress Wu died in 705 before wiping out Nestorianism in China; however, Nestorianism was also "ridiculed and derided" by Taoists, as the inscription states, during the reign of her son who was assassinated in 710 (Cary-Elwes 25). Under the rule of Hsuan-Tsung (712-55), the next emperor of the empire, the situation again became easier for Christianity. As the inscription describes it, "The consecrated rafters, which had been temporarily bent, were once more straightened" (Saeki 1916:168).

Cary-Elwes maintains that the reign of Hsuan-Tsung was a glorious time for China and for Nestorianism in China. Not only was the empire benefiting from internal peace, but it was also
experiencing an artistic renaissance; however, externally, control over Central Asia was being threatened by Islam, and this served to help the power of the Nestorian Church in China since Nestorians were also battling "Mohammedan intruders" in Central Asia (26). The inscription on the monument reflects this "politico-religious" situation, as Cary-Elwes states it, for he indicates that two missionaries who arrived in Hsi-an Fu at this time for the purpose of converting the city's inhabitants were ordered by Hsuan-Tsung to perform Christian rituals in the Hsing-ching Palace (26). This fact suggests to Cary-Elwes that this emperor may even have become a Christian (26). If he did become a Christian, the conversion would undoubtedly have made him feel somewhat more secure that the Christians to the west may have become his allies if necessary.

Sources other than the monument provide evidence that after the death of Hsuan-Tsung, the status of the Nestorian Church in China was unstable, but the inscription does not go into detail again about the history of Nestorianism in China until it describes the reign of Emperor Teh Tsung, who was responsible for the erection of the tablet in 781 A.D.. Although it is not clear to me from available sources to what religion Teh Tsung belonged, Reverend John Stewart maintains that there was a large community of Christians in China in 780 A.D., and he even goes so far as to suggest Christianity was "either the dominant religion of the state or that it occupied a very important position therein" (185). Saeki tends to agree with these conclusions for he claims that for at least two centuries of the Tang dynasty China was to a large extent under the influence of
Christianity (Saeki 1916:93). The inscription does tell us of the coming of I-ssu during this period, who was a native of Balkh (which is now located in Afghanistan), and "whose gifts appear to have been the occasion of the erection of the monument" (Latourette 1929:54). China missionary scholar Latourette points out that I-ssu held a high ranking status in the Chinese government during the eighth century as a result of having helped to "suppress a rebellion," and, as a result was in good standing with the emperor (1929:54). He fails to mention, however, that the cause for celebration was not only due to the fact that I-ssu gave generously to the monasteries, but that he had also converted from Buddhism to Christianity as Legge points out (Legge 1966:53-54).

Although Nestorianism thrived during the reign of Teh-Tsung - as symbolized by the erection of the Nestorian Monument in the late eighth century - this secure situation did not last for long. When the Taoist Wu Tsung came into power, he issued an edict in 845 A.D. which suppressed all foreign religions, not only that of Nestorianism. Cary-Elwes suggests that one of Wu Tsung's motives for issuing the edict was due to the fact that he was fighting and losing many of his wars on the northern frontier, and as a result, needed the money and the labor which was being put into these foreign religions instead of into his own causes. Wu Tsung's edict states the following:

This then is what I decree: first, that more than 4600 monasteries (Bonzeries), which are spread here and there and everywhere throughout the Empire, be completely destroyed: consequently let the Bonzes, men and women, who inhabit those monasteries and who, in all, number 260,5000, return to
the world, and pay their proportion of ordinary taxes. Secondly, let more than 40,000 monasteries also be destroyed, less numerous, which are spread in the countryside: consequently let the lands that were attached which amount to and let 150,000 slaves belonging to the Bonzes be put under the rule of the Magistrates and be considered part of the people.

As for the foreign Bonzes (monks) who come here, to make known the Law which is current in their Kingdom, there are about 3,000 of them, both from Tachin and from Mu-hu-po. My command is that they also return to the world so that in the customs of our Empire there be no mixture. Alas! It is only too long that people have delayed to put things back on their ancient footing! Why delay any longer? The thing is finished and done. In view of the present command, let it be put into education. Such is our will (Cary-Elwes 31-32).

Scholars such as Latourette, Legge, and Cameron claim that it is not certain what happened to the Nestorians after this fateful 845 edict; however, there has been speculation as reported by Mar Aprem, Cary-Elwes, Saeki and Clark. Both Cary-Elwes and Aprem mention the possibility that the Nestorians became Moslem, Buddhist or Manichean (Cary-Elwes 32; Aprem 72-73). Saeki and Aprem indicate the possibility that some Nestorians joined any of the ten existing secret societies, the description of which is beyond the scope of this project (Saeki 1966:53-56; Aprem 73); however, I will note Saeki's characterization of the Chin-tan Chiao society, or the "Religion of the Pill of Immortality," in order to at least give the reader a general idea of the reasons for the connections made between these societies and Nestorianism. Saeki states that this society is "decidedly Christian in character, and that it is a relic of the
Nestorians who set up our Monument we are convinced from both internal and external evidence" (1916:49). One piece of evidence which Saeki feels gives strength to his argument is his finding that it was the author of the characters of the monument who happened to be the founder of this Chin-tan Chiao society (1916:53-56). Latourette, however, questions the strength of this connection and claims that this "guess" needs further justification (1929:55). Clark maintains that many Nestorians withdrew from the capital of China after the 845 edict and took on the mission of converting Mongols and other indigenous peoples in the west of China (14). He offers no evidence for this assertion, however.

The third, and eulogistic part of the monument praises the Nestorian conception of God and their religion as well as certain Chinese emperors. To give the reader at least an idea of the feeling and content of the eulogy, I offer the first two lines of a few of the eight stanzas of verse: "(I) He, the true Lord, Himself uncaused, Profound and still, is aye the same... (IV) Hsuan Tsung his sacred course began; His mind pursued the Truth and Right... (VI) Tai Tsung was Filial and Just, Both heaven and earth were in him found... (VII) Our emperor of the present time, Has widest sway and virtue bright" (Legge 1966:27-29). This lovely eulogy is a poetic testimony to the Nestorian love and worship of their God and to their love and appreciation of the Chinese emperors who allowed them to express their religious views and tradition with toleration and, at times, encouragement and support.
In the twentieth century, the history of the Nestorian Monument in the world continues to develop. In 1907 the Nestorian Monument was moved to what is known as the "Pei-in" or the "Forest of Tablets" in the eastern part of the city of Hsi-an Fu. This is a special place where important monuments are stored for their safe keeping (Aprem 70; Carus 31). In addition, it is also worthy of mention that three replicas of this monument have been made: one by Dr. Frits Von Holm which is located in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City; the second sits on top of Mount Koya in Japan, while the third is situated in Calcutta, India (Aprem 70; Saeki 1916: 9-11). (It is interesting to note that the Danish Dr. Holm had his replica shipped from Shanghai on board "the S.S. 'Kennebec' for final conveyance to New York via the Suez Canal" (Carus 34).)

What other evidence is there which clearly indicates that the Nestorians were in China from at least 635 A.D. to 845 A.D.? As claimed earlier, there were at least two other sources: Chinese historical records, and documents found in the Tun Huang cave. I have already noted two of the imperial edicts which had an effect on the Nestorian situation in China, but Latourette briefly summarizes the most important ones for us when he states, "Imperial edicts of A.D. 638, 745, and 845 which contain references to Nestorianism have been found in Chinese records" (1929:53). In addition, Latourette also indicates that in two very different pieces of work from the ninth century, Christianity is referred to: a Taoist piece of writing mentions the Chinese equivalent of "Messiah" while a geographical record refers to the Nestorian Monument (1929:53).
However, as the Christian scholar Arthur Christopher Moule points out in his work *Christians in China Before the Year 1550*, "only second in importance to the great Christian Monument at Hsi-an, and indeed in some ways more interesting than that, is the little manuscript found by Paul Pelliot at Tun-huang in 1908 and now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris" (1930:52). Here he refers to the manuscript which contains the East Syrian form of the *Gloria in excelsis* (which is a hymn to the holy Trinity), a list of saints and books, and a brief historical note. In addition to this finding, there were four other documents which were immediately determined to be Christian: *Hsuan yuan chih pen ching* ("Proclaim origin reach root"), *Chih hsuan an lo ching* ("Devoted to hidden peace"), *I shen lun* ("Discourse on one God"), and *Hsu t'ing mi shih so ching* ("The Book of I-shu Mi-shih-hê (Iê ŝî'ô Miei ŝî xCEÂ - Jesus Messiah); one roll"). Two of these were translated by Adam Ching-ching, reports Moule, in the latter part of the eighth century (1930:56-59)\(^5\)

Saeki reports that in addition to the *Gloria in excelsis*, the other most complete Nestorian document found by Pelliot was the "Tsun-ching," or "Praise sutra" which is also named "The Nestorian Book of Praise, dedicated to the Living and the Dead" (65). Saeki states, "In other words, this 'Tsun-ching' of the Chinese Nestorians exactly corresponds to the Nestorian Diptychs, i.e. 'The Memento,' or list of living benefactors, as well as of the dead who were commemorated in the Divine Liturgy, and whose names were

---

\(^5\)For plates which represent portions of these Christian documents, see Moule 1977:11, 12, 29.
inscribed in the two-leaved ivory tablets" (1916:65). Saeki provides the text of "The Nestorian Diptychs" which I only present portions of below.6

We praise Thee, Aloha, God-Father and Mysterious One; and we praise Thee, Messiah, the God-Son of the Father; and Lu-ho-ning-chu-sha (i.e. the Syriac 'Ruha-de-kudsa,' the Holy Spirit), the Spirit that beareth witness. "These Three Persons are One.

(Let us pray also for the memorial of)
Catholicos John
Catholicos Luke
Catholicos Mar George
Catholicos Matthew
Catholicos Moses.......

(Let us pray also for the Memorial of those who wrote the books called):
The eternal-enlightenment-kingly-leisure-sutra (The Lamp of the Sanctuary, etc.)
The explaining-origin-reaching-the-cause-sutra (De causa omnium causarum)
The aiming-at-the-origin-of-happy-pleasure-sutra (The Book of Jubilees)..."( Saeki 1916:65-70)

In consideration of the fact that the primary focus of this project is the theme of Chinese and Chinese-American ancestor veneration in the Catholic Church, this early Nestorian Diptych is worthy of our special attention. As I describe below, although the Nestorians did not believe in purgatory, this sample Diptych demonstrates that the Nestorians did indeed take their ritual of memorializing the dead seriously, perhaps as seriously as the Chinese have traditionally taken their veneration of their ancestors. I will come back to this point in a later section.

---

6I quote the Diptych as closely as possible to the way it appears in Saeki with the exception of the omissions which are indicated by ellipsis points.
At this point, I would like to turn our attention to a summary of Nestorian beliefs and traditions and to a more thorough analysis of the possible reasons as to why Nestorianism was originally welcomed and able to survive comfortably for centuries during the Tang period in China.

Nestorianism is a Christian religion which is also known by the name of the Assyrian Church. Its center is located in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley. As a result, it has acquired many Asian qualities over the years as this Church has done most of its evangelizing to the east of its home. For example, by the fifth century, the Nestorians had successfully won converts in Persia, Mesopotamia and "surrounding countries" (Rowbotham 4). The Nestorian Church is distinct from the Western Church of Rome from which it broke in the fifth century largely due to what is known as the the Nestorian Controversy (Rowbotham 4). Because the controversy itself is a very complicated theological as well as historical issue, I shall not attempt to explore this topic in any depth; however, I find it necessary to at least outline some of the major points of the controversy in order to enhance our understanding of just what "brand" of Christianity was being introduced to China during the seventh and eighth centuries which is, of course, a central concern here. (To systematically distinguish between Nestorianism and other Eastern Orthodox Churches which broke from Rome is beyond the scope of this paper.)

Aubrey R. Vine unequivocally indicates in the opening sentence of the first page of his book Nestorian Churches that Nestorianism is the name of a Christian religion which was
erroneously named after Nestorius, a bishop of Constantinople in the fifth century, who was eventually denounced and banished by the Catholic Church. (Although there were several Councils which were conducted in regard to the Nestorian Controversy, the one which finally condemned Nestorius was that of the Council of Ephesus in 431) (McBrien 442). The author states, "Nestorius...has provided a name for a heresy which he did not originate, possibly did not even hold, and for a Church which he did not found. Nevertheless, his name has become so firmly associated with a certain Christological theory and with the churches which have held that theory that it is not now easy to find terms equally definite but more exactly descriptive. Nestorianism, therefore, must be understood to mean the Christology supposedly held by Nestorius, though not originated by him, and the Nestorian churches the churches holding to the Nestorian Christology" (21).

According to Vine, the Nestorian Christology is more accurately the belief and teaching of Nestorius's teacher, Theodore of Mopsuestia (26). His teachings represent what is known as the Antiochene School of Syria and Asia Minor which were in opposition to the orthodox teachings of the Alexandrian School of Egypt and other areas throughout the West. Mainly Theodore's Christology emphasizes the humanity of Jesus who is believed to be imbued with the Logos (the eternal thought or word of God made incarnate in Jesus) of God before human birth. After baptism and the receipt of the Holy Ghost, then Jesus the man - in unison with the Logos and the Holy Ghost - could proceed with his holy mission on earth. Thus,
Theodore believed and taught that the development of the Messiah on earth was a progressive one. He held that there is a special bond of some kind which exists between the human and divine in Jesus, but he did not maintain that there is a "state of true unification" as the Alexandrian School did (Vine 27). In sum, then, Vine states that "his Christology leaves the impression of a person specially favoured, guided and empowered by God, but hardly one to whom the term Deity could be applied" (27). In addition to Nestorius's supposed following of these teachings, he also is said to have preferred the use of the term Christotokos which means "bearer of Christ," and implies that Mary bore "a man who was the organ of the Godhead" as opposed to having born the Godhead (Vine 28). Nestorius's use of the term Christotokos was offensive to those of the Alexandrian School who preferred the term Theotokos, which, of course, means "bearer of God" (Vine 30; McBrien 442). The Nestorian Controversy, though simplified in my version given here, is commonly simplified even to a greater extent by quite reputable scholars who characteristically and formulaically state that Nestorius was condemned by Rome for his belief that Christ was incarnate in "two natures, two persons, and one presence" (Vine 54; Latourette 1929:56). The highly esteemed James Legge confesses perplexity about the controversy: "What his doctrine really was as to the union of the two natures in our Lord, I have never been able to fashion clearly in my own mind" (1966:42). Regardless of whether or not Christian missionary scholars characteristically fully understand the Nestorian Controversy, Legge significantly points out that this point
of controversy about the Nestorian view of the nature of Christ is not mentioned at all on the monument at Hsi-an Fu. Thus, he concludes, "the great crux of the Nestorian doctrine was avoided...by those who composed the Inscription" (Legge 1966:42).

Important aspects of Nestorian beliefs and traditions, some of which I have not yet touched upon, and which may not be completely clear from my edited version of Legge's summary of the doctrinal section of the inscription on the Nestorian Monument, have been encapsulated by Saeki and Latourette. Saeki points out that Nestorians believe the following: (1) The Blessed Virgin Mary should not be reverenced as "the Mother of God" as mentioned above. This is in contrast to the teachings of the Alexandrian School - and thus the Roman Catholic Church - as well as the Greek Orthodox. (2) Although the Nestorian Monument inscription states that Alopen "brought Scriptures and images," Nestorians do not typically encourage the use of images (Saeki 1916:113). This also goes against the traditions of Greek and Roman Catholic Churches. Nestorians do continue to use the sign of the cross, however. (3) As I state previously, the Assyrian Church does not believe in purgatory, but members do pray for their dead. Saeki describes their custom of writing the names of the deceased on Diptychs as being a form of ancestor commemoration. In regard to this practice, Saeki quotes the Nestorian Monument inscription: "Seven times a day they perform worship and praise God and pray for the great protection of the living and for the dead" (1916:113) (4) The Nestorian Church does not hold a belief in Transubstantiation, but it does believe in the
"Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist" (1916:113). (5) The Nestorian Church does not differ from the Catholic Church in its episcopal organization: The Catholicos or Patriarch, the Metropolitan and the Bishop compose the Episcopate; the Presbyter, the Archdeacon, and the Deacon create the Presbyterate; the Sub-deacon and the Reader make up the Diaconate. (6) Only those who are members of the Episcopate cannot marry. Saeki states that "in former times" Bishops, Metropolitans and Patriarchs were allowed to marry, but he does not specify when this practice ceased (1916:114). (7) There are numerous occasions upon which Nestorians fast: Lent; "the fast of the Apostles: from the first Monday after Pentecost, till the first of 'the Sundays' of Summer" (1916:114); in August, for the fast of the Migration of the Virgin; the fasts of Elijah, the Annunciation, Ninevites, and the Virgin. (8) Nestorians are vegetarians. (9) From 1557 until the end of the sixteenth century Patriarchs were chosen from the same family. Until that time he was "ordained by the Patriarch Antioch as Bishop of Seleucia (the then Metropolitan), but after the sixteenth century he was consecrated by three Metropolitans" (1916:115). (10) The ecclesiastical books are written in Greek, Latin, and the vernacular; however, most of them are written in Syriac. The "Nestorian Baptismal Hymn" found by Professor Pelliot in Tun-Huang cave in 1908 demonstrates that in China the Nestorians used the vernacular (1916:113-115). Latourette summarizes the chief tenets of the Nestorians. The Christian missionary scholar states, "They believed in God as lord of heaven, earth and sea. They held that God had made man in his own image,
that he had given the law through Moses, had sent his spirit upon the prophets, and had finally sent his Christ into the world. They held to the resurrection of the dead and to the mystery of baptism." (1929:56). Of course, many of these beliefs are written on the monument (with the exception of mention of anything related to the crucifixion or resurrection, as indicated earlier in our description of the inscription), and Latourette comments on them: "It seems fair to infer from the Hsi-an Fu inscription that the message and practice of these Nestorian representatives of Christianity were as nearly true to the spirit of Jesus as were those of the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox missionaries in Northern Europe during the period that the peoples of these regions were being won to the Christian faith" (57).7

The third tradition described in (3) above from Saeki in regard to praying for the living and the dead is of special concern to us and directly relates to this last quotation of Latourette which suggests that Nestorian beliefs do not differ largely from those of orthodox Catholicism. Catholics have had a tradition of praying for the dead since "the earliest days" as is evidenced by inscriptions in Roman catacombs (Lamirande 144). However, since, as Saeki indicates, Nestorians do not believe in purgatory ("a 'place' where those who die in God's grace expiate their venial sins or satisfy divine justice for mortal sins which have been committed," it is obvious that Nestorians do not believe in the entire Catholic doctrine of the Communion of Saints which maintains that all members of the

---

7I speculate as to why there is no mention on the Nestorian Monument of the crucifixion and resurrection in a later chapter.
Church - the Church militant on earth, the Church suffering in purgatory, and the Church triumphant in heaven - all work with and for each other in "a mutual sharing in help, satisfaction, prayer and other good works," to quote Leo XIII's encyclical on the Eucharist, *Mirae caritatis* (Reese 468; Lawlor 41). That is, even though Nestorians pray for the "joy of the dead" as do Catholics, their complete lack of belief in purgatory gives evidence that their entire conception of the "Church" is radically different from that of the essential Catholic teaching of the Communion of the Saints (Saeki 1916:143).

Although it has been necessary to point out a major difference between Catholic and Nestorian beliefs, I now find it of importance to speculate as to the similarity which existed between this aspect of Nestorian tradition - that is, their practice of praying for the dead and illustrating this tradition on a material plane by writing the names of the deceased on Diptychs - with the indigenous Chinese belief systems and customs of Taoism and Confucianism and the imported religion of Buddhism that existed in the capital of China when Alopen arrived in 637 A.D.. It is important that I turn our attention to this aspect of the history of Nestorianism in China during this early period in order to attempt to fully understand why this foreign religion was allowed to make a home for itself in this land, if only temporarily.

As mentioned earlier, Cary-Elwes maintains that Nestorians were encouraged to remain in Hsi-an Fu largely due to the political situation of the time (22-23). He suggests that it was because
Nestorians were opposed to Islam - which was threatening to become the political power of Asia at the time - and because the missionaries had language skills which the Chinese needed in order to help win the fighting power of the surrounding minority ethnic groups such as the Uighurs, for instance, that the Empire wanted, and in fact, needed this foreign religious group to stay. Cary-Elwes states that China wanted to have political control over the area of Bactria especially, which had many Christians living there at the time, and that this was another reason that it would be wise for the Chinese to make allies with the Nestorian Alopen and his embassy (22-23; Aprem 65).

I would like to suggest that although the political situation was perhaps the original reason why the Nestorians were welcomed, they were able to stay for almost two and one half centuries for two additional reasons: because the Nestorians were willing to accommodate themselves to different aspects of Chinese culture and language - as both Saeki and Cary-Elwes point out - and because the Nestorian practice of praying for the dead (and, again, writing the names of the deceased on Diptychs) is quite similar to the Confucian practice of venerating Confucius, and to the Taoist tradition of venerating their dead (Saeki 1916:105; Cary-Elwes 35). (Buddhism only began the practice of venerating their ancestors in China during the period of the Tang. I shall discuss this at a later point.) (Saeki 1916:139; Shryock 132).

First I would like to examine Cary-Elwes' views on the Nestorian willingness to learn and use the different "languages"
found amongst the Chinese from the seventh to ninth centuries as illustrated on the Nestorian Monument alone. Cary-Elwes claims that the Christian effort demonstrated by the Hsi-an Fu Monument to understand and accommodate Chinese culture and thought is as great as the Christian effort was to accommodate the "Greco-Roman world" (33). This scholar recognizes that although the Jesuit scholars of the sixteenth century, and especially Father Matteo Ricci, became Chinese scholars in order to win Chinese Catholic converts, the Christians of the seventh century went to an even greater extreme in order to accomplish this. That is, Cary-Elwes interprets the amalgam of Buddhist, Taoist, and Confucian symbols and allusions by the author of the monument, Adam Ching-ching, to be evidence of the Christian endeavor of the seventh century to help give Chinese form to Christianity. For example, although the pearl mentioned in our description of the monument can be interpreted to be Christian in symbolism, for P. Y. Saeki claims that this "is the pearl of great price of the Gospels (Saeki 1916:13), the carved upper portion of the stone is Buddhist in origin. The lotus carving is a "Buddhist emblem" and the cloud carving is a "Taoist emblem" both of which are situated beneath the cross as mentioned earlier (Cary-Elwes 19). In addition to the integration of these non-Christian religious images are the "innumerable uses of Buddhist and Taoist ideas" and a quantity of literary allusions within the content of the inscription of the lower section. The historian Henri Havret, as translated and provided by Cary-Elwes states, "The two native Chinese cults gave place to Buddhism for hierarchic names and for ceremonial; whilst for
abstract and metaphysical ideas the Taoist repertoire was more suitable. All the rest, moral principles as well as literary allusions, were derived from the Confucian canonical or historical books" (Cary-Elwes 33). Havret becomes more specific at a later point. Cary-Elwes again translates and quotes him: "This list [of literary echoes] contains three or four hundred expressions...more than thirty of those expressions are borrowed from the Book of Changes above; almost as many came from the Book of Odes; twenty or so from the Annals. The Canonical Books alone furnish a total of about 150 allusions. The historians provide more than a hundred others; the Philosopher's about thirty; the remainder come from different collections" (34). On the one hand, it appears that Cary-Elwes commends this Christian effort to "get inside the Chinese mind," (33) and calls Adam Ching-Ching a pioneer, yet he does warn Christians of the possibility that Christianity tends to lose its individuality "more especially in the East where religions tend to amalgamate" when adaptation of Christianity to another culture is attempted (35).

Saeki also observes that the Nestorians had a tendency to adopt "anything that they thought was good whether it came from Buddhism or from Taoism" (Saeki 1916:105). Latourette suggests that it is precisely because of the Nestorian effort to "clothe their faith in dress familiar to the Chinese," that the religion may have "sacrificed its distinctiveness and defeated their own aim" (1929:59). He also points out that the Nestorians went to such an extreme in adopting Buddhist language that many Chinese believed that Nestorianism was just another branch of Buddhism, that other
"foreign" religion in China. William Gascoyne-Cecil, in his introductory note to Saeki's *The Nestorian Monument in China* takes the most extreme view about the Nestorians in regard to their willingness to accommodate Buddhism. He attributes the failure of Nestorianism to survive in China in the Tang dynasty to his idea that Nestorian preachers "were ashamed of their faith" and that they deliberately "tried to recommend it as a branch of Buddhism" (Saeki 1916:iii). Gascoyne-Cecil does not give any evidence for his blanket statement, and therefore seems unfounded in my view.

The relationship which existed between Christianity and Buddhism has been much considered by scholars not only in regard to China, but also in reference to India (Latourette 49; Saeki 1916:133-145). It is beyond the scope of this project to even begin to outline the similarities and differences which have been studied about this relationship except for the claim made by Saeki that the incorporation of ancestor veneration into Buddhism (which ultimately became know as Chinese Buddhism as distinct from Indian Buddhism) during the Tang Dynasty was largely due to Nestorian influence (Saeki 1916:139). Saeki claims that there were many anti-Buddhist movements in China during this time largely due to the fact that Indian Buddhism as it had been introduced to China did not include that fundamental centuries old Chinese tradition of ancestor veneration - that custom which ritually acknowledges the continuation of the family relationships which are believed to exist after death. Saeki maintains that it was the close association of Buddhists and Nestorians which helped the Buddhists to understand
that they must acknowledge the continuing relationship of the dead with the living if they were to survive as a religion in China. The Japanese scholar asserts that it was largely because of the Buddhist recognition that the Nestorians met "on common ground" with the Taoists and Confucianists in their respective traditions of praying for the dead that they incorporated the festival known as "Festival of Departed Souls" into their belief system (Saeki 1916:136;140;143). This festival, which Saeki only minimally explains as functioning to appease departed souls through food offerings, was incorporated into Buddhism in China by the Indian monk, Amogha Vadjra, and by doing so, succeeded in demonstrating to the Chinese masses that Buddhists do not neglect the dead (138-139). Thus, Saeki concludes "that Buddhism, taking Chinese color and adopting the national culture of Ancestor-Worship, took a leaf from the Assyrian Christians' book may be fairly conjectured from their mutual friendliness; the Buddhist teachers would naturally observe that the Assyrian Christians offered prayers both for the living and for the dead seven times a day, as mentioned in the Nestorian Inscription by Adam...who composed it and also co-operated with Prajna, the Kashir monk, in Hsi-an Fu, in translating a Buddhist Sutra as already described" (140). (At this point I would like to clarify my use of the word veneration in contrast to the use of the word worship by many scholars, such as Saeki does above. I predominantly use the more overarching phrase ancestor veneration because it does not necessarily connote any supernatural or spiritual significance which the words ancestor worship typically do. I use the phrase ancestor
veneration instead of ancestor worship because it is frequently difficult to discern whether the rituals performed by an individual or a group of individuals in honor of the ancestral dead has any spiritual significance, even, on occasion, by the individuals involved in the actual ceremonies (Addison 47).

In sum, according to Saeki, there was anti-Buddhist sentiment during the Tang dynasty largely due to the neglect of the dead by this religion. He maintains that it was largely because of their contact with the Assyrian Church that the Buddhists came to be more acceptable to the Chinese. The highly recognized China missionary scholar Latourette disregards Saeki's theory about the influence of Nestorianism on Buddhism although he frequently relies on Saeki's judgement in other areas (as do other reliable sources). He states that "the best scholars are inclined to say positively that none existed" (1929:49). However, it does seem to me that the close relationship between Buddhists and Nestorians, as evidenced by the relationship between Adam Ching-ching and Prajna, and also by the Buddhist symbolism and allusions on the Nestorian Monument that the theory could be valid or, at the very least, worthy of our consideration (Latourette 1929:49). Even if the theory is not true, the concept is thought provoking for it inspires us to realize that perhaps it was largely because of the "common ground" which existed between Nestorians, Confucianists, Taoists - and eventually Buddhists - in regard to the prayers and rituals performed in honor of the dead, in addition to the Nestorian effort to accommodate Chinese culture and thought (though some scholars consider this accommodation a
strength while others consider it a weakness, as indicate above) that this foreign religion was able to survive for centuries during this time. Even Latourette, who makes light of Saeki's theory that Nestorians influenced Buddhists states that "the marvel is not that the Nestorians did not win her to the Christian faith or found a permanent Chinese Christian community, but that they maintained themselves in the country for nearly two hundred and fifty years" (59).

I would like to close this section on the history of the first Christians in China by offering all of the reasons given by Latourette for the disappearance of Nestorianism from China during the Tang dynasty since his ideas are the most comprehensive. One of the main reasons provided, which other scholars also mention, is that Nestorianism in China seems to have remained largely a foreign religion composed of missionaries, soldiers and merchants (Latourette 1929:58; Clark 14; Cary-Elwes 29). Latourette realizes, however, that there must have been a number of Chinese converts since the Imperial edict of 845 mentions the 3,000 followers "of Ta-ch'in and Mu-hu-fu," as well as the fact that so many monasteries would not have been built if there had not been Chinese converts (1929:58). Despite these observations, he still maintains that Nestorianism was primarily a religion of foreigners who were in favor with the court long enough to survive for more than two centuries (Legge is in agreement here; he states that "I attributed its failure to its leaders addressing themselves to the emperors and men in power and placing their reliance so much on them") (55).
Latourette's second reason given in his attempt to understand and explain why this Eastern Church disappeared with the Edict of 845 is the following: the indigenous belief systems and the foreign religion of Buddhism were sufficient to take care of the spiritual needs of the Chinese people; he claims that there was "no marked religious hunger" in China as there had been in the Roman Empire when Christianity entered that arena (1929:58). Thirdly, and quite significantly, is the reality that the land of China was so very far away from the spiritual center of the Assyrian Church in Mesopotamia that missionaries "could look for little assistance and inspiration from the main body of their fellow believers" (1929:59).

In addition, Latourette points out that the fact that Nestorians were a minority in every land where they lived and worshipped could not have helped them in the cause with the Chinese. Cary-Elwes agrees with Latourette's first and third reasons and nicely clarifies these ideas when he describes the Nestorians as foreigners who "were cut off from their base in Mesopotamia by war between the Chinese and their levies on the one hand and the Moslems on the other, whilst the region we may call Transoxania, formerly Bactria, was overrun by the Arabs. Thus the first twilight of the Christian religion in China was a false dawn..."(29). But a fascinating dawn for those of us in the late twentieth century to have a glimpse of.
CHAPTER 2
NESTORIANS AND CATHOLICS IN CHINA
845 A.D. - 1368 A.D.

With the Imperial Edict of 845 A.D., the Nestorians were largely forced out of China proper; however, Nestorian missionary activity successfully continued to the north, northwest, and on occasion, within the borders of China amongst different Turko-Mongol tribes such as the Keraits, the Onguts, the Uighurs, the Alans and the Naimans. The Mongols, some of whom were Nestorians, began to win power and control away from the Chinese around the year 1000 (although Mongol or Yuan dynasty proper was only from 1280-1368). Therefore, it was around this time that Nestorians - later followed by Catholics - began to move eastward and southward into the heart of China once more (Cary-Elwes 36; Rowbotham 8-9; Latourette 1929:62-63; Yule 1926:179).

Latourette reports that by 1289, there were so many Christians in China that Kublai Khan (1216-94), one of the great Mongol leaders, established a special office to supervise Christian affairs. Although still a non-Chinese and foreign religion, Nestorians could be found in cities such as Chinkian, Yangchow, Hangchow, Yunnanfu, Kansu, and Hokienfu. Latourette states, "They were to be found only on the northern marches, in the capital, and in the cities on the main arteries of trade" (65).

The first Catholic priest to be sent into China from Europe was The Italian Friar John of Pian de Carpini (1182-1252), one of St.
Francis's disciples (D'Elia 16). He was not sent specifically to convert the infidels, however. Europe was beginning to panic at the threat of the Mongol invasions. The Mongol Khans had not only conquered large areas of China, but they were also beginning to move into eastern Europe, in particular, Poland and Hungary. Knowledge that the Great Ghenghis Khan's (1162-1227) son - the current Khan leader - Ogodei (died 1241), had plans to expand his Empire over the whole earth, from the Yellow Sea to the Atlantic terrified Europe (Cary-Elwes 39). It was after the battle in Liegnitz in 1241, that Pope Innocent IV, as a result of the Council of Lyons in 1245, decided to send Friar John of Pian de Carpini, a Franciscan, on a mission which would be a "protest against the invasion of Christian lands" as well as an attempt to discover what was the extent of Mongol power (Komroff 2; D'Elia 16).

This Friar John set off to visit the Ogodei Khan in 1245 accompanied by two other friars. They arrived in the Mongol capital, Karakorum, on July 22, 1246. Ogodei had died prior to this time, and, as a result, Friar John got to witness the coronation of a new Mongol Emperor, Kuyuk (died 1248), the eldest son of Ogodei. As the friar reports in his journal, Kuyuk never met with him personally; however, Friar John was able to to speak to Batu (died 1295), a grandson of Ghenghis Khan (by his second son Tuluy), and Friar John of Pian de Carpini delivered the Pontifical message to him: he asked Batu whether or not the Mongols could live in peace with Christians, questioned why they had done so much killing, and strongly recommended that they repent for their sins and convert to
Catholicism. Kuyuk Khan (whose mother was Nestorian) finally responded with a message to the Pope which asked why Mongols should become Christians, and suggested that if God did not want the Mongols to be victorious over his conquered, God would not let him win (Cary-Elwes 42-43). He also requested that the Pope come to him and do homage, otherwise Kuyak would consider him to be an enemy (Komroff 2).

This historic journey was not terribly successful in any direct sense; however, the friar's reports upon his return to the West in 1247 were provocative. Friar John informed his listeners and readers of his journal that he had seen "representatives from almost all the tribes and races of Eurasia," and indicated that some form of Christianity existed in China. He also gave colorful descriptions of the Chinese - or Cathayans, as they were largely called then - which helped to stimulate the European interest in this eastern part of the world (Cary-Elwes 40; D'Elia 17; Komroff 3-50).

The European fear of the Mongols was largely alleviated about this time though not as a result of of Friar John of Pian de Carpini's efforts. When the Pope had sent Friar John on his mission, he nor anyone else in Europe was aware that with the death of Ogodei in 1241, Batu, the general, had ordered a retreat of the warriors and were no longer a threat to Europe. Cary-Elwes states, "They vanished as suddenly and mysteriously as they had come" (39).

After the journey of Friar John of Pian de Carpini, several other missions and envoys of little impact were sent to China (D'Elia 17; Cary-Elwes 43). Therefore, I would like to turn our attention to the
next significant journey to the Mongol court from Europe, that of the French Franciscan William of Rubruck (1215-1270), which took place during the years 1253-1255.

Upon hearing the rumour that Sartach, the current leader of the Mongols in Russia (and son of Batu) had become a Christian, Louis IV of France sent William of Rubruck as an envoy "to open avenues of communication between Europe and the Far East" (Rowbotham 26). Friar Williams' findings, which were also recorded in a journal, were fruitful because he not only learned that Sartach had not become a Christian as the West had hoped, but because he was also able to report on the quality of life of the Christian Alans, Hungarians, Georgians, Ruthenians and Armenians that he met in Cathay (Komroff 1928:89, 93-94, 161); in addition, he suggested to the Europeans that the Cathayans were indeed the same people as the Seres who had been written about during the period of the Greco-Roman world, as well as described in vivid detail the daily lives of the Mongols (Komroff 1928:119-120). Several scholars interpret Friar William of Rubruck's journal to be equal in value to that of Marco Polo, whose work I describe at a later point (Komroff 1928: 52; D'Elia 17-20; Cary-Elwes 43-48; Cameron 28-60).

It is not completely germane to my purpose to elaborate on Friar William of Rubruck's experiences with the Mongols to any great extent; however, his perceptions of the Nestorians at this time are important for us to note, as well as fascinating. Friar William did not have a favorable impression of Nestorians by any means. In his journal, he repeatedly claims that they were drunkards and liars.
(Komroff 1928:93; 156; 120). There is one passage which is especially revealing of the Friar's repugnance at this group of Christian's behavior and customs:

They are above all usurers, drunkards and some live with the Tartars and have like them several wives. When they enter a church they wash the lower parts of their bodies like Saracens; they eat meat on Friday and hold their banquets in the manner of the Saracens. The bishop rarely visits their country, perhaps only once in fifty years...Then they marry, which is completely contrary to the teaching of the Fathers, and they are bigamists because after the death of their first wife they take a second. They are also simoniacs, not administering any sacrament without pay. They are very attentive to their wives and children and consequently they are more occupied in gaining money than in propagating the faith. Those among them who bring up the children of noble Moals, while teaching them the gospel and faith, manage to alienate them from the practice of Christian virtues, through the bad example of their habits and above all through their cupidity...(Komroff 1928: 120-121).8

Friar William also claimed that the Nestorians recognized the Roman Catholic Church to be "the head of all churches, and that they themselves would have to receive their patriarch from the Pope if the roads were open" (Komroff 1928:161). Thus, readers learn, that from Friar William of Rubruck's perspective, although the behavior

8"Moals" is another name for Mongols (Komroff 349); It is relevant to indicate that A.C.Moule notes a Chinese silk painting which dates somewhere from between the ninth to fifteenth centuries and which is entitled "A Clerical Orgy." The central scene is of a tonsured, bearded and apparently drunken priest sitting on a bed who is surrounded by two women - one holding a baby - and four men, two of whom are claping large wine chalices. Though there are several theories as to who is the subject of this work of art, Moule is in agreement with Professor Pelliot who "hazarded the conjecture that the scene may represent an Orgy of Nestorian priests" (Moule 1940: 35-37;2).
of the Nestorians is decadent and diverges from true Christian teaching during the thirteenth century, they supposedly recognize that the Roman Church is superior to their own. Latourette, however, warns readers to read Friar William's journal with the awareness that the Roman Catholic priest only had a limited experience of the Nestorians in China and that he lived during a time "When tolerance, especially toward Christians of heretical sects, was not regarded as a virtue" (Latourette 1929: 65).

Although William of Rubruck may have been intolerant of non-Catholic religious groups, the reader learns from Friar William's journal that the Mongols during the Yuan dynasty were very tolerant of foreign religious persuasions just as the Chinese were during the Tang (with the exception, temporarily, of Buddhism). While during the Tang the Chinese rulers appear to have originally welcomed the Nestorians, for instance, because they thought they could use them as allies against Islam, Clark maintains that the Mongols were also interested in using this foreign religion of Nestorianism as a "political tool" for the same exact purpose: to overtake Islam (Clark 18). Thus, I would like to turn our attention from what we have learned from the Catholic Friar William of Rubruck's journal entries for the years 1253-55 to a consideration of the lives of two monks whose biographies are especially relevant to Clark's point that the Mongol rulers may have been particularly tolerant of foreign Nestorians because they could be of help to the empire politically.

In the second half of the thirteenth century, there were two other monks - as just mentioned - who helped to enhance the
communication between East and West. The life stories I am about to sketchily outline, however, do not concern Catholic missionaries moving from a westward to an eastward direction; rather these monks were both of the Turkish Kerait tribe, were Nestorians, and travelled from Khanbaliq to several important cities west of Cathay.\footnote{Khanbaliq is present day Peking (Rowbotham 26).} One of these monks eventually to went to Europe to accomplish an important mission which was not a part of their original agenda by any means.

In 1275, Sauma and Mark left their homeland with the ostensible intention of visiting the Holy Land of Jerusalem to visit the Holy Places (D'Elia 20-21; Rowbotham 10; Cary-Elwes 49). The scholar Sir E. A. Budge, Kr., in his exhaustive study of these two lives in The Monks of Kublai Khan Emperor of China, suggests that Kublai Khan might have sent these monks to Jerusalem not because it was the Holy Land of Jesus Christ, but because he dreamed of winning the city away from the Muslims and he wanted the monks to assess the situation for him (1-2). For instance, the monks could attempt to discover whether any Western power would seem to be likely to assist the Mongols in their attempt to overtake Jerusalem (2). (Oddly enough, William Clark does not suggest the possibility that the initial journey westward of these two monks was inspired by a Khan, as Budge does.) Whatever his reasons may have been for condoning this journey, the Khan did request that the two monks take some garments and touch the Holy Sepulchre with it for him (D'Elia 21).
However, the two monks never made it to Jerusalem (Budge 9). The reasons why are dramatic and resonate with historic significance.

The first major stop of these Nestorian monks was Baghdad, the center of the Assyrian Church at that time, before moving on to tour Nestorian shrines in Persia. Before the two could proceed westward with their plans, the Nestorian Catholicos made Sauma Visitor General in 1280. He also appointed the thirty-five year old Mark Metropolitan of Cathay. Subsequently, in 1281, Mark was elected Catholicos and from thenceforth became known as Yahballah III (Budge 9; D'Elia 21).

Clark, Budge, D'Elia and Cary-Elwes indicate that in 1287, at the request of Arghun - leader of the western Mongols since 1284 (whose dreams reflect those of his uncle Kublai Khan) - Rabban Sauma went to Rome seeking the help of the Western powers in fighting against Mohammedanism, and in attempting to overtake Jerusalem. Because Pope Honorius IV had just died, Rabban Sauma could not present his letters from Arghun and Yaballaha III until 1288 when Nicholas IV became Pope. It was at this point in Rabbam Sauma's life that the influence of Rome and of those he met there and in other parts of Europe were so great, that he became a Roman Catholic after "he had confessed his sins" (Clark 19; Budge 9; D'Elia 23; Cary-Elwes 52).

Rabbam Sauma not only had a reply filled with "promises" from the Pope upon his reunion with his friend and spiritual colleague, the Patriarch in Baghdad, but he also had "the formula of Faith" which would inspire the Patriarch to declare his allegiance to
the Roman Catholic Church. In a letter of May 18, 1304, the Patriarch Yahballaha III also stated his allegiance to the Roman Church by becoming a Catholic (D'Elia 23-24; Cary-Elwes 54-55).

Although both Kublai Khan and Arghun died without having achieved their dream of winning Jerusalem, with or without help from the West, it was this dream of both of these Khans which was possibly the original inspiration for sending these monks to the west, if Budge's theory is valid. Even though this dream did not come true for these Mongols, a greater dream came true for the Catholics of Europe: they succeeded in converting two Nestorian priests of high standing to their faith. It was possibly the success that the Roman Catholic Church had with these two men that inspired the Pope to send the first European Catholic missionary to Cathay to convert these Eastern peoples in the late thirteenth century, as scholars Clark and Cary-Elwes suggest (Clark 20; Cary-Elwes 54, 56). If this is true, it is indeed ironic that because the Mongols sought to use the Nestorians for their political purposes, that European Catholics should be incited to begin the second period of Christian missions in China.

The man who is responsible for bringing the first Catholic mission to China was an Italian Franciscan named John of Montecorvino (1247-1328). Friar John was born in Montecorvino Rovevela, near Salerno, went to the university, and is said to have been quite well known for his abilities as a preacher and theologian. Because of these abilities, before being sent to China, he had been given the difficult task of trying to unite the Greek Church with the Roman (D'Elia 24; Cameron 90).
In 1294 Friar John of Montecorvino arrived in Khanbaliq alone, for his two companion priests, Friar John of Palma and Brother Nicholas of Pistoia, died on their way (D'Elia 24; Cary-Elwes 56). Friar John of Montecorvino was greeted by Timur Khan (1336-1405), grandson of KUBLAI, and he soon began his work of the Church. Friar John built three churches during his mission. The first was finished by 1299, the second by 1305, and the third before 1318 (D'Elia 25). One of the last two churches built was supposed to have been constructed near the palace gates of the emperor so that he could "hear the chanting of the choir" (Cary-Elwes 58). By the time the second church was built, Friar John had supposedly baptized 30,000 converts (Cary-Elwes 59). Although Latourette doubts the authenticity of a letter written by the Bishop of Peregrine in 1318, it claims that Friar John had succeeded in converting 20,000 ALANS by this date (1929: 71). Rowbotham estimates that by the time Friar John died, there were approximately 100,000 Christians in the empire (apparently the figure includes Nestorians although the author does not specifically state this) (33).

Friar John of Montecorvino may have had more converts if the claims made about the Nestorian efforts to work against his goals are true. Friar John maintained that the Nestorians (who were estimated to number about 30,000 during this time) made life extremely difficult for him for the first five years of his mission (Moule 1977:251). For example, at night they destroyed the abbeys that he had built during the day; they also accused him of being a spy, a magician and an imposter (Cameron 96; Moule:1977:251).
In regard to Friar John having been accused of being an imposter, certain Nestorians claimed that he killed the real envoy from Rome, and falsely stated that he was merely pretending to be the priest. Many of these rumours were taken seriously by the people, and at certain periods, Friar John's life was at risk. However, the Nestorians who caused him the most trouble eventually confessed to their lies and were punished (Cary-Elwes 58; Cameron 96). It is interesting to note that Friar John of Montecorvino's words about the Nestorians echo those of Friar William of Rubruck from a former era. Friar John states, "The Nestorians, men who bear the Christian name but deviate very far from the Christian religion...have brought on me persecutions of the sharpest" (Cameron 96).

Although we cannot be certain of the exact number of converts which Friar John won during his lifetime in China, again, it is likely that most of the peoples converted were not Chinese. We do know that Friar John successfully converted the leader of the Onguts, King George, and "a great part of his people" (Cary-Elwes 58; Latourette 1929:69). (Even though it is believed that many of these followers later returned to their Nestorian religion after George died, and understandably so, since there is so much evidence for the antagonisms which existed between the two branches of Christianity) (Latourette 1929:69). We also know that Friar John translated the New Testament and Psalter into the Ongut language, but he does not mention translating any Christian writings into Chinese. In addition, when he built his second church, "pictures with writing in Latin, Uighur and Persian characters were put up," but again, no mention is
made of the use or knowledge of Chinese characters being used by these Catholics (Cary-Ewes 60). Paschal M. D'Elia, S.J. reports in a footnote in his work, *The Catholic Missions in China*, that the scholars A.C. Moule, Fr. Brucker, and Prof. Pelliot all believe that the majority of Christian converts in China during this period were mostly of foreign peoples as well (31).

Friar John was alone carrying on his work for the first twelve years in China before he was finally joined in 1303 by the German Friar Arnold of Cologne. In a response to an appeal from Friar John of Montecorvino for more support from European missionaries, Pope Clement V at Avignon sent seven additional Franciscan priests to help him and Friar Arnold, but only three of them arrived in Khanbaliq alive in 1313: Friar Andrew of Perugia, Friar Gerard Peregrine of Castello, and Friar Nicholas of Bantra.\(^{10}\) The Pope had given these priests the power to make Friar John of Montecorvino Archbishop of Khanbaliq and Patriarch of all the Orient upon their arrival which they did (Cary-Ewes 61; D'Elia 26-27).

After the arrival of the friars, a period of expansion began beyond Khanbaliq. In 1313 a new cathedral (perhaps the third mentioned previously) was built in Zaitun due to the generous donation of a wealthy Armenian (Cary-Ewes 61; D'Elia 61). Other missions were also opened up in Hangchow and in Yangchow. In 1311, the Pope sent three more bishops to join the Archbishop, but only one, Friar Peter of Florence, reached China (Latourette 1929: 70).

\(^{10}\) Cary-Ewes claims that they arrived in 1308 (61).
In 1322, another Italian Franciscan, Odoric of Porddenone (1265-1331), arrived in Zaitun (Latourette 1929:70).¹¹ Because Friar Odoric wrote a journal, he is one of the most well know friars from this period (Komroff 1928:211-250). It is claimed that he opened two Franciscan houses in Zaitun, but mostly his journal describes the sights he witnessed in his travels from Fuchow to Hangchow and eventually to Peking. He was supposed to have been a particularly devout man who had miracles attributed to him even before he left for China (Latourette 1929:71; Komroff 1928:211). Friar Odoric only remained in China for three years before returning to Europe where he intended to request that the Pope send fifty friars with him on his return to China; however, this priest died in Italy in 1331 as an "object of popular devotion" before he could return to this missionary work in the East (D'Elia 28; Komroff 1928:212).

Latourette claims that the date of the death of Friar John of Montecorvino is uncertain, but that it occurred in either 1328, 1329, 1330 or 1333 (1929:71). Rowbotham as well as Latourette maintain that numerous attempts were made to replace this outstanding missionary, but all of those who were given this assignment, and who even set off to carry it out, never reached their destination (Rowbotham 33; Latourette 1929:74). Rowbotham names Nicholas of Bentia accompanied by a "large group of priests," William of Prato,

¹¹ Presently known as the port of Ch'uan-chow (Latourette 1929:70); Komroff states that Friar Odoric "is said to have been born in 1286" (212).
and Francis of Podio and his twelve companions as never having survived their trip to China (33).

In response to an embassy which arrived from China in Europe in 1338 from the Christian Alans with a request that the Pope send them "a good, capable and wise Legate who may care for our souls" to replace Friar John, Pope Benedict II organized a great mission led by John of Marignolli (Cary-Elwes 67). This Friar John arrived in China with thirty-two other friars in 1342. Although Rowbotham asserts that he made a "great harvest of souls" while he was there, D'Elia puts forth the idea that he only remained in China for three years because he was "afraid of the coming political storm which would later on lead to the fall of the Mongol Yuan Dynasty and the accession of the Ming" (29). D'Elia also reports that three other bishops were appointed to go on mission in China despite the political situation, but none of these Italians ever reached their destination (30).

Latourette is certain that there were many friars who did make it to China, but knowledge of these facts simply have not come down to us. He cites Friar John of Marignolli's reports of numerous houses and churches which he claimed to have seen as evidence (1929:75).

It appears that Friar John Marignolli made the right decision in leaving China if his intention was to save his life, for with the fall of the Mongol Empire in 1368, all traces of Catholicism as well as of Nestorianism were erased. Latourette indicates that the situation was so extreme that with the incoming Ming there was an anti-foreign reaction that set in amongst the Chinese. He states that there
was "an active aversion to all that the hated alien introduced" (1929:73). This was demonstrated in the transitional period just prior to the Ming. It was during this time, as Cary-Elwes reports, that Christians were persecuted and churches were destroyed (70). This was also when James of Florence, the fifth bishop of Zaitun, was martyred, and when the mission in that city and in Khanbaliq "ceased to exist" (Rowbotham 33).

William Clark points out that the Nestorians especially suffered during this period of the fourteenth century. Clark maintains that after Timur's conversion to Islam, he took a strong stand against the Nestorians in Asia, who were "literally slaughtered by the tens of thousands in Persia and Mesopotamia" (21). Latourette claims that Nestorianism disappeared from the borderland of China with the takeover of the Ming dynasty (1929:75).

It is incredible to recognize that when the Jesuits arrived in China in the sixteenth century, that there was no awareness that any form of Christianity had ever lived in this land and that only a few indications of its presence eventually turned up during this later mission. Aside from the finding of the Hsi-an Fu Nestorian Monument during the age of the Jesuits, the only mementos of Christianity were a thirteenth century Franciscan's Latin Bible which was found at Changchow in the late 1600s (Clark 21); a small bell with a cross on it which was discovered by Matteo Ricci in 1595 (Cary-Elwes 71); and three crosses which became known in the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries (Latourette 1929:76). In addition, the Jesuits heard rumours of Chinese who used the sign of the cross, but for
whom all meaning had been lost, both in North China and in Kiangsi (Latourette 1929: 75).

Latourette speculates as to the reasons why Catholicism and Nestorianism did not at least survive, if not thrive, during the Ming period. He maintains that as with the Tang, the Christian religions were foreign religions; there was little dissatisfaction with existing faiths amongst the Chinese, and "there were no intimate, and extended contacts between the Chinese and any powerful people who professed the Christian faith" (1929:76). Latourette also asserts that during the Mongol Empire, the Christians only had one hundred years in which to try to establish a successful mission as opposed to the two-hundred and fifty year period of the Tang. He believes that the Christians were also at a disadvantage during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries because China was under the rule of a "foreign conquerer" (1929:77). The best evidence for this claim is the anti-foreign reaction which set in amongst the Chinese people when they once again came to power in 1368, as mentioned earlier (Latourette 1929:73). In addition, as also mentioned previously, I would like to add that even this foreign conquerer turned against Christianity when Timur converted to Islam.

Clark adds that Catholicism failed to establish itself during the Yuan dynasty because the Franciscans made little effort to accommodate themselves to Chinese culture. He states that not only did the missionaries not learn the Chinese language, but that "Not the slightest adaptation was permitted" (21). Clark and Cary-Elwes also claim that the rival relationship which existed between Catholics and
Nestorians could not have helped Christianity to successfully have presented itself as a viable religious alternative to the Chinese (Clark 22; Cary-Elwes 71). I would like to point out that evidence for both of these points can be found if we look again at the account of Friar John of Montecovino's mission as presented earlier. Not only did Friar John not include Chinese characters under the pictures in his church along with the Persian, Latin and Uighur script, but we also know that although he did learn the Mongol language, he did not learn Chinese. In addition, when he converted and recruited small boys to be part of the church, he taught them Latin and Greek, and did not attempt to use the Chinese vernacular as the Nestorians had in the early period of their mission in China (Cary-Elwes 59; Saeki 1916:113-115).

In regard to the specific failure of Nestorianism in their second missionary effort in China, Latourette believes that there is enough evidence to indicate that the religion was in a more corrupt form during the Yuan dynasty than in the Tang, and that it is not surprising, therefore, that this form of Christianity did not survive into the Ming (1929:77). We just have to reflect upon Friar John of Montecorvino's experiences with the Nestorians and upon Friar William of Rubruck's reports on the Nestorians as discussed above to understand his position.

Keeping in mind all of these reasons as to why Christianity did not survive during this period of our concern in mind, it would be difficult not to agree with Latourette who exclaims, "Even more than
under the earlier dynasty it would have been a marvel had Christianity permanently established itself in China" (1929:77).\textsuperscript{12}

Although Christianity was no longer welcome in China after 1368, both the Catholics and Nestorians continued to assign hierarchical positions to individuals within the respective Churches after this date: Archbishops were assigned to China by the Catholic Church until 1490; Nestorian prelates were designated for China as late as 1502. However, it appears that these titles were merely honorary and not of substance since, as previously indicated, there was not any evidence that Christians were in China when the Jesuits first arrived in the sixteenth century (Latourette 1929:76-77; Clark 21).

Before turning to a discussion of the Jesuit mission in China in the sixteenth century, I must, at least briefly, mention the very first Europeans to arrive in China in the thirteenth century. I have reserved an introduction to this story for the final section of this chapter because the Europeans of whom I write were not religious personages but merchants. However, these men were noted Catholics who had experiences with Christianity in China, and they therefore warrant some attention here.

The Italian merchant brothers Maffeo and Nicolo Polo left Constantinople to journey to the court of Kublai Khan in 1260. They

\textsuperscript{12} This statement is particularly true when we recognize that Europe during the fifteenth century was experiencing the Black Death as well as the Hundred Years War. The breakup of the Mongol Empire may not have been the only reason the missionaries could not be replenished (Rowbotham 34; Latourette 73).
were well received by this Emperor of the Yuan dynasty, and many interesting discussions took place between these men (Cameron 75). On one occasion, the Kublai made a request of these two Polos in regard to Christianity. This request is recorded in the Book of Ser Marco Polo: The Venetian Concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East which was dictated at one point in the life of the son of Nicolo while a prisoner of war in Genoa. In Chapter VII of this great work, which describes the travels and sights of China in the thirteenth century, Marco reports that the Kublai sent the two Polos on a return trip to Italy with a letter to the Pope. The contents of the letter are the following: "He begged that the Pope would send as many as an hundred persons of our Christian faith; intelligent men, acquainted with the Seven Arts, well qualified to enter into controversy, and able clearly to prove by force of argument to idolaters and other kinds of folk, that the Law of Christ was best, and that all other religions were false and naught; and that if they would prove this, he and all under him would become Christians and the Church's liegemen. Finally he charged his Envoys to bring back to him some Oil of the Lamp which burns on the Sepulchre of our Lord at Jerusalem" (Yule 1926: 13-14). The response to this request could have had significant impact in China under Mongol rule; however, nothing much comes of the Kublai's wishes. The Polos did return to Acre in 1269 and made the Kublai's requests known to the

---

13 The "Seven Arts" refer to rhetoric, logic, grammar, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music (Yule 1926:14).
newly elected Pope Gregory of Piacenze (Yule 1926:21). The Pope responded by sending two Dominican friars (instead of one hundred!) who eventually turned back when they were frightened at witnessing a war (Yule 1926:23). When the two Polos brothers, now accompanied by the seventeen year old son of Nicolo, Marco, returned to Kublai’s court, they were only able to present the Emperor with letters from the Pope, Oil from the Sepulchre, and the services of Marco, who was warmly received by Kublai (Yule 1926:26).

Latourette claims that it is not known what motive the Khan had for requesting one hundred Christians to come to his court (1929:67); however, Nigel Cameron speculates that the Khan needed these men for secular reasons rather than as a sincere gesture to learn more about Catholicism. That is, Cameron asserts that because the Kublai had only recently come into power, he was still unable to trust Chinese with high administrative positions. Therefore, he wanted one hundred "intelligent" Christians to fulfill this function for him (68). Here Cameron is in agreement with William Clark who also asserts that the Khans tended to use foreign religions - and not only Nestorianism - to enhance their political positions as discussed previously.

In addition to this significant interaction between the Emperor of the Mongols and these European adventurer merchants in regard to Christianity, Marco Polo also indicates that the Khan tolerated "the four great teachers, Jesus, Mohammed, Moses, and Buddha" (Rowbotham 30; Cameron 75). It is important for us to note this fact
again (our discussion of William of Rubruck's journal gave us our first indication of the Mongol tolerance of a diversity of religions) especially because this attitude of the Yuan dynasty toward foreign religions (which was similar to that of the Tang) differed so greatly from the policy of the incoming Ming dynasty.\textsuperscript{14}

Marco Polo also reported in his travel account of the many Nestorian communities which were established all throughout China, especially in the west. He maintains that he saw Nestorians at Mōsul, Tauris, Kashgar, Kamul, Yang-chau, churches at Chinhchianfu and in Kinsay and in many other areas as well (Yule 1926:60, 75, 182, 154, 177, 192). His brief but lovely description of what he saw in Chinhchianfu in Charter LXXIII is worth quoting, in part: "There are in this city two churches of Nestorian Christians which were established in the year of our Lord 1278; and I will tell you how that happened. You see, in the year just named the Great Khan sent a Baron of his whose name was MAR SARGHIS, a Nestorian Christian, to be governor of this city for three years. And during the three years that he abode there he caused these two Christian churches to be built, and since then there they are. But before his time there was no church, neither were there any Christians" (Yule 1926:177).

Marco Polo was not a missionary in China, but a merchant and an adventurer; therefore, it is appropriate that we appreciate what he has told the world about the presence of Christianity in China

\textsuperscript{14}Latourette suggests that the Khans were so tolerant of such a diversity of religions because these Mongols feared that the gods of these faiths might harm them or that perhaps they could even benefit the Mongol Empire in some way (1929:62). Even this interpretation can be seen as being political in motivation!
during the thirteenth century. Although for many years, Polo's accounts of the large numbers of Christians in China were largely "discounted as part of his supposed habit of exaggerating," many of Polo's reports have been corroborated by Chinese sources (Cary-Elwes 48; D'Elia 13).

A wonder it is that the Popes who were sending missionaries to China while the Mongols were in power show no awareness of Marco's narrative, as Cameron points out: "There is no sign that what it contained about Nestorian Christianity in China served any purpose at all in church circles" (87). It is unfortunate that Polo's account was apparently not found to be of any use at all to Christian missionaries in regard to China until the coming of the Jesuit Italian priest, Matteo Ricci, in the sixteenth century (Cameron 87). Indeed it is also ironic that what possibly ultimately caused the Pope to send Catholic missionaries to China for conversion purposes in the late thirteenth century was not something of the nature of Marco Polo's travel account, but rather the political ambitions of Kublai and Arghun.
CHAPTER 3
EUROPEAN MERCHANTS, ADVENTURERS, COLONIZERS
AND MISSIONARIES GO EAST: 1495-1583

Largely due to the anti-foreign attitude of the Ming dynasty and the
problems in Europe created by the Black Death and the Hundred
years War, China and Europe largely lost contact with each other for
approximately a century and a half (Cary-Elwes 74; D'Elia 32;
Rowbotham 34). However, during the fifteenth and sixteenth
centuries, Europe was ripe for change and a period of exploration
which resulted in the opening up of trade, colonization, and
missionary work occurred in countries in the East.

The reasons for this ripening were numerous and varied. The
Renaissance inspired an intellectual and artistic awakening which
could have been part of the impetus for adventurers to satisfy their
curiosity and head East (Latourette 1929:80; Hughes 8). The
availability of inventions such as the compass made navigation over
such vast oceans and distances possible (Cameron 129; Cary-Elwes
75). Latourette also claims that "mining and commerce brought
increased wealth" in Europe which enabled these journeys to be
financed (1929:81). Cary-Elwes maintains that one of the original
reasons for travels across the seas to eastern shores was due to the
European need for spices that could be gotten only from such
countries as China (75). Then, of course, there was greed which
motivated European countries to colonialize Asian countries, or parts
of them, for economic gain and political power (Dunne 9; Latourette
89; Cary-Elwes 82; Hughes 8,9). In addition to all of these reasons, is the one with which I am the most concerned here: Roman Catholic missionary zeal which was possibly largely in reaction to the success of the Reformation and the loss of papal power over many sections of Northern and Central Europe as scholars Clark and Latourette suggest (Clark 26; Latourette 81).

The main countries which brought missionaries to the East during this period were Spain, Portugal and, later, France (Latourette 83). As the Jesuit missionary scholar George Dunne points out, a form of Europeanism arose during the fifteenth century in which there arose a "close union between the mission and secular political power" (8). In 1495 the Treaty of Tordesillas was drawn up and signed by Pope Alexander VI (Dunne 17; Clark 24; Latourette 1929:89). This treaty divided sections of the world as it was then known into two parts: those sections belonging to Portugal and those belonging to Spain! Clark describes the details of this treaty for us: "Portugal was to have all Islands which might be discovered east of a line of demarcation drawn from the Arctic Pole to the Antarctic, at a distance of 370 leagues west of Cape Verde, Africa. This left all the New World of the Americas to Spain except East Brazil, which was sighted by the Portuguese in 1500 and claimed by them. Eventually Spain got the Philippines, but the major push into Asia was by the Portuguese, who regarded it as their exclusive sphere of influence and resented any Spanish or Dutch penetration" (24). Dunne and Sebes indicate that it was because the popes were aware that the kings of Portugal and Spain wanted to spread the Christian faith
(with crusade-like zeal) that the Holy See felt obligated to endorse such governmental ambitions, and this was how such a treaty could be drawn up by a pope (Dunne 8; Sebes 19). Consequently, because the kings received the validation of the pope for their activities, they were obligated to send missionaries into the above named spheres of influence, "to provide for their maintenance, to establish churches, chapels, cloisters and other mission foundations" (Dunne 8,9). However, although in 1622 the Catholic Church created the Congregation for the Propaganda of the Faith which was to organize and oversee all mission activity, for centuries many of the decisions made through this organ in Rome were overridden for political reasons by the Spanish, the Portuguese, and later the French governments (Latourette 1929:84; Sebes 20). According to Latourette, in China particularly, the Portuguese padroado, or "right to control the Church in the East" greatly hampered the growth of the Catholic Church largely due to national rivalries amongst missionaries as shall become clear at a later point (Latourette 1929: 84).

As a result of the "interpenetration of Church, Society, and State" these monarchies frequently felt justified in their use of force on those whom they met in their travels - especially, obviously, when the aim was to colonize (Dunne 8). Spain's religious, political, and economic domination of the Philippines, for example, is probably one of the most successful as well as disturbing stories of colonization ever (Cary-Elwes 82). Hughes points out that this was the period of the Inquisition in the Americas and in southern Europe, and that secular power and the glory of the Christian Church justified any
atrocities that were committed by Christians in the world. He maintains that it was the "religious zeal" and the "lust for money" of Spanish Catholics which caused them to murder the 20,000 Chinese who "by their numbers and trading ability were likely to hinder their own success" upon their arrival in the Philippines (9).

The behavior of the Portuguese when they landed on Chinese shores - not to colonize in this case, but to trade - was not much better (Cary-Elwes 82). Hughes claims that the Portuguese "had no scruples about the use of violence" when they were not welcome in a Chinese port or if they did not like the terms of a trade agreement (9). This behavior did not help the Chinese during the Ming period to alter their view that all non-Chinese were barbarians nor did it inspire them to change their minds and want to open their doors to non-Chinese as had been done during the Tang and the Yuan dynasties. Upon first contact with Portuguese merchants, the Chinese largely equated them with the Japanese pirates who sometimes attacked Chinese shores, and this view of these Europeans contributed to the maintenance of their law that all foreigners would be imprisoned or killed if caught on Chinese shores (Cary-Elwes 74; Sebes 26).

Because it was the individuals from Portugal who were the first Europeans to return to China after almost centuries, it is with this monarchy that I am the most concerned at this point. Although the Chinese initially resisted doing business with the Portuguese at all when they first arrived in China in 1514 or 1515, eventually the Chinese allowed these Europeans to establish a city on a peninsula.
about forty miles west of present day Hong Kong which came to be called Macao, and to do trade from the port of Canton. Latourette states that "Macao was the only European settlement permitted by the Chinese and Canton was the chief and eventually the only port through which the Westerner was allowed to trade" (1929:86). It was in the city of Macao (created after 1552) that the European missionaries established themselves before they attempted to secure missionary bases on the mainland (Cary-Elwes 79).

There was one very famous missionary who was not Portuguese, however, but who served as a role model for other Catholic missionaries by making the first serious attempt to penetrate China before the port of Macao had developed into a thriving city containing churches, seminaries and even factories (Cary-Elwes 80). His name was Francis; he was a Jesuit, and that member of the Society of Jesus who later became Saint Francis of Xavier.

Since the Jesuits play a very important part in the establishment of Catholic missions on the Chinese mainland I would like to briefly characterize this group of missionaries before presenting Saint Francis of Xavier's story. The Society of Jesus was founded in Spain by Ignatius of Loyola in 1534 after he had been wounded in battle and had undergone a spiritual transformation. In 1540 the society was approved by Pope Paul the III. The Society of Jesus is known to have attracted a high caliber of Catholic priests who were required to follow the strict guidelines of the order, as outlined by Ignatius of Loyola in his Spiritual Exercises, and which
was organized in a manner similar to a military organization (and, which undoubtedly reflected the fact that Ignatius had been in "the profession of arms" before he became a priest) (Rowbotham 40; Reese 268).

The Jesuits are largely associated with the Catholic Counter-Reformation. Philosopher William Reese reports that the Jesuits set for themselves three goals: "to teach the young, to preach to the ignorant and heathen and to guide Christians to perfection" (Reese 269). Although the Society of Jesus was predominant in Spain, it also spread to the Spanish Netherlands, to Italy and also to France. They early on won a reputation for their saintliness due to the extent to which they helped others and were willing to live in poverty. They revived the confessional within the Catholic Church, won princes and kings as converts and before long, they were in a powerful position in Europe (Rowbotham 42).

It was this relatively young and demanding order which Francis of Xavier decided to join. Rowbotham claims that he was "Loyola's greatest convert, the highest exemplification of the lofty ideals and mystic devotion of the founder of the order" (43). Indeed, Francis of Xavier demonstrated himself to be a truly charismatic figure for he is said to have had thousands of converts (in India especially) and to have established some of the innovative changes in the behavior of priests which needed to be initiated in the Catholic mission of the East if these Christian missions were going to be a success. For instance, Saint Francis was one of the first, if not the first missionary in Asia to follow the guidelines of Saint Ignatius of
Loyola and learn the language of the people who were the object of concern (Dunne 13; Rowbotham 45). That is, when he was in Japan, he learned Japanese before he expected to be able to convert the people. In addition, Saint Francis wore "rich dress befitting his rank" instead of "the torn robe of the pilgrim" in order to be taken seriously by the emperor in Japan. Saint Francis felt it was necessary to convert the ruler before it was possible to have any influence on the Japanese people (an idea which was also the outgrowth of Saint Ignatius of Loyola's influence who had "decided against the adoption of a distinctive habit for members of the Society") (Dunne 13). As Rowbotham states: "With the Jesuit policy of reaching always to the top and working down, Xavier felt that to win Japan he must first win the ear of the emperor" (Rowbotham 45). Saint Francis of Xavier's strategy of learning the language of the native people and of dressing in such a way that the indigenous people of Japan would take him seriously and listen to what he had to say was imitated by other Jesuit missionaries on mainland China as I discuss at a later point.

Saint Francis of Xavier not only demonstrated that the learning of the native language and the wearing of appropriate dress were important strategies for conversion when he was in Japan. He also learned from the Japanese that in order to have these people be receptive to his Christian ideas, he would first have to convert the Chinese to whom the Japanese looked for all of their cultural wisdom and precedence for behavior (Cary-Elwes 79; Rowbotham 46). Thus, it was to China that Saint Francis attempted to go and to be heard.
Because the Portuguese merchants had still not been allowed to establish themselves in Macao or in the port of Canton at the time of Saint Francis, as mentioned earlier, for three months each year these men had to live on an uninhabited island off the coast of Canton while attempting to do trade with the mainland. Saint Francis of Xavier went to this island of Si-Kiang in 1552 and attempted to persuade the merchants to take him ashore so that he could try to establish a mission there. The men felt that this missionary could jeopardize their already tenuous connection with the Chinese; therefore, no one would accommodate him. Although Saint Francis had not given up in his quest to convert the Chinese, he died the same year he arrived on this island off the coast of the mainland before being able to accomplish this goal. His mission, on a material level was a failure; however, his determined and ardent example served to inspire many other missionaries, especially Jesuits, to follow in his footsteps and to at least aspire to what he had attempted. In regard to Saint Francis of Xavier's life and death, Cary-Elwes concludes the following: "His name was already a legend in the East. It still is. It can truly be said of him that in his generation he was the missionary effort in the Eastern hemisphere. It had seemed to him necessary and wise to attempt single-handed this supreme problem of the Far East, the conversion of China, and this was enough to make it the business of his successors to carry on where he had left off" (81).

After the heroic effort of Saint Francis to make the mainland his home in order to convert the Chinese, there were numerous other
short and/or aborted efforts made by Catholic missionaries on the mainland. These missionaries came from one of the "two centers of European power in the Far East," the Spanish dominated Manila and the largely Portuguese Macao (Latourette 1929:88). Missionaries tried to penetrate China from both of these cities despite the fact that China was supposed to be off limits to the Spanish according to the Treaty of Tordesillas.

Some of the most oft mentioned ventures were those of the following individuals: the Portuguese Jesuit Nunes Barreto spent two months in Canton attempting to free some imprisoned Portuguese in 1555 (Latourette 1929:89); in the same year, the Portuguese Dominican Gaspar da Cruz stayed temporarily in the same city (Latourette 1929:89; D'Elia:34); in 1565, the Jesuit Francis Perez arrived in Canton and asked permission to stay but he was denied (D'Elia 34). Other individuals of Jesuit, Dominican, Augustinian and Franciscan orders also attempted to establish missions on the mainland between the years of 1552-1583 (Cary-Elwes 81-85; Latourette 1929:88-90; D'Elia 32-35; Rowbotham 48-50; Dunne 15-16; Sebes 30).15 However, the heartbreaking yet highly inspiring story of Saint Francis of Xavier was of use for some very intelligent, brave, creative, deeply spiritual and determined Jesuit missionaries who were eventually able to make mainland China their home,

---

15 For a very thorough summary of all the missionaries who were unable to establish permanent missions on the mainland, see Joseph Sebes 1988: 27-30.
successfully build many churches, as well as win converts and the respect of the Emperor and other high government officials.
CHAPTER 4
THE JESUITS ESTABLISH MISSIONS
IN MAINLAND CHINA: 1580-1610

Although Augustinian, Dominican, and Franciscan priests whose center in Asia was the Philippines had succeeded in temporarily establishing themselves on mainland China in 1577, 1579 and 1581, it was the Jesuits who established the first successful mission of any permanence in China (Rienstra 6; Spence 1985:51; Sebes 1988: 23). Although many of these Jesuits were not Portuguese, their base in Asia was Macao, as indicated earlier.

By the mid 1500's a Jesuit house had been established by Friar Francis Perez in Macao. At any one time there could be found from fifty to sixty Jesuits studying theology and some time after 1579 learning Chinese there. This institution also housed a school for Portuguese and Chinese children (Cary-Elwes 86; Dunne 16). By 1563 the city of Macao contained about five thousand people, nine hundred of whom were Portuguese (Dunne 15).

These early Macao based Jesuits, as well as the Franciscans, Dominicans and Augustinians who were situated in the Philippines, all had a reputation for Europeanizing their converts. That is, in the Philippines, the Catholic priests would "spanishize" the Philippine converts, while in Macao Chinese converts would have to abandon Chinese culture and tradition, and become "Portuguese" in their behavior and looks to whatever extent was possible (Sebes 1988:22; Dunne 10, 19). This means of spreading the Catholic faith was a part
of the "Europeanism" mentioned earlier. That is, when mission and secular power became joined in the fifteenth century, many Catholics tended to equate Catholicism with nationalism (Dunne 8). The missionaries in particular did not seem able to separate the cultural practices and customs which were indigenous to their respective countries from Catholic rituals and behavior.

This nationalizing tendency was not new to the church. As George Dunne indicates, the earliest Christians also tried to impose Jewish cultural forms onto Greco-Roman society. It was St. Paul who made it clear that such externally imposed manifestations of Catholicism were not only not necessary, but not desirable. He taught that the church had to accommodate itself to Greco-Roman culture to a large extent in order to win the necessary converts. The Christian Church needed to recognize what was good in this originally pagan culture, to keep it and to Christianize it (Dunne 5-6; Chupungco 3-27). Catholics did not need to and should not obliterate all of the beauty and greatness that Greco-Roman culture had to offer the world unless it went against the teaching of Christianity. In particular, of course, there could be no worship of pagan gods (Dunne 6). However, many of the cultural practices of using "candles, incense, oil and water" which were used in pagan rites were incorporated into Catholic liturgical practices (Dunne 5). In addition, "pagan feast days were replaced with Christian feast days," and as "the people were fond of religious processions these found ready acceptance in Christian practice" (Dunne 5). Perhaps one of the most interesting means of accommodating Greco-Roman culture was the way in which
Christian artists incorporated pagan imagery into their work in catacombs. Dunne indicates that much of the traditional pagan symbolism of the phoenix of immortality, the olive branch of peace and the palm of victory were retained. He suggests that even the figure of the fish which typically represents the Eucharist for Christians had its origins in pagan sacrifices (5). Thus, as Dunne states, "the early Church entered thoroughly into the cultural life of the Roman empire. Without sacrificing doctrinal purity she preserved from the old culture whatever was good, transformed whatever was indifferent, and with a view to gradual catharsis from within tolerated much that was considered evil, but not intrinsically or irremediably so. It was cultural accommodation carried to its highest point" (Dunne 6).

By the time of the Christian missions in Asia in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, this awareness of the need for cultural accommodation in the church was largely lost, and this nationalizing of converts, as described above, took place. In Macao, for instance, the Chinese were expected to take Portuguese names, adopt Portuguese customs, and wear Portuguese clothes when they were baptized. In essence, they were expected to become Portuguese in its outward cultural manifestations to as great extent as possible (Dunne 18; Sebes 1988:22). In fact, the Jesuit scholar Joseph Sebes maintains that "any adaptation of European culture, not to mention Christian doctrine, was considered to be against God" (22). Obviously this approach was just the opposite from the approach of the earliest Christians as epitomized in the teachings of St. Paul.
In addition to this Europeanizing policy of these early missionaries in Asia, was the tendency to consider military force in trying to convert China (this is in addition to and aside from the actual violent behavior demonstrated by Portuguese traders in China described earlier). Missionaries from both the Philippines and Macao frequently became so frustrated at the Chinese resistance to allowing Catholic missions to establish themselves on the mainland that force was seriously discussed. Evidence for the consideration of the use of force can be found in Portuguese as well as Spanish reports from this period (Sebes 1988:39). Dunne even provides the specific words of two noted missionaries from this time who were personally frustrated with the situation. The Portuguese provincial of the Jesuits in India, Melchior Nunes Barreto (1519-1571), wrote after visiting Macao that he thought the European Christian princes should "force the sovereign of China to grant to the missionaries the right to preach and to the natives the right to hear the truth" (Dunne 16). Dunne suggests that this priest had come to this conclusion after discussions with the Spanish Jesuit priest, Juan Bautista Ribeira at Macao who at one point had written, "There is no hope of converting [the Chinese], unless one has recourse to force and unless they give way before the soldiers" (Dunne 16). Obviously the spirit of the crusades from the thirteenth century had not yet died.

Before going to the island of Si-Kiang off the coast of China where he ultimately died, Saint Francis Xavier had fled the Portuguese colonizing base of Goa, India for Japan because he was so disgusted with the harsh methods of the Portuguese missionaries
with those natives (Sebes 1988:23). Approximately three decades after Xavier's death, another Jesuit who had not lost sight of the methods of Xavier who advocated learning the language of the country of interest, and wearing acceptable dress there, and who had kept in mind the cultural accommodation teachings of Saint Paul, and to whom the advocacy of violence would be unthinkable, came to Macao and essentially changed the entire thrust of the Jesuit mission in China (Dunne 13; Cronin 30). In fact, it was largely because of this man's observations of the methods and mental attitudes of the missionaries toward conversion of the Chinese that Jesuit methods were changed in Macao, and a Catholic mission was shortly thereafter established on the mainland.

The name of this significant figure in the history of Catholic missions in Asia is Father Alessandro Valignano. Valignano was known to be another spiritually gifted and talented individual. He was born in 1539 to a wealthy family in the southern Italian city of Abruzzi. After gaining a law degree and experience in the court of Pope Paul IV, he joined the Society of Jesus and attended the Roman college. Jonathan Spence reports that "there he studied mathematics under Clavius, along with physics, philosophy, and theology, and by 1471 he was appointed master of novices; in this role he administered the first-year examinations to the young Matteo Ricci"

16 Here not only were the converts expected to become "Portuguese," but the following rules were also enforced: "All Mohammedan and pagan priests, penitents, and sorcerers are to be driven from areas under Portuguese domination; non-Christian places of worship are to be destroyed; public practice of any but the Christian religion is forbidden; polygamy is punishable by banishment to the galleys; certain sections of the city are zoned against non-Christians" (Dunne 10).
Matteo Ricci (1552-1610), as will soon become apparent, is the major figure in this period of the "Jesuit Age," and is known as the founder of the Catholic Church in mainland China (D'Elia 35). Therefore, it is important that I clearly indicate the influence that Father Valignano had on the Catholic missions at this time directly - in so far as his actions go - and indirectly, to demonstrate the "immense effect" he had on Matteo Ricci (Spence 1985:40).

In 1573, the general of the Jesuit order, Father Everand Mercurian, designated Father Valignano to be visitor to the missions in India, "an assignment which, by the nature of the church's organization at the time, gave the thirty-four-year-old Valignano at one swoop powers equivalent to those of the general himself over all the Jesuit missions from the Cape of Good Hope to Japan" (Spence 1985:40). On a ten month layover on his way to Japan, Valignano stopped in Macao long enough to understand why the missionaries in that city had largely been unsuccessful in establishing themselves on the mainland (Sebes 1988:32). He recognized that a large part of their failure was due to the fact that these priests did not even attempt to understand Chinese language and customs; therefore, one of the first actions he took was to order the Jesuits to completely cease "portugalizing" the Chinese converts, and to "sinicize" themselves instead. In addition, because he recognized that the Jesuits in Macao "were not equal to the task" of changing from the policy of Europeanism to one of cultural accommodation, he requested that the Italian Father Bernardino de Ferrariis be sent to him from Goa (Dunne 18). Because he was unable to come, another
Italian priest, Michele Ruggieri was sent in his place.

Father Michele Ruggieri (1543-1607), about whom my biographical information is limited, was instructed by Valignano to begin his serious study of the Chinese language while Valignano was in Japan. However, the other Macao Jesuits were not very supportive of his attempt to "sinicize" himself, and they tried to distract him from his goals by giving him administrative responsibilities. When Valignano returned to Macao and was fully informed of this he had the Jesuit Superior removed and sent to Japan. He also "decreed that Jesuits appointed to the China mission should enjoy a large degree of autonomy from the Macao community and he strongly urged Claudio Aquaviva, the general of the Society, not to disturb these decisions" (Dunne 19). Thus, from thenceforth it became possible for the Jesuits to attempt a different approach of trying to make the Chinese understand that the true reason for the presence of many Catholic missionaries, at least, was a sincere one: they were in Asia to try to establish missions because they wholeheartedly believed that all peoples of the world needed to hear the Christian word of God in order that they too could win eternal salvation. Kenneth Scott Latourette, a top Christian missionary scholar who happens to be Protestant, offers his evaluation of the motives of these Catholic missionaries at this time: "No one can read many of the letters and diaries of missionaries without realizing that their writers were actuated primarily by exalted devotion. At times unworthy motives emerged but in the main the urge that sent representatives of the Church to the ends of the earth, often beyond the merchant, the
warrior, the explorer, the scientist, and the diplomat, had its source in a profound conviction that in the Christian faith are spiritual values which are essential to the present and eternal welfare of men and which it is the duty and privilege of Christians to share with the entire world" (1929:82).

Upon arriving in Macao in 1579, Michele Ruggieri diligently set about studying the Chinese language (despite the obstacles), and, with the help of interpreters, writing the first Chinese catechism (Sebes 1988:34; Latourette 1929:91; Dunne 29). Because Ruggieri found the language difficult to master, he wrote to Valignano in Japan to request that Matteo Ricci join him. Father Valignano responded by having both Father Francesco Pasio (1554-1612) and Ricci sent to Macao (Sebes 1982:34). While all three Jesuits were now endeavoring to become fluent in Chinese, Father Ruggieri saw his opportunity to try and establish a mission on the mainland. When the Portuguese traders were setting off to Canton on one of their semi-annual trading missions, Ruggieri managed to go with them. There Ruggieri successfully ingratiated himself to a Chinese viceroy, "perhaps because of his evident respect for their language and culture," as M. Howard Riensta, editor and translator of Jesuit Letters from China 1583-84. states it, and eventually was able to be granted a temporary residence for himself and Pasio in 1580 (Rienstra 11; Dunne 20). At the suggestion of Father Valignano, Ruggieri eventually requested a permanent residence for himself and other companions. As written in a letter in 1583, Ruggieri describes his method of making his request to the official: "One time, among
others, as we were visiting, and finding him in a good mood, we put forth our request for a residence inside China, both to share their language and letters, and to share ours with them" (Rienstra 18). Ruggieri succeeded in having a house provided for him and Pasio, and a license for Matteo Ricci to join them in this city of Chao ch'ing as a result of this interaction. Here it is only fair that I point out that Ruggieri was truly the first Jesuit missionary to successfully implement Valignano's strategy of cultural accommodation on the mainland. That is, it should be apparent from the above quotation that Ruggieri won a residence for these Jesuit missionaries in China by showing respect for and interest in Chinese culture and traditions. Instead of attempting to thrust European and/or Christian ways of viewing and acting in the world onto the Chinese, Ruggieri not only culturally accommodated the Chinese, but he also did not overtly state that his main purpose for wanting to live in this foreign land was to win Chinese converts to the faith of Christianity. This behavior on the part of Ruggieri was to set the precedence for most Jesuit missionaries who followed him and Pasio to China. Valignano's methods of cultural accommodation, which he was successfully implementing in Japan, had its start with Ruggieri in China and its fullest development and largest success with the highly intellectual, sensitive and diplomatic Matteo Ricci (Sebes 1988:33). This strategy was obviously radically different from the typically aggressive and "Europeanizing" methods of Dominican, Franciscan, Augustinian and other early Jesuit priests in the Philippines, Goa, and in Macao. Indeed, if it had not been for this understated approach to the
Chinese, who were quite extremely xenophobic, as will be recalled, Catholic missionaries may never have succeeded in finding a largely acceptable place for themselves in China, difficult though this place was for them many a time.

After Ruggieri, Pasio and Ricci had been situated in Chao ch'ing for a period of time, the viceroy who had granted them permission to stay in their designated house fell, temporarily, into disfavor with his superior. As a result, he had these missionaries dispelled from the mainland. However, soon afterwards, the trouble had apparently passed and the missionaries were invited to return. Pasio had found the expulsion from China to be so disheartening, however, that he decided to devote himself to mission work in Japan where he felt he would be more successful (Dunne 20-21; Allan 29-30). Therefore, only Ruggieri and Ricci returned to the mainland; however, because these Jesuits felt that the only way that Christianity would become an acceptable religious alternative to the Chinese would be by gaining the approval, at least, of the emperor of China, Valignano sent Ruggieri to Rome to request that the pope send an embassy to the capital for this purpose. The situation in Rome upon Ruggieri's arrival was not conducive to having such a request granted due to the fact that within one year's time, four popes had been elected, and four had died. Meanwhile, Ruggieri's health was failing, and he stayed in Rome never to return to China. Thus, the idea of sending an embassy to China from Rome was abandoned (D'Elia 36; Sebes 1988:37).

Matteo Ricci had been left alone in Chao-ch'ing until 1589.
However, before proceeding with an outline of Ricci's "ascent to Peking" from this city - as Jonathan Spence aptly phrases Ricci's sixteen year "cartographic" progression from southern China to the capital in the north - it is important that I provide a brief biographical account of the life and education of this significant individual (Spence 1982:12). This Italian Jesuit priest was the oldest of fourteen children born in the city of Macerata on October 6, 1552, less than two months after the death of Xavier (D'Elia 35; Spence 1985:235). At the age of nine he was sent to a Jesuit college in Macerata; in 1568 he went to the University of Rome where he studied law for three years; in 1971 he entered the Society of Jesus in the novitiate of San Andrea in Quirinale. After taking his vows, and teaching for several years in the Jesuit college in Florence, he attended college in Rome. It was here at the Roman college that he learned many of the subjects which were so useful for him in his China mission in later years. He studied philosophy and mathematics under the famous Jesuit Christopher Clavius (1537?-1612), "the associate and friend of Kepler and Galileo and a leader in the Gregorian reform of the Julian calendar promulgated in 1582" (Sebes 1988:36). It was also here that Ricci studied physics, astronomy, geometry, map making and mechanics, and learned how to make sundials, clocks and astrolabes. The young Jesuit also had the opportunity to study theology with the noted Jesuit thinker Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) at this college, from whom he learned "that clear exposition of doctrine which he put to such practical use later years" (Sebes 1982:37). The reader should also be reminded that this
is where Ricci met one of the most influential figures of his life in Asia, Alessandro Valignano, whom, it should be recalled, was the acting master of novices at the time of Ricci's stay there in Rome (Spence 1982:5). After completion of his studies at the Roman college, Ricci was accepted by the Portuguese padroado; as a result, the young Italian went to Portugal where he continued his study of theology at the University of Coimbra. From 1578 until 1582 Ricci taught at the Jesuit St. Paul's College in Goa, India. It was in Goa, in 1580, that he was ordained to the priesthood, and it was from Goa that Father Valignano summoned Ricci, along with Pasio, to Macao to begin the rest of his radically changed life as a leading missionary in China (Sebes 1982:36-37).

Although Ricci had been able to stay in this city of Chao ch'ing under the authority of three viceroyys, in 1589 a new viceroy wanted Ricci expelled. Due to Ricci's linguistic skills and winning personality, he managed to be able to stay on the mainland, but on the condition that he move to another city. Therefore, at this time, he was forced to move further north to the city of Shao-chou - which was then the capital of Kuangtung and Kuangsi - where he stayed until 1595 (D'Elia 36; Sebes 1982:38; Spence 1982:12). In 1595, he moved north to Nanking, but he was unable to stay there due to the Japanese invasion of China in this year and to the fact that Nanking was then the second capital of the empire. Therefore, he had to go back to Nanchang, a city of many scholars and the place where the official imperial examinations were given every three years at that time (Sebes 1988:38; Dunne 47). This was a city where he was able to
make many contacts with the Chinese literati - also known as scholars - from numerous provinces all throughout China, and therefore to give them exposure to many of his ideas (Dunne 47). In 1598 Ricci attempted to establish himself in Peking, but was unsuccessful; however, this time he was able to stay in Nanking until 1600. He finally arrived in Peking, the city in which Jesuits had striven to establish residence since they first entered China, in January of 1601 (Spence 1988:12; Sebes 1988:38). Finally he was in the vicinity of the emperor and his court officials, those whom he and Valignano felt were necessary to influence if Christianity was to become an acceptable and viable religious alternative for the Chinese, and not just be viewed by them as a foreign religion (Sebes 1988:38-39; Rowbotham 57; Cary-Elwes 91; Dunne 45, 88).

Ricci's "ascent" to Peking was not accomplished without many trials and difficulties. Frequently there were rumors about Ricci and other priests who accompanied him throughout his missionary life in China which were detrimental to him and to his religion. Stones were thrown at them and/or at their place of residence and sometimes he or other priests wound up in court due to false accusations. On occasion, they would walk down the street and be called "foreign devil" (Trigault 161). Cary-Elwes reports that "all kinds of slanderous tales were spread; that they mistreated the son of a citizen, that Ruggieri had committed adultery, when in fact he had been miles away" (88). In Ricci's journal a typically outrageous story is described: "they trumped up a story that the boy had been seized by the Fathers and hidden in their house for three days, that
he had been given a certain drug, well known to the Chinese, which had prevented him from crying out, and that the purpose of it was to smuggle him back to Macao, where they could sell him into slavery" (Trigault 162-3; Cary-Elwes 88-90; Rienstra 16; Latourette 96, 97). Much of this xenophobic behavior was caused not only by the traditional Chinese attitude that theirs was the superior civilization in the world and all other peoples were barbarians (Dunne 10-12); rather, this condescending attitude was reinforced by their observations of non-Chinese behavior of peoples from all parts of the world. China scholar Albert Chan lists the reasons for the Chinese view of "barbarians" during the Ming: he mentions the Japanese pirates which had been causing problems along the coast of China; the Japanese invasion of Korea in 1597; the "menace" that Japan had become to China; and the Manchus who were beginning to give the Chinese government trouble. In regard to peoples of the west, Chan points out that the Chinese were aware of the Spanish colonization of the Philippines and of the Dutch occupation of Java, but most importantly, was the situation with Macao. Although the Chinese government had originally given permission to the Portuguese to stay on this island, when Spain and Portugal united in 1580 under King Philip of Spain, Philip claimed as his all of Portugal's dominions which, from his point of view, included Macao. In addition, the personal interactions the Chinese had with the merchants who were from Macao found these characters not to be of the highest caliber, as mention elsewhere. Therefore, Chan concludes, "The Chinese had reason to suspect foreigners coming into China and tried to keep
them out whenever they could do so" (158-159). One reason the Chinese did not like foreign missionaries in particular, according to Ricci's journal, was because they were afraid that the merchants from Macao would enter the interior of the empire with them (Trigault 161). Hence, with all of these reasons for the Chinese not to be open and receptive to Jesuit missionaries, it is all the more amazing that many of them were - especially by the most highly educated Chinese, as shall become clear.

So why were Ricci and many of the other Jesuits allowed to stay on the mainland after the initial work of Ruggieri when the Chinese mind was filled with a plethora of reasons as to why to keep them out? It is my observation that the reasons for tolerance on the part of the Chinese are at least twofold: the "pacific penetration and cultural adaptation" strategies of the Jesuit order, and the state of unrest that certain elements of the Chinese literati, were experiencing during this period of the Ming which made these men perhaps uncharacteristically open to foreign ideas (Dunne 86; Latourette 1929:93,95; Chan 155). Let us first begin with a brief exploration of this latter openness of the Ming literati in order to attempt to understand this seeming contradiction.

Latourette, Chan and Allan indicate that the period in which Ricci and company entered China was largely one of decline, a time of the Ming dynasty in which "restlessness" and "dissatisfaction" was being experienced largely on the part of the scholar-officials (Latourette 1929:93; Chan 155; Allan 48-49). Chan explains that the reason for this was largely due to the behavior of the Wan-I
emperor who was neglecting his duties as ruler and placing his private affairs first; when he did pay attention to governmental affairs, the emperor had a tendency to ask the advice of the rather uneducated eunuchs instead of the more knowledgeable and experienced scholar-officials. His negligence was, in fact, so severe that several governmental posts went unfilled, and soon political factions amongst the literati were formed (Chan 155). This immoral behavior, according to Chan, was of great concern to this class of officials. Editor Bonnie Oh, in the introduction to his piece in *East Meets West: The Jesuits in China from 1582-1773*, summarizes the essence of Chan's understanding of the Ming scholarly class of this time: "The scholar-officials were concerned about the erosion of traditional moral values, about the conduct of government, and about the visible decline of the empire" (xxvii). Thus, it was this state of affairs, Chan suggests, which allowed the scholar-officials to open their minds -and some their hearts and spirits - to the educated Western missionaries who were on their soil.

In addition to the conditions in the empire which were conducive to allowing the scholar-officials to tolerate the presence of Jesuits in China during the Ming dynasty (as well as the emperor, as Dunne points out, who implicitly sanctioned their stay by not reacting to it), were the Jesuit strategies of "pacific penetration and cultural accommodation" stated above (Dunne 86). Although Dunne does not specifically elaborate on the phrase to any extent, I interpret Dunne's use of the term "pacific penetration" to refer to the way in which Ricci and his cohorts were able to penetrate mainland
China and to have been able to live in numerous cities in China for years. This method was "pacific" or peaceful and conciliatory because the Jesuits did not behave as if they came from a superior civilization and brashly go about preaching the "truths" from their Gospel; rather, Ricci followed Ruggieri's approach who presented himself, if the reader recalls, as if he wanted to share the knowledge of his culture with the Chinese, as well as learn about the their culture. To repeat Ruggieri's words once again, he stated that he wanted "to share their language and letters, and to share ours with them" (Rienstra 18). In other words, neither Ricci nor Ruggieri emphasized in their early relations with the Chinese the fact that they were truly in China for the sole purpose of converting the Chinese to Christianity. Dunne describes Ricci's method: "He therefore resolved, without denying or disguising his true character, not to thrust into the forefront of public consciousness the fact that his object was to propagate a new religion" (45). Although Ruggieri had set the precedent as to how to present oneself to the Chinese - as wanting to share the fruits of each other's civilizations - Dunne points out that the Jesuits only realized the extent to which they must not foreground their religious views with time (28). In other words, they discovered that their religious views and customs were so radically different from anything else these Chinese had ever been exposed to that it was better to win their friendship and trust based on communication about other areas of life first and in an overt manner, while only slowly and discreetly revealing their religious beliefs. Thus, Ricci came to understand as well as practice
Valignano's conclusions that "Instead of attempting to graft itself as a foreign substance upon the resistant and unfriendly body of Chinese culture, Christianity was to revert to its original character of leaven. Entering quietly into the body of Chinese culture it must endeavor to transform it from within" (Dunne 17). One material example of the gradual process by which Ricci came to the conclusion that he must quietly come to influence Chinese culture with Christianity was his shift from having chapels built immediately upon his arrival in a new city, to his reliance on conversational halls instead. Ricci had decided that "more could be accomplished through private conversations and small discussion groups than by public preaching" (Dunne 46). This was why upon his arrival in Nanchang that he had only a residence built as opposed to having chapels built as he had in Chaoching and Shaochow (Dunne 45).

There is much interesting evidence which helps us to understand why Ricci should make such a decision as to not build chapels immediately upon arrival in a new city. Although the Nestorians in the seventh century and the Franciscans in the fourteenth century had succeeded in temporarily establishing missions in China, there was, for the large part, no conscious memory of it (on either the Chinese or European side) when the Jesuits returned in the sixteenth century, as stated previously (Cary-Elwes 95). To begin with, the people with whom the Nestorians and Franciscans had come in contact could only have been a small percentage of the population. Therefore, we should recognize that the encounter between Ricci and his colleagues with the Chinese was
really the meeting of two virgin mindsets with radically different ways of viewing and experiencing the world. Two examples of interactions which Ricci had with local Chinese will help us understand the extent to which this contact between two cultures was, at times, difficult. Understanding the significance of these interactions should also deepen our insight into the reasons why Ricci came to the conclusion that his method of conversion had to be extremely slow, gradual and discreet.

Cary-Elwes reports the reaction of one eunuch to Ricci and his fellow foreigner missionaries. Ma T'ang captured Ricci and those by whom he was accompanied and threw them in jail on one of their journeys to Peking (Cary-Elwes does not mention if there was a specific reason for the imprisonment other than to imply that it was simply because they were foreigners). Upon inspection of Ricci's luggage, this eunuch found a crucifix. A clashing of the two world views is evident both in the eunuch's reaction to the crucifix, and to Ricci's description of the eunuch's reaction. Ricci states the following in his journal: "The thing that astonished them all most and gave us greatest pain was the discovery among our effects of a very beautiful crucifix made in wood, the blood painted on so that it seemed alive. On seeing this, the cruel eunuch began to exclaim: 'so this is the sorcery you have made in order to threaten our king with. This cannot be a good or kindly person who goes about with such works of art'" (Cary-Elwes 100). The reaction of the eunuch should make clear to the reader the extent to which some of the concepts of Christianity were extremely alien to the Chinese view and
experience of the world. Actually it is quite easy to understand how someone who had never been exposed to Christianity would have such a reaction. To see an image of a bloody and dead person hanging on a piece of wood is not a pretty sight; only with the necessary education would anyone anywhere be able to appreciate the deep meaning and significance the figure had and has for a large portion of the world population. From the perspective of the eunuch during this period in time, therefore, it is understandable that he might be concerned that this "foreign devil" could conceivably have been on his way to the capital to attempt to hang the emperor from such a cross - or something of the sort!

Another incident occurred which reflects a cultural difference in the Chinese reaction to the Christian way of manifesting its beliefs and customs in the world as to the way the Chinese were accustomed to seeing religious views expressed in the material world. Because Buddhist temples were frequently used for social gatherings, the Chinese took offense when they discovered that Christian chapels could not be used for the same purpose (Dunne 46-47). Ricci states in his journal that the Chinese could not understand why "the doors of our house, which were kept open for inspection while it was being built, were now kept closed according to the rule of our Society. What they wanted to do was to use the house as they did their temples of idols, which are always left wide open and are often the scenes of uncouth frivolity" (Trigault 162). Dunne claims that a "minor riot" occurred as a result of the locking of chapel doors on one occasion because this behavior was interpreted by the Chinese as
being "an infringement of customary law" (Dunne 47). Thus, it is now easier to comprehend that Ricci decided not to build a chapel at Nanchang upon his arrival because of the accumulation of such experiences. At this point in the early conversion process of the Chinese, it seemed wiser to Ricci to avoid violating Chinese customs and at the same time to avoid having the Chinese violate the sacred customs of the Christian Church. Recognition of these two incidents are extremely significant in enabling us to grasp the quality of the obstacles that both the Chinese and the European missionaries had to overcome in order to understand each other and not to desecrate each other's highly revered traditional expressions of each respective world view.

The degree to which it was necessary for Ricci to become more and more sensitive to the Chinese way of doing and seeing was simply a refinement of his method of pacific penetration. Spence agrees with this view of Ricci's increased awareness of the need to try to understand the Chinese perspective which caused him to be more cautious in when and how he presented his views of Christianity. Spence maintains that not only did Ricci cartographically ascend to Peking, but he also experienced a "type of ascent in sensitivity in which he learned to take Chinese values ever more seriously" (1988:13).

The concepts of pacific penetration and cultural accommodation are closely connected. However, there is some distinction between

---

17 Ricci was in Nanchang in 1595; in 1596 there were approximately one hundred converts in all of China (D'Elia 39).
them which needs to be made. I have tried to establish the argument that pacific penetration is a phrase which is used to describe the way in which the Jesuits went about presenting their religion to the Chinese. I have noted that they did not foreground their religious purposes, but rather emphasized their interest in establishing mutual understanding between the missionaries and the Chinese instead. The Jesuit goal was to peacefully and nonabrasively be accepted into various sections of the mainland and especially the capital. In order to accomplish this, the Jesuits largely had to withhold what they thought and attempt to learn what the Chinese thought in order to be certain that their Christian ideas would eventually be heard at all and that they would not be permanently expelled from China. More needs to be said about this aspect of the Jesuit approach and I do elaborate more fully at a later, and more appropriate, point.

Cultural accommodation, on the other hand, was the conscious effort on the part of the Jesuits to "sinicize" themselves in order to spread the Christian word of God. Ricci was interested in establishing a Sino-Christian civilization. In order to accomplish this he and his fellow Jesuits needed to abandon their exterior European cultural expressions of Christianity as much as possible and become Chinese to as great an extent as he could, in accordance with Valignano's wishes (Dunne 27,19). Ruggieri, at one point exclaimed in a letter, "we have become Chinese, ut Christo sinus lucrificiamus (so that we may gain China for Christ)" (Rienstra 37). One way in which the Jesuits initially went about "becoming Chinese" was to dress as
Buddhist *bonzes*, or monks. The Jesuits thought that if they presented themselves as being religious figures with which the Chinese were familiar, they would have more of a chance of being taken seriously; however, it was only after the Jesuits had lived on the mainland for some time, and they had the opportunity to observe that the Buddhist bonzes were not very highly esteemed by many of the Chinese due to their immoral behavior, that they realized that they had "developed the wrong external image" as Jonathan Spence states it, and, as a result, decided to change their attire to that of the prestigious Confucian literati instead (1985:115; Dunne 33; Sebes 1988:40). Soon the Jesuits were wearing purple silk embroidered dresses as well as silk shoes with hopes that they would have the status of those whom they imitated (Spence 1985:115). This tactic appears to have worked for the Jesuits for this is the clothing that the majority of the Jesuits wore throughout their mission in China. Therefore, the wearing of literati clothing was one successful means by which the Jesuits successfully culturally accommodated themselves, externally at least, to Chinese ways. They made the conscious decision to literally wear a traditional Chinese custom.

Sebes describes all of Matteo Ricci's efforts at relinquishing his outer manifestations of Italianess and gives us an idea of the Chinese view of his success. The scholar states, "After his entry into China, Ricci became a Chinese with the Chinese. He adopted Chinese manners, diet, sleep patterns, and clothing, down to the cuffs, belt, sash, hat, and colors. He gave up grape wine for rice wine, no small
matter for an Italian. When he died, one of the most important of his friends addressed a memorial to the emperor requesting that in view of the great merit of Li Ma-tou (Ricci's Chinese name), the Westerner who had become Chinese, a special place of burial should be designated to receive his remains" (1982:42). Matteo Ricci would even have obeyed Valignano's wishes to an even greater extreme if he could have, for according to Dunne, Ricci "is on record as expressing regret that he could not change the cast of his eyes and the size of his nose the more completely to sinicize himself" (Dunne 33). Such was the greatness of Ricci's desire to be fully accepted by the Chinese.

Spence also mentions another custom which the Jesuits adopted in order to win the respect of the Chinese people. In a letter which Ricci wrote in 1592 the missionary states, "To gain greater status we do not walk along the streets on foot, but have ourselves carried in sedan chairs, on men's shoulder's, as men of rank are accustomed to do. For we have great need for this type of prestige in this region, and without it would make no progress among these gentiles" (Spence 1985:115). Spence points out that the letter was written in a tone of an apology. This observation is worth noting for indeed it must have been difficult for the Jesuits to be humble and sensitive - which Dunne and Spence maintain was necessary for them to be in order to be culturally accommodating - on the one hand, yet have to deliberately wear the outward "baggage" of status and prestige in Chinese society in order to gain their ear on the other (Spence 1985:115; Dunne 18).
Another way in which the Jesuits were culturally accommodating was by making every effort not only to learn the Chinese language, and to adopt some outward Chinese customs and mannerisms as their own, but by making every possible effort to become familiar with Chinese literature. This knowledge of Chinese teachings is one of the bodies of knowledge which the Jesuits initially put forward and emphasized in the establishment of their relationship with the Chinese instead of overtly preaching their Gospel. This aspect of the Jesuit strategy is also the point where the distinction between pacific penetration and cultural accommodation is the most difficult to make, for really it was a part of the Jesuit method of not emphasizing religion that the cultural accommodation of being well versed in Chinese writings became subsumed under this rubric of pacific penetration. That is, part of the means by which the Jesuits achieved pacific penetration was by being culturally accommodating. Ironically, however, it was by being culturally accommodating in this sense of mastering Chinese Classics (as Ricci did at least) that the Jesuits were finally able to express their religious views. This they did by drawing parallels between traditional Chinese views as described in these Classics (or at least as interpreted by Ricci) with some fundamental teachings of Christianity as I demonstrate below.

Prior to Ricci's writing on parallels between Chinese and Christian values and concepts came his establishment of friendships with Chinese people. Of course, only after his linguistic abilities had improved could any quality of deep friendship be cultivated (or
could writing of any depth be produced); however, Ricci had no problem with this difficult language for, although he had only begun to study Chinese upon his arrival in Macao in 1582, he proved himself to be capable of making "his first stabs at original composition without the help of other Chinese scholars" by 1594 (Sebes 1988:36; Spence 1988:13). Ricci's very first composition in Chinese was, in fact, his *Treatise on Friendship* (*Chiao-yu lun*) - published in 1595 in Nanchang - and, interestingly enough, this was where he began to discreetly draw parallels between classic Confucian teachings and Christian values (Spence 1985:150). Ricci was, of course, aware that Confucian teachings greatly emphasized ethical behavior. According to the rules of *li* or "the codes of social conduct and propriety," the Chinese were expected to behave with the utmost respect and appropriateness in all of their five relationships (*wu lun*) - one of which was that relationship which existed between friend and friend - in order to achieve a harmonious society (Minamiki 1985:4; Sebes 1988:45). By writing about a subject which was of fundamental importance to Chinese civilization, he succeeded in gaining much attention and admiration for himself. In fact, this treatise was so successful in China, that it was still being published in serial form in a Chinese newspaper in 1914 (Dunne 45). More significantly, however, the writing of this

---

18 According to Spence, this "small book" was republished in 1601 in expanded form and included "several flattering prefaces by his Chinese friends" (1985:150).
treatise "spread his fame into every corner of the empire" during Ricci's lifetime (Dunne 44).

In the Treatise on Friendship, Ricci "equated the Christian concept of love with the Confucian concept of humaneness (jen)" (Sebes 1988:44). Here he put forth the ideas that to be human in Confucian terms is to behave in accordance with the rules of li and to love others, while to be human in Christian terms is to treat others as one treats oneself and to love others as one loves oneself. Thus, by comparing Confucian and Christian teachings, Ricci pointed out that these two bodies of moral literature came to the same conclusion: humans should love humans and treat them accordingly. However, Ricci took this meeting of minds a step further and elaborated upon the Christian idea of being human by stating that the Christian concept is more than that of treating others as one treats oneself and simply loving others, for it includes the "love of God above all things" (Sebes 1988:44). Therefore, by demonstrating the parallels which existed between Confucian and Christian ideas on friendship - as well as the one major difference - Ricci succeeded in "christianizing Confucianism" or "confucianizing Christianity," to use Sebes' phrases (1988:45). Either way, because Ricci based his treatise in terms the Chinese could understand - Confucian terms - he was able to bring in his Christian views which did not omit mention of the importance of God. Because Ricci was capable of writing in Confucian terms, he succeeded in having the Chinese take him seriously. This was one example of how he was able to slowly and unobtrusively introduce Christian values to the Chinese. Spence
states that it was because Ricci "did not push the more intransigent side of the Christian teaching, it was easy for senior Confucian scholars to accept him as a near equal" (Spence 1985:151). Not only was he able to achieve this quality of camaraderie for himself which Spence describes with his Chinese friends by the publication of his Treatise on Friendship, but he also succeeded in ameliorating the Chinese view of non-Chinese in general in the process. Dunne states that with publication of the treatise, "The Chinese, accustomed to regard all other peoples as 'barbarians,' were no doubt surprised to discover that Europeans entertained such lofty notions on a subject dear to Chinese hearts. Their respect for European civilization immediately rose. It is for this reason that Ricci wrote that the work won credit not only for him, but for Europe as well" (45).

In addition to the Christian values regarding human behavior which the treatise reflected, there was a more specific reason as to why non-Chinese should have risen in the estimation of the Chinese from their reading of this treatise. Although I have stressed the fact that the Jesuits made a tremendous effort to sinicize themselves, and, to shed the accoutrements of European culture, Ricci did not abandon his European humanist training in the process. That is, Ricci was not adverse to using the works of European thinkers to communicate his Christian values to the Chinese. Even more significantly, perhaps, is the fact that Ricci not only used the works of Christian humanists when he spoke and wrote for the Chinese, but he also frequently referred to the works of men from the Greco-Roman world. For instance, in Ricci's Treatise on Friendship alone, he referred to the
views on friendship of Seneca, Cicero, Martial, Plutarch, and even of Erasmus (the inclusion of which Spence expresses particular surprise due to the fact that Saint Ignatius of Loyola did not consider his work to be "proper fare for Jesuit readers") (Spence 1985:150).

A beautiful example of how Ricci used classical literature while paralleling Christian and traditional Chinese teachings and keeping his Chinese audience in mind is his True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven, published in Peking in 1604 (D'Elia 38). Here Ricci attempted to demonstrate that Christianity and traditional Confucian teachings not only have ethical mores in common as he illustrated in his Treatise on Friendship, but he pointed out that the Confucian Classics describe a view of God which parallels that of Christianity and indicated that the contemporary Neo-Confucianist scholars had lost sight of this fact. That is, in the True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven, Ricci attempted to demonstrate that the Confucian Classics, which largely were written by Confucius (551-479 BC) but which were not canonized in China until the Han dynasty (206 BC-222 AD), (I describe more fully the evolution of the Confucian canon at a later point), described a belief in a personal creator God which directly mirrors the Christian belief in a personal creator God. He maintained that Chinese scholars came to misinterpret this concept in an effort to maintain their popularity in China after the rival religions of Buddhism and Taoism had threatened its omnipresence (Dunne 27; 19 D'Elia reports that this work was written from 1593-1596, that it was "widely circulated as a manuscript" before publication, and that it had four editions before 1609 "twice being printed by two High Mandarins not yet Christians" (D'Elia 38).
Sebes 1988:42-44; Rule 109, 113; Minamiki 1985:4; Ricci 1985:22-23). Ricci suggested in this work that it was largely due to the influence of these other religions that Chinese scholars began to interpret the classic Confucian conception of God not as a personal creator God, but as "the Supreme Ultimate (t'ai-chi), a kind of impersonal, mechanical prime mover functioning by way of 'act' and 'potency' (li and ch'i)" (Sebes 1988:42). This writing was truly his supreme effort at attempting to bridge the world view of the Chinese with that of Christianity. If he could successfully convince the Chinese that that their God was the same God as his Christian God, there would be no problem with converting China to the Christian religion, in his view. In order to make this supreme effort, Ricci used six Chinese Classics to assert his argument that the Supreme Being of traditional China is the same Supreme Being about which the Jesuits spoke in sixteenth century China (Rowbotham 64). He also used western classical works in order to demonstrate other Christian concepts. For example, Jonathan Spence points out that in chapter three in The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven Ricci attempted to demonstrate the Christian idea that one should not look for happiness in this world but should look forward to eternal life with God in heaven instead. In order to illustrate these ideas he tells the following story: "two famous philosophers from the West, one called Democritus, who was always laughing, and the other Heraclitus, who wept without ceasing. Their utterly different conduct in fact sprang from the same cause, for both of them saw how the men of their day ran after the false goods of this earth.
Democritus, by his laughter, mocked their folly; Heraclitus, with his tears, showed his compassion for them" (Spence 1985:158). The erudite Ricci creatively, and undoubtedly successfully, at least captured the attention of Chinese intellectuals by drawing on cultural traditions as distant in space and time as that of ancient Greece in order to serve his purpose. He tried to demonstrate the truth of Christianity not only through his knowledge of Confucian teachings but through relevant teachings from as many other parts of the world as his mind could muster. However, as Spence points out, Ricci never forgot his audience in his presentation of non-Chinese cultural expressions. He always geared his stories toward his Chinese friends and never lost sight of their world view. In trying to further his argument that there is more to life than what is before us on a material plane, Ricci told the story of a woman who has a child in prison, and while doing so provided evidence of his sensitivity toward Chinese values and customs, as Spence points out (1985:159). Spence judges this section from True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven as being "one of his strongest passages" (Spence 1985:159). For this reason, as well as for the beauty and poignancy of the story, I offer Spence's translation, though lengthy:

The Christian religion instructs us perfectly on these rules, but men do not understand what is in front of their eyes. Everything they cannot see seems opaque to them. If a pregnant woman is thrown into prison, and gives birth in a dungeon, her son will grow up knowing neither sun nor moon, ignorant that there are such things as mountains and rivers, a human race, a universe. A large candle serves as his sun, and a small one as his moon. The few people he sees in the prison
are the human race to him. He can think of nothing better than this. He is not aware there is hardship in his prison, he stays there peacefully, he does not think of leaving. But if his mother should speak to him of the splendour of the stars, of the fine objects owned by the wealthy, of the wide expanse and wonder of the world, of the loveliness and loftiness of the sky, he will come to understand that he has only seen some pale echoes of the sun, that his prison indeed is narrow, dirty, stinking. From that time on will he not cease wanting to make his home there? Will he not think, day and night, of freeing himself and going to live in joy amid his parents and friends? (Spence 1985:159)

The reference to Chinese customs is in the last line where Ricci illustrates his awareness of how important it is to Chinese tradition that people gather together for food, drink, and conversation, especially with one's parents. Spence states, "the final image was beautifully chosen, for the joys of company and society were a focal part of Ming Upper-class life, as Ricci knew too well" (1985:159). (Ricci was reported to have, on occasion, eaten and drunk "exuberantly" with his Chinese friends) (Spence 1985:160). It is also appropriate to mention that in this prison story, Ricci drew on Clavius and Plato, which provides further evidence of Ricci's consistent use of Greco-Roman allusions in his Christian apologetics (Spence 1985:159). Thus, the extent to which Ricci was capable of drawing on traditions upon which European culture was largely based to make his Christian points undoubtedly also served to impress the Chinese mind and to raise their estimation of Europeans in the process. The man knew many engaging stories from a plenitude of sources and knew how to use them for his purposes as
well.

Matteo Ricci and his fellow Jesuits were in China to teach the uninitiated about Christianity. In order to accomplish this, on the one hand, they abandoned some aspects of one culture, and adopted some aspects of another. In the truest sense, what Ricci especially was attempting to do, in my view, was to transcend culture. Ironically, however, Ricci had to use culture in order to transcend it. Culture was simply a means by which to teach the essence of Christianity. Therefore, it did not matter what dress he wore, what food he ate, what piece of literature he read or taught - whether it was Greco-Roman or Chinese - he could always find some element of goodness in radically different non-Christian cultural manifestations which he could equate with uniform Christian values just as the early Christians had done, as stated previously, when they had to relinquish some of their Jewish customs and traditions and incorporate some Greco-Roman elements into the Church at that time. Christianity was the "leaven," from the Jesuit point of view - to again use Dunne's term - which was supposed to gradually transform each individual in a particular culture for the better once he or she had completely digested all the mysteries of the Christian Church (4). However, as also stated elsewhere, the full extent of Christian doctrine was only revealed slowly in China, when Ricci and the other Jesuits felt that the Chinese who came from such a highly developed civilization were ready to hear the truth as these Christians saw it. Therefore, Ricci did not begin to form his deep friendships with Chinese on the level of ideas put forth in his Treatise of Friendship
and especially his *True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven*. Rather, he began by introducing the Chinese to other concepts of "Western Learning" (as Chinese converts came to call it) which he had studied in the Roman college before becoming a priest (Sebes 1988:40). In fact, out of all of the reasons for which Ricci became well known in China, Sebes claims that "Ricci acknowledged that his religious teachings came last" (Sebes 1988:41).

The pattern of interaction which Ricci and other early Jesuits appear to have repeated with many of their Chinese friends is the following: first the Chinese would become aware of the foreigners who were living in their area. Then, overcoming their xenophobia, they would pay a visit to the priests out of curiosity. As Father Francesco Cabral stated it in a letter, "And they usually come to our house to see this novel thing in China" (Rienstra 28; Young 19-20). Then the visitors would become fascinated by material objects which the Jesuits had brought with them from the West. Again I quote Father Cabral: "Here they are shown some things of Europe which to them are unusual and strange, such as triangular crystals (prisms), the map with Chinese letters, and other things in which they take delight" (Rienstra 28). This arousal of curiosity about these "unusual and strange" things would often be used to "placate officials" (Rowbotham 54). For example, after giving a clock to the viceroy of Kwangtung, Ruggieri petitioned the government official to establish a permanent residence; as a result, the Jesuits were granted their wish and given permission to travel throughout the empire as well (Rowbotham 55). In a very similar incident, Sebes relates that in
1583 Ricci petitioned to be allowed to remain in Chao-ch'ing, and his petition was granted because of the local magistrate's interest in the map of the world which Ricci had made (1988:41). Rowbotham reports that the mission in China was well supplied with "many objects such as watches, clocks, scientific instruments, paintings, engravings, maps and prisms" to "help them smooth the way to Peking" (58).

The next step after succeeding in stimulating initial interest in these foreigners with such objects as clocks and maps was the Jesuit method of capturing and holding the Chinese interest in subjects such as science and mathematics. Sebes states that "Ricci's predecessors, Xavier, Valignano, and Ruggieri, having learned about the Chinese respect and admiration for science and technology, advocated using these as means or, as some say as 'bait' to attract the Chinese" (1988:40). Many of the Chinese converts were educated men of the literati class (Latourette 95). Their intellects were frequently entranced by the knowledge that these learned Jesuits - in particular, that Ricci - had to offer. It was at this point in Ricci's relationships with the Chinese that he was able to call upon all of the education that he received at the Roman college for soon he was teaching mathematics, science, map-making, geometry, and memory techniques to the Chinese (Spence 1985:52-54; Rowbotham 62; Dunne 34; Cary-Elwes 96; Trigault 325-332). After friendships had been formed largely through the sharing of some aspect or aspects of this body of knowledge, then the conversations broadened and deepened to include consideration of religious issues such as those
expressed by Ricci in *True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven*. As is stated in Ricci's journal, "In the course of the centuries, God has shown more than one way of drawing men to Him....Whoever may think that ethics, physics and mathematics are not important in the work of the Church, is unacquainted with the taste of the Chinese" (Trigault 325). Presently, I would like to trace the development of Ricci's relationship with three highly influential Chinese which, to a certain degree reflect the pattern described above, in order to make clearer the movement of many of Ricci's (and other Jesuit) "convert" relationships.

An important friendship which Ricci formed in Shaochow was with Ch'u Ju-k'uei, the son of one of "the most distinguished and brilliant scholar-officials, Ch'u Ching-ch'un" (Dunne 33). Although in this case the friend was not a literati himself, but rather a bit of a dilettante, he was a highly educated young man with great intellectual curiosity. Initially, Ch'u went to Ricci because he thought he was an alchemist; however, discovering this was not the case, he realized that Ricci had much more to offer instead. Because Ch'u was "fascinated by the revelations of European science," Ricci soon became his mentor (Dunne 34). Ricci taught him the works of Clavius and Euclid, as well as arithmetic, and how to make sun-dials. After a period of time in which Ch'u and Ricci worked and studied together, Ch'u expressed an interest in learning about Ricci's religious beliefs. Cary-Elwes states, "The moment came when Ch'u T'ai-su wanted to be informed of the religion of these astonishing, charming unselfish travellers" (Cary-Elwes 96-97); and Ricci recorded the
moment in his journal: "Once he stopped the classes for three or four days and wished to speak of this subject, and he did so very much to the point. For, in order to do so to the best advantage, he had made a book of the difficulties he had found in our Catholic faith in order to put underneath the answer and solution the Fathers would give to each" (Cary-Elwes 97). Dunne indicates that many of the questions which Ch'u raised were far from superficial and "reached to the center of some of the gravest problems of theology" (34). Although he was eventually convinced of the truth of Catholic teaching, it was impossible for Ch'u to immediately formally convert to Catholicism due to the fact that he kept a concubine whom he refused to marry because of her low social station. However, after many years, when this woman had given birth to two of his sons, he found it in his heart to marry her, and thus was able to convert to Catholicism (Dunne 34-35). Thus, it is clear that Ricci's religious influence on Ch'u slowly evolved. The relationship began with a shared interest in secular studies (in these three cases no attraction to European objects or giving of gifts were involved), and progressed to discussions of deeper significance to the Jesuits, that of theology. The evolution of this relationship demonstrates the Jesuit method of only gradually introducing the ideas of Christianity when they and their Chinese friends felt that the time was appropriate. By engaging the mind of Ch'u on the material plane, and winning the utmost respect and admiration of his pupil, Ricci was eventually able to demonstrate (from his point of view) how wrong the Chinese were in spiritual matters (Cary-Elwes 101). In addition, just as the Jesuits early in
their mission were better able to secure positions for themselves on the mainland through the giving of gifts, the popularity and extent to which appreciation of the Jesuits grew in Chinese eyes due to the knowledge they brought with them further expanded and deepened their influence amongst the literati. Ch'u, for instance, because of the influential position of his family, was able to be very instrumental in introducing Ricci and his fellow Europeans to literati in Shaochow as well as in other cities such as Kwangtung, Kiangsi, Nanking, and eventually Peking (Dunne 35). As a consequence of the Jesuits being able to increase their influence due to their Western learning, they had more opportunities to share their faith with this broad spectrum of individuals.

Another highly influential Chinese convert to Christianity was Hsu Kuang-ch'i, commonly known amongst the missionaries as Paul Hsu. He was also instrumental in helping the Jesuits, particularly with their literary endeavors, and by his influence at court. His daughter, Candida, also became a Christian, and her story is of special interest to folklorists. Candida, widowed at a young age, devoted herself to good works and often spoke openly of her religion. Her contribution to folklore in this regard was significant for it was she who taught Chinese storytellers the word of the Gospel in order "that it might reach the more quickly the masses of the people" (Latourette 95). Even in the twentieth century there is evidence of the depth of the Hsu family's devotion to the Christian cause for their hometown, Zikawei, is where the Jesuit center of education is still located. The land upon which this center is housed was originally
donated by Paul Hsu (Latourette 95). All of this background information about Paul Hsu should not deter me from adding further evidence to my argument that many of Ricci's successful Chinese converts were made possible only after he had shared other aspects of his humanistic training with them. Actually, it is interesting to note that there was sometimes a chain reaction of converts who shared interest in some aspect of Ricci's non-religious teachings, which leads me to mention the connection between Ch'u and Hsu. Jonathan Spence speculates that it was most likely Ch'u and Ricci's "preliminary translation of the first book of Euclid" which originally caught the attention of Paul Hsu; in turn, Spence believes that it was Hsu and Ricci's final translation of Euclid which "deeply impressed" the bureaucrat Li Chih-tsao, "who had been drawn to Ricci out of admiration for his cartography" (1985:152). Only after numerous conversations about geometry and mathematics did Li also eventually become a Christian convert, in 1610, the year of Ricci's death. Hence, it should be easy for the reader to see that in Ricci's relationship with Ch'u the focus of their bond moved from mathematics and other subjects to Christianity; in his friendship with Hsu it moved from mathematics to Christianity; and in Ricci's relationship with Li the interest developed from mathematics and geometry to Christian conversion. In a larger frame, the connection which can be discerned between these scholars (in relationship to Ricci) moves from Ch'u to Hsu to Li.

The manner in which all three of these men became introduced to, convinced of the truth of, and converted to Christianity was a slow
and gradual process. The movement was from secular to religious matters as demonstrated above. However, it is also important to recognize that the way in which the Jesuits revealed all of the teachings of Christianity to the Chinese after the subject of religion had been broached, and even after it had become the center of discussion between the Jesuits and the Chinese, was slowly and gradually. I described earlier the incident which occurred when the eunuch Ma Tang found the crucifix in Ricci's luggage. This incident illustrated how absolutely alien many of the ideas of the Christian religion were to the Chinese. Another similar incident is told by Spence. This scholar explains that during a period of Ricci's life in China (after some of the main tenets of Christianity had become generally and vaguely known by a portion of the population) there was some confusion amongst the Chinese as to the significance of the Blessed Virgin Mary. On the one hand, they were aware that these Jesuits taught that there was only one creator God, yet they saw images of the Virgin displayed by these men. In their minds, they equated the Virgin Mother with other female goddesses of Chinese tradition. They could not understand why the Europeans would erect images of her if she was not a goddess. The Jesuits found it difficult to explain to these Chinese why the Virgin Mother was a major figure in Christianity, but yet was not a goddess. Spence states, "Since the Jesuits did not yet feel ready to explain to the Chinese the mystery of how Christ had entered the Virgin's womb in the Incarnation, some confusion was inevitable, and removing the Virgin's picture from its prominent position did not end the rumors" (1985:245). The
mysteries were too great for the Jesuits to even attempt to explain to the uninitiated. Therefore, in order for the Jesuits to try to assure that their religion would not be rejected outright, they told all of the mysteries of the faith only with time, when they felt that the Chinese were capable of understanding and perhaps accepting some of the more difficult teachings of the faith, such as that of the Incarnation.

Not only did the Jesuits not attempt to explain all of the mysteries of the Christian faith to the completely uninitiated, but they - just like the early Christians - refrained from divulging the most difficult concepts of Christianity even to the catechumens (Dunne 4; Cary-Elwes 100). Dunne states in regard to the early Christians, "Not until they had completed their probation and were ready for baptism did they receive initiation into the more recondite mysteries such as the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist..." (6). Cary-Elwes states in relation to Ricci, "his Catechism for neophytes and his 'Christian Doctrine' for those approaching the end of the catechumen's instruction give us a clear idea of his method....the sight of Christ on the cross was easily mistaken for magic, and as the ideas of the majesty and love of God were totally lacking to the Chinese of his day, he eliminated all mention of them in the catechism" (100). Only later, when Ricci felt that the novices were ready to understand and to accept these elements of Christian doctrine did Ricci and his companions begin to educate them more fully. Dunne claims that, this was an approach that was not only used by the early Christians, it was also a pedagogy used by Christ himself who extended it "beyond the limits of His mortal life" when he said to his disciples: "I
have yet many things to say to you: but you cannot hear them now. But when He, the Spirit of Truth is come, He will teach you all truth" (5). Only with time, the Jesuits maintained, should the Chinese attempt to be fully released from their "prison," and should they be the ones to attempt to unlock the door.

The pattern of relationships which Ricci and many of the other learned Jesuits in China established with Chinese in the "ascent" to Peking, can also be discerned in the way in which the Peking mission was finally established in this city in 1601. Upon arrival, the Jesuits brought an enormous amount of gifts with them to present to the emperor. Spence reports that it took "eight packhorses and more than thirty porters" to bear them all (1985:195). He also lists the contents of these packs: "There were three religious paintings, one of them the triptych of Christ in its glass case, one of the Virgin Mary and Child with John the Baptist in attendance, and one of the Virgin and Child together...There was one large clock, with hanging weights, and one smaller desk clock, spring-driven; a gilded breviary, and a handsome edition of Abraham Ortelius's cartographic masterwork, Theatrum Orbis Terrarum. There were prisms and hourglasses, colored belts and bolts of cloth, European silver coins, a rhinoceros horn...a small harpsichord designed to be played not by means of a keyboard but by plucking the strings with a plectrum" (1985:195). Allan also adds that the Jesuits brought some figurines dressed in costumes which represented European sovereigns and nobles (49). Although the Jesuits never set their eyes upon the emperor during Ricci's stay in Peking, the emperor was given these gifts and was
supposedly very pleased with them. His pleasure was undoubtedly demonstrated by his official announcement that the Jesuits would not only be able to remain in the empire, but that they would also be supported by the imperial treasury during their stay (Allan 49,53). It is interesting to note that the court eunuches discouraged the emperor from allowing the Jesuits to stay at all until they realized that it would be wise to keep them around just in case the clocks or other gadgets were in need of repair (and this would be necessary in order to keep the emperor happy with them) (Fulop-Miller 243). Allan directly quotes a memorial that the eunuches sent to the emperor upon arrival of the Jesuits which attempted to discourage him from allowing them to remain. The attitude reflected in the memorial is reminiscent of the reaction that the eunuch Ma Tang had to Ricci's crucifix, and therefore further demonstrates how alien Christian ideas - especially as represented in tangible images - were to most Chinese. Allan reports that The History of the Ming Dynasty, as translated by Moule, reiterates the words of the memorial: "And the tribute which he offered was a picture of the Lord of Heaven, and the Mother of the Lord of Heaven, altogether improper things; and amongst the things he brought were also bones of supernatural beings and such things. But since they say that supernatural things can fly upwards of themselves, how can these have bones? Thus they are superfluous things of ill-omen, and disgusting things which ought not to enter the palace" (52). It was lucky for these Jesuits that the weight of their gifts appeared to have more significance to the emperor than the words of the eunuches.
Before proceeding to a description of the next stage of the Jesuit pattern, of establishing a new mission in Peking, a closer look at the quality of interaction of the Jesuits with those of the imperial court is appropriate for reasons which will become apparent. As mentioned above, Ricci never saw the emperor in person, but communicated with him through intermediaries. In accordance with court etiquette - as determined by the governmental entity known as the Board of Rites - the emperor was only permitted to meet with certain individuals face to face, and these foreigners were not amongst the chosen few. Because of the emperor's curiosity about these men, however, he had portraits painted of them (Cary-Elwes 92). Upon arrival at the court of Peking, Ricci was unaware of this custom, and was fully expectant of meeting the ruler in person when he was summoned there. In anticipation of the event, Ricci rehearsed the gesture of kowtowing which he thought he would have to perform in the emperor's presence, "always willing to comply with any custom of the Chinese that did not offend his moral sense," as Allan states it (51). This traditional Chinese gesture which involves "a number of prostrations and knockings of the head on the ground," was enacted by Ricci before the throne of the great hall of reception, but an empty one (Allan 51)! It is fascinating to reflect on this incident, for here it is apparent that Ricci was confronted with two customs which were alien to Western civilization. It is unlikely that it ever entered his mind that he would not be able to meet with the emperor face to face when he was summoned to the imperial court, and undoubtedly he thought it odd that the emperor had to resort to
seeing portraits of the Jesuits in order to even have the vaguest idea of what these foreigners looked like. If he had not expected to meet the emperor face to face, he probably would not have rehearsed the kowtow. On the other hand, it is important to recognize that Ricci's knowledge of this foreign custom of kowtowing made him excel further at becoming "Chinese," for he was undoubtedly concerned about being accepted by the emperor of China in order that he could remain in his kingdom to ultimately spread the word of Christianity (Allan 51). Thus, once again, Ricci was personally willing to accommodate himself to Chinese culture. Now he kowtowed in addition to dressing like a Chinese literati, eating and sleeping as they did, as well as becoming knowledgeable about their traditional teachings.

Cameron reveals that it was not uncommon for Western embassies to refuse to kowtow before the throne of the emperor in Peking because they considered this gesture to be an inappropriate act of obeisance to a governmental figure who was from a culture which was inferior to theirs (148). Merchants, for instance, found themselves in a difficult bind when they wanted to do trade with China. After travelling such a great distance from the West to the East, bearing tribute to the king, a simple refusal to "compromise (as they saw it) their personal and national dignity" by not kowtowing frequently literally ruined all of their plans (Cameron 142). Cameron aptly sums up the dilemma with which many Westerners who had landed at the court of Peking were confronted: "The Chinese invariably demanded the performance of the kowtow; some
Westerners refused and as a consequence suffered agonies of frustration; others performed it, and suffered agonies of humiliation" (140). Thus, the significance of Ricci's willingness to kowtow becomes more apparent. He was a humble human being who understood the thinking and the ways of the Chinese, and his attempt to perfect the ritual of the kowtow by rehearsing it before he went to court is evidence of the extent to which he respected them and was once again willing to accommodate the Chinese culturally.

Although the sources at hand do not overtly state that the emperor acknowledged the fact that Ricci had indeed kowtowed before the empty throne, it is likely that this information was referred back to him. Therefore it is probable that Ricci's behavior in court as well as the bearing of such wonderful gifts were instrumental in influencing the emperor to make an official statement which allowed the Jesuits to remain in the capital.

After the Jesuits had succeeded in winning a secure position for themselves in Peking, the next stage of the Jesuit pattern manifested itself in the form of conferences which were held by these missionaries. These gatherings provided the opportunity to discuss science and philosophy as well as to bring those present "to the consideration of the existence and attributes of the true God" (Allan 53). Because Peking was the capital, numerous officials from all over China would pass through this city. For example, in 1610, the year of Ricci's death, approximately five thousand magistrates came to the city "to pay their respects to the king," while numerous examinees
from all over China came to take their imperial examinations (Trigault 561). Because by this time Ricci had become extremely famous all throughout China largely due to his "Western Learning," many of these officials would not only attend these organized conferences, but they would also visit him at his home, which provided the Jesuits with further opportunity to spread the word of Christianity throughout the empire. Trigault reports: "During the few years that he was in Pekin he was continually occupied with an almost incessant line of visitors, who came from all directions" (560). Dunne refers to this extensive and intensive communication with numerous individuals, whether they were of high station or low, as Ricci's "apostolate of radiation" for "From the parlor of his residence his quiet voice and influence reached out into almost every part of the sprawling empire" (93,91). These Chinese would have exposure to Christianity in Peking, and take this knowledge back with them to their provinces. Therefore, once again it becomes apparent that the progression of the relationships between the Jesuits and the Chinese often began with the giving of gifts, then moved to the sharing of secular ideas - either or both of which helped to provide the Jesuits win a more secure position in their new mission - to the enlargement of the scope of opportunities in which to introduce the uninitiated to the tenets of Christianity.

It should not be surprising to the reader that the last nine years of Ricci's life in Peking were "the most fruitful and productive" (Dunne 89). Largely as a result of his efforts, there was plenty of reason for optimism that the Catholic presence in China could survive
after his death. Latourette reports that public opinion in regard to Christianity at this time "was such that it was possible to administer baptism openly and with a good deal of ceremony" (96). A Catholic church had been built in Peking in 1602 (Cary-Elwes 105; Dunne 104). In 1584, there were only three Catholics, but at the time of Ricci's death in 1610 there were 2500 in China (D'Elia 39). The converts were from all levels of society. The very first one in Peking was a commoner who lived until he was 84 years of age (Dunne 101). Other converts included many members of the literati class; two were the sons of the emperor's personal physician, while one was the husband of the sister of the empress (Dunne 101; D'Elia 40). In addition, "The Three Pillars of the Early Catholic Church," two of whom were described earlier in their "chain reaction" convert relationship to each other - Hsu Kuang-ch'i, Li Chih-tsao, and the as of yet unintroduced Yang T'ing-yun all established missions in their home cities of Shanghai, Hangchow, and Chekiang, respectively (Dunne 112; Cary-Elwes 105). In 1594 there were ninety priests in preparation for the priesthood (Cary-Elwes 105); more Jesuits had arrived in Macao and and there were plans for a native clergy to be trained there (Latourette 96). Highly educated Jesuits were able to join Ricci in Peking as well as establish new missions in other parts of China. Some of the more memorable priests were the Portuguese Gaspard Ferreira and Emmanuel Diaz who were Ricci's colleagues in Peking; Sebastina Fernandez, the first Chinese to become a Jesuit (1591), was another colleague who was always at Ricci's side; a Spaniard named Pantoja who also helped Ricci establish the mission.
in the capital (D'Elia 42); the Italian Sabbatini de Uris, who was a mathematician and a scientist (Allan 58-59); the Italian Cattaneo who founded the Christian Church in Shanghai in 1608 (D'Elia 42); the Belgian Nicholas Trigault who translated Ricci's journals, and who was situated with Cattaneo in Shanghai; Aleni, an Italian, who was called by the famous Chinese premier, Yehhsiangkao (1558-1627) "'The Western Confucius' because of his vast sinological learning" and "scores of others who distinguished themselves as mathematicians, geographers, linguists or astronomers" (D'Elia 42).

Although, for the reasons provided above, many Christians had high hopes in regard to the prospects for Christianity in early seventeenth century China, Ricci realized that there would still be many problems for the Church to overcome. On his deathbed he stated to those by whom he was surrounded, "I am leaving you on the threshold of an open door, that leads to a great reward, but only after labors endured and dangers encountered" (Trigault 563). Undoubtedly it was Ricci's hope and dream that his successors would continue to interact with the Chinese in a similar manner to the way in which he, Ruggieri and Valignano had. All advocated the policy of cultural accommodation as illustrated so many times previously. Ricci also encouraged Jesuits to avoid "Needless conflicts with Chinese prejudices" and stated that "suspicions should be avoided" (Dunne 87). He advocated tolerance and patience and understanding in regard to many Chinese traditions which were unfamiliar to or characteristically disapproved of by Westerners. For instance, when his friend Ch'u Ju-kuei, mentioned elsewhere, could not immediately
convert to Christianity due to his relationship with a concubine, Ricci
did not judge him by Western or even Christian standards because
he understood that he was dealing with a tradition whose mores
were "hundreds, even thousands, of years old" (Dunne 35). This
attitude of toleration was also reflected in relation to his stance
toward ancestral and Confucian rites which also involved Chinese
traditions which were thousands of years old. Although I explore
these two aspects of Chinese tradition in relationship to Christianity
to a much greater extent in later chapters, at this point I will only
briefly summarize the issues involved. Because the rituals performed
in honor of one's ancestors and in honor of the great sage Confucius
appeared to the Western eye as possibly being religious in nature,
there was some question as to whether or not Catholic converts
should be permitted to participate in these rites after their
conversion (Minamiki 1985:2; Allan 56). Because Ricci understood
that both of these traditions were deeply rooted in Chinese
civilization and therefore in the Chinese identity, he recognized that
at that point in time, the Catholic Church could not proscribe them.
Therefore, he chose to view the rites as being predominantly a
secular means of demonstrating respect; however, because he did
admit that some "Chinese mingled superstition with the rites," he
gave Chinese Christians "rules in order to discriminate" between
those which were appropriate for Catholics and those which went
against Church teaching (Allan 56; Dunne 100). This position of
Ricci's, assumed in relation to the rites, is just another indication of
his willingness to understand and tolerate Chinese culture to the
extent which was necessary in order to be able to remain in China and to continue to have the opportunity to convert more Chinese. Many of the Catholic missionaries who came later to the China mission did not agree with Ricci's methods and interpretations - particularly in regard to the rites - but Ricci felt in his heart that accommodation to such a degree was necessary during that period of history. He realized that it would take a lot of time before members of Western civilization and individuals from Eastern civilization would understand each other well enough in order not to make quick judgements about each others values and traditions.

Ricci, Ruggieri, and Valignano all recognized that the existence of the Church in China was still a fragile one. Although there had been much growth and development from the time that Ruggieri first set foot on the mainland to the time of the establishment of the mission in Peking, it is likely that Ricci still felt concern on his deathbed that the words Ruggieri had written years before were still true: "The mission is a new and tender plant, and it would take but a breath of wind to destroy it; for this reason it is necessary that it be handled in these beginnings with great suavity and delicacy, and receive in due time cultivators who will cultivate rather than destroy it" (Dunne 125). The continuing story of the Catholic mission in China will soon reveal whether or not Ricci's successor's cultivated or destroyed the work that he and these other early Jesuits had accomplished.

Ricci died as he had lived for he had a Chinese funeral to the extent that was possible within the bounds of Christianity
(Latourette 98). After his death, he was placed in a Chinese casket, and taken to the church where a mass was said and the Office of the Dead was chanted by the converts and the priests; then he was taken to his home where his coffin was placed on a platform for mourners to see, in accordance with Chinese custom (Trigault 564). Panegyrics, "in praise of his virtue" were provided by Christians in Nankin and Peking and placed on either side of the catafalque; the Chinese emperor donated a plot of land in which the missionary could be buried (Trigault 565). This gesture could be interpreted as being a demonstration of appreciation of and respect for the qualities of the man known as Li Ma-Tou, or Matteo Ricci - who contributed so much to Chinese knowledge of science, mathematics and technology, especially - if not for agreement with his religious beliefs. Obviously, this move on the part of the emperor clearly illustrates his tolerance of the Jesuits in Peking dead or alive! Indeed it seems that this Western missionary with the "curly beard, blue eyes, and a voice like a great bell," as Ricci was described in a local Chinese history, had even impressed the emperor who had only seen a portrait of the man (Latourette 98). Thus ended the life of the founder of the Catholic Church in China, and the first part of the story about the Jesuit mission in this country.
CHAPTER 5  
CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN CHINA: 1610-1722

At the time of Ricci's death in 1610, the Jesuits were the only order in China. In 1585, Pope Gregory VIII had given them "the exclusive right to preach" in China and Japan (Noll vii). The reader should recall that the East was under the jurisdiction of Portugal at this time. Pope Clement VIII had decreed that Rome would "give in perpetuity the whole province of China" to that country (Cary-Elwes 132-133). This meant that only Jesuits who had the permission of the Portuguese government could be missionaries in China. However, eventually different Catholic orders from other European countries were eager to preach the gospel in China, and the Portuguese government was having difficulty financially sustaining the Jesuit missions that were established on mainland China as well as in Macao (Latourette 99-101; Cary-Elwes 127); therefore, the pope began to allow non-Jesuit orders from countries such as France, Spain and Italy, and, which were not under the jurisdiction of Portugal, to establish missions in China after 1600. However, these new missionaries were still required to travel to China by way of Lisbon until 1608 (Latourette 100). With the permission of the pope, Dominicans began to build missions in China in 1631, and the Franciscans arrived in 1633. The Augustinians established themselves on the mainland by 1680, and the Paris Foreign Missions joined these other orders in 1683 (D'Elia 51).

With the coming of the new orders to China, there was an
increase in the number of converts, but there were also new problems. Jesuit and non-Jesuit orders had different views on how to convert the Chinese. Many of the non-Jesuits were very critical of the Jesuit approach of cultural accommodation and pacific penetration which had been established prior to their arrival. Interestingly enough, Pope Gregory XIII anticipated this problem of how to convert the Chinese for in his decree of 1585 he recognized that the resistance of the Chinese to foreigners and their ideas and the ancient and highly developed civilization of China required a missionary approach which was different than that which was characteristicly used by the majority of orders. In other words, he realized that only with the "uniform missionary method" of cultural accommodation and pacific penetration slowly developed by Saint Francis of Xavior, Vagnoni, Ruggieri and later Ricci would the chance of success for Catholic missions in China be possible (Noll vii). However, because of the new pope's acknowledgement that there was a need for more missionaries in China the subsequent decision was made to allow different missionary methods to enter China through the Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians, and Paris Foreign missions.

The approach of these non-Jesuit orders to achieve the goal of conversion of the Chinese differed radically from that of the Jesuit pattern. Instead of beginning their mission by demonstrating a sincere respect for and desire to learn about and understand Chinese culture, these Europeans typically did not attempt to learn the Chinese language, did not attempt to study Chinese literature and
culture, but brashly went about preaching the Christian gospel, while wearing their habits and carrying their crucifixes in their hands (Rowbotham 133; Cary-Elwes 150; Clark 30). They were characteristically adamant in their refusal to make any accommodation of Chinese national culture, and even went so far as to claim that all Chinese would be condemned to hell if they did not convert to Catholicism. The scholar Fülöp-Miller states the following: "Dominican and Franciscan monks alike preached that all the emperors of China, as well as the wise Confucius, were, heathens, damned to the everlasting fires of hell," and as a result were frequently thrown into prison and deported (267; Cary-Elwes 149). The proselytizing efforts of one Spanish Dominican even caused him to lose his life. John or Francis Capellas, who did learn the Chinese language, walked around China, with his Breviary and crucifix, and in his preaching "relied solely on the virtue of the cross" (Cary-Elwes 110). Because he refused to pay respects before the tablet of Confucius (which was declared as being a civil act by Ricci), he was arrested and thrown in jail. When the Chinese authorities asked him where he lived, the reply of this mendicant, as reported by Cary-Elwes, was the following, "I have no other house than the wide world, no other bed than the ground, no other food than what Providence provides from day to day, and no occupation other than that of labouring and suffering for the glory of Jesus Christ and the eternal happiness of those who believe in Him" (110-11). In consideration of the extent to which most Chinese had an understanding of Christianity, and in recognition of their values and
world view in regard to the importance of an individual's relationship to others in society as defined by Confucius (mentioned briefly earlier, and explored fully later) in contrast to the individualism of this man as revealed in these few words, it is not difficult to understand why the Chinese had this missionary executed in 1648 before his Dominican brethren who had just arrived from Europe (Cary-Elwes 110-11). Clearly, once again, this incident is an example of two radically different world views in conflict - only this time the clash occurs between the Chinese and a Dominican and not a Jesuit.

Cary-Elwes mentions another incident which occurred with a Dominican friar who had entered China in 1556 before the pope had given permission. The habit of Friar Gaspar de la Cruz, "much to the discomfiture of later Jesuits," was to overthrow idols wherever he saw them (109). In this case, the punishment was not death, but deportation.

It has been suggested that some of the persecutions of Christian missionaries which occurred in China were at least partly due to the proselytizing methods which were non-Riccian, in addition to the general Chinese fear of foreigners, and the jealousy which some Chinese officials had of some of the Catholic missionary scholars (Cary-Elwes 105; D'Elia 51; Latourette 103). Although I will return to a fuller exploration of the differences between Jesuit and mendicant order methods of conversion at a later point, presently it is appropriate to describe the persecutions that all Christian missionaries (who were, of course, predominantly Jesuit) experienced
during the years of 1610 and 1622.

Some time after 1610 (no exact date is provided), when the Chinese became aware that Europeans had seized ports in the Malay peninsula and in India, and when they discovered that fortifications were being erected on Macao (which were, in actuality, to ward off the invading Dutch enemy and had nothing to do with the Chinese), the Chinese threatened to starve out Macao. However, this attempt at persecution was prevented by a Chinese official who was friendly with the Macao missionaries. Due to his efforts, the Chinese were put at ease and food was not prevented from entering the island (Cary-Elwes 105). In 1616, a more serious incident occurred. The Vice President of the Board of Rites, Shen Ts'u of Nanking "appears to have entertained a peculiar animosity for Father Alphonsus Vagnoni," who "had perhaps been indiscreet" by not following the methods of Ricci (Latourette 103; Cary-Elwes 106). Latourette states that although the exact reasons are a bit obscure, the arrest and expulsion of the priests were ordered largely due to the belief that the missionaries were plotting with the other foreigners in Macao against the Chinese government (103). As a result, the Nanking church and residence was destroyed, and Fathers Semedo and Vagnoni were put in cages and taken to Canton. Other priests and Christians were also imprisoned, but Father Longobardi, who succeeded Matteo Ricci at Peking, went into hiding. This ill fortune of the missionaries lasted until 1617, when Shen Ts'u "fell into disgrace" (Cary-Elwes 106). The persecution was renewed in 1622 due to the same official who again charged the foreigners with being seditious;
however: "with the help of a sympathetic scholar official, Hsu Kuang-ch'i, and the death of Shen Ts'u, the missionaries were "honorably reinstated" and returned to their missions (Latourette 104).

After this period of persecutions, the Jesuit enterprise flourished. By 1624, there were six missionary centers in the provinces, and by 1629 nineteen new Jesuits had arrived in China to help with the missionary effort (Latourette 104). Paul Hsu, the Confucian scholar who became a devoted Christian, moved up in the Chinese governmental hierarchy. Therefore, he was in a stronger position to help the missionaries in many ways. In 1628 he became Vice-President of the Board of Rites, and in 1631, the President (Cary-Elwes 107). It was Hsu who was instrumental in causing one of the most significant events to occur for the Jesuits in early seventeenth century China: a Jesuit was ordered to reform the Chinese calendar. The work would take place at the imperial court, and of course, this would provide the Jesuits "unique occasion for them to approach the Emperor more frequently" (D' Elia 47). This imperial mandate is significant especially in light of the fact that even Ricci had never seen the emperor.

Although other Jesuit scholars began work on the calendar, due to their untimely deaths, Johann Adam Schall von Bell was the man who had one of the greatest opportunities in Jesuit history. He was born in a town near Cologne in 1591, entered the Society of Jesus in 1611, and requested that he be allowed to become a missionary. The Church sent Schall to Macao in 1619, but he did not
enter the mainland until 1622 (Latourette 104). In 1929 the missionary scholar was summoned to Peking to begin work on the imperial calendar at court where he "soon became the leading figure in the mission" (Rowbotham 67; Latourette 104).

The imperial calendar was of great importance to the emperor as well as to the rest of the Chinese people because most of the people's daily activities were supposed to be officially guided by consulting this document. Everyone in the entire kingdom was required to follow its instructions from the "lowliest peasant as well as to the palace of the viceroy" (Rowbotham 69). However, apparently there had been some miscalculations in judging the seasons of the year and frequently crops were ruined as a result. Theoretically, if the calendar conformed to the rules of nature, and the people followed the rules as outlined therein, then the result would be peace in the land and harmony in the universe. This is why everyone in China was expected to consult the calendar. In order for daily life to run smoothly, one had to know what to do when, and what not to do when. Obviously, if the calendar itself was incorrect, the kingdom would be in disarray as a result. This is why it was so important that an educated Jesuit assume the role of correcting the calendar. The Chinese acknowledged that the West had developed theories which enabled them to understand and even predict certain movements in the sky (such as eclipses) while Chinese astronomy had not developed to this extent and had merely

---

20 Cary-Ellies provides conflicting biographical information for Schall. He claims that Schall entered mainland China in 1618 with Trigault (107).
"contented itself with the practice of observation and the accumulation of isolated facts" (Rowbotham 68).

Since the calendar also included information such as when a birth or marriage should take place, when it was safe to travel or to build a building, some missionaries - Jesuits and non-Jesuits - questioned whether or not it was appropriate for a Christian to become involved with such an undertaking (Latourette 106; Rowbotham 70; Cary-Elwes 114). As Rowbotham points out, "The question involved was: At what point did the information in the calendar cease to be 'scientific' and become superstition?" (Rowbotham 70). Father Aleni, a highly educated and noted Jesuit of the period, freely expressed his disapproval of Schall's activities at the court in 1648 (Rowbotham 71). The Franciscan Antonio de Santa Maria Caballero strongly opposed a Catholic missionary's involvement with the project. In a letter of 1649 he wrote, "This calendar is printed with the name, seal and signature of the said Father, making it clear who the author is...other matters are obtained in this calendar more abstruse and foreign to Catholicism, for instance: not only are the suitable days for sowing seed and for cutting wood given, etc, which are things to be expected, but even things which are superstitious and clearly diabolical, such as: which day is good for getting married on, which for buying, which for selling, which for going out of the house, for going on a journey, for offering sacrifice" (Cary-Elwes 114). News of Schall's work on the calendar at the Bureau of Astronomy at the imperial palace spread to Europe and was questioned there. In 1652 and in 1659, Schall
wrote in defense of his work, and four professors from the Roman college examined the issue. With the advise of these men and of the defence of Father Greuber, who had just returned from China, a favorable decision was reached by Pope Alexander VII in 1664. Rowbotham summarizes the results: "Henceforth the Jesuits were to be permitted to hold their posts in the bureau, always with the understanding that they should have nothing to do with 'the superstitious excrescence' of the calendar but should try to bring the document in line with Christian science and Christian doctrine" (Rowbotham 71).

Schall went to work for the emperor of China toward the end of the Ming dynasty. After only a few months of his presence at court, about 540 baptisms had taken place there (Cary-Elwes 108). However, soon thereafter uprisings by different rebel groups occurred throughout the land largely due to the corruption of the government (Rowbotham 74). In addition, the Manchus had been busily "accumulating territory by conquest until they were the possessors of the whole of the Liotung Peninsula and adjacent territory" (Rowbotham 73). Finally, in 1643, Peking was attacked by rebels and the Manchus moved in at this vulnerable moment and usurped the throne. As a result, the last Ming emperor, Ch'ung Ching, committed suicide and a six year old Manchu boy, whose reign-title was Shun Chih took his place (Cary-Elwes 118; Latourette 105; Parker 79; Rowbotham 75).

Although the Manchu's succeeded in taking over power in the northern provinces, the Ming dynasty "dragged on" in the southern
(Rowbotham 75). There were two pretenders to the throne before Yung Li in 1647. Yung Li and his entourage established themselves in Chao Ch'ing where the Jesuit priests Andrew Koffler and Michael Boym had great influence on these individuals in distress (Rowbotham 75-76). They, in addition to the emperor's Catholic Premier, Achilleus Pangtienshou, were largely responsible for the following Christian conversion statistics: 140 Blood Princes, 40 Members of the Court, and approximately 75 Court Ladies; the Emperor Yung Li's father's wives - the two Empresses Dowager; the Yung Li's wife, the actual Empress, Ann; and Prince Constantine, Ann and Yung Li's son (D'Elia 46-47; Allan 126). In 1650 Father Boym was sent to Rome with letters from the Empress Helen in which she asked the pope to "protect her country to its restoration and peace," while also requesting that he send more missionaries to China (Parker 81). Latourette suggests that this was a last desperate attempt on the part of the fallen Ming power to try to gain the help of Europeans. Nothing ever came of the request: Boym died on his return trip, and Koffler died along with the Ming contingents when Yung Li was surrendered to the Manchus by the Burmese natives after the pretenders had been pushed into that territory (Latourette 107; Rowbotham 76-77).

Before I proceed with the story of Schall and the Manchus, I would like to mention an incident which occurred in the life of Schall before the Ming ended. When the Ming emperor realized the extent to which the rebels and the Manchus were a threat, he issued an imperial mandate to Father Schall which ordered him to establish a
foundry in which cannons should be built in order to overcome both groups.\textsuperscript{21} Schall was reluctant to engage in such an activity, but he apparently felt he had no choice but to comply (Cary-Elwes 118). After successfully building these cannons, he named each one after a female saint, "perhaps to prevent them from being dedicated to the heathen God of Fire," as Rowbotham suggests (74). This military endeavor was another activity engaged in by the Jesuits in China which also drew criticism in Europe. However, Pope Innocent XI sanctioned the "Jesuits as cannon makers" when Father Verbiest, Schall's successor at the Bureau of Astronomy, was called upon to do the same task for the Manchus, and was also attacked for it. In 1681, the pope praised the use of "the profane sciences for the safety of the people and the advancement of the Faith" (Rowbotham 98). Once again the Jesuit method of exposing the Chinese to Christianity was applauded in Rome.

Due to the achievements of Schall, he was invited to stay at the Bureau of Astronomy when the Manchus took over. Schall nor the other Jesuits were greatly concerned with who, exactly, governed China, just as long as they had the opportunity to continue to be missionaries there. Fülöp-Miller undoubtedly relates their feeling when he states, "The Jesuits...continued to serve the Manchu emperors with the same fidelity with which they had served the Ming emperors, since to them it was all the same in the end who governed China, provided that the possibility still remained open to

\textsuperscript{21} Albert Chan points out that during the Ming dynasty there was a great interest in the study of European firearms (161).
them of winning the Middle Kingdom for Christianity by slow and methodical work" (249). Schall soon demonstrated the extent of his abilities to the Manchus when he predicted an eclipse which no other imperial mathematician was able to do. As a result, Schall was promoted to President of the Board of Astronomy in 1645 (Cary-Elwes 119). It did not take long before Schall became the emperor's advisor. The missionary is known to have offered his opinion on the affairs of state to Shun Chih and supposedly became indispensable to the young emperor. Rowbotham goes so far as to state that "Nowhere in the history of China can a European be found who played such an important role at court as did Schall" (81). Perhaps the titles which were bestowed upon Schall give some indication of the extent to which he was valued by the Manchus. In addition to that of being the President of the Board mentioned above, he was also the Superintendent of the Imperial Stud, Exploring Teacher of the Mysteries of Heaven, High Honorable Bearer of the Imperial Banquet (which made him a first class mandarin), High Senator, and Vice President of the Office of the Imperial Sacrifice (Rowbotham 81). Although I have not located an explanation of the implications of these titles - with the exception of the President of the Board and the High Honorable Bearer of the Imperial Banquet - recognition of these titles, "high-sounding and empty" as they may appear, are a strong indication of the extent to which the imperial court valued Father Schall (Rowbotham 81).

The Manchus also sanctioned the presence of Schall in the court, and by implication, the presence of other missionaries in China,
by conferring an imperial rescript upon him in 1657 in which the emperor "praised the Jesuit's religion" (Rowbotham 79; D'Elia 50). In addition, Shun Chih donated a plot of land near the southern gate whereupon a church, named the Nan T'ang, was built (Cary-Elwes 119). The emperor also contributed to the church a "laudatory inscription, which in 1652 was carved in letters of gold on a handsome white marble commemorative arch (p'ai lou) erected in front of the building" (Rowbotham 80). Two other Jesuits, Fathers Buglio and Maghalhaens, were also allowed to build a church in Peking about this time; in addition, the Manchus granted their permission for more Jesuits to enter China. In addition, the imperial court had Schall's father, grandfather, and grandmother ennobled as a gesture of their appreciation of him (Cary-Elwes 119).

Schall was not only useful to the Manchus because of his work on the calendar and because of his ability to advise the emperor on the affairs of state; rather, the priest also became a friend and mentor of Shun Chih who taught the young man "on all kinds of subjects" (D'Elia 48). Their relationship became so close, that the emperor broke all of the rules of court etiquette and frequently went to Schall's residence to be educated. In addition, Shun Chih came to address the European by a term of endearment, "Mafa," or "dear Father" (D'Elia 48; Rowbotham 80-81; Dunne 347). Of course, eventually Schall spoke about his religious beliefs with the emperor, and Shun Chih is said to have listened to the priest with sincerity and appreciation. Rowbotham states, "The young emperor was sympathetic to the Bible story and he received with emotion the
account of the crucified Christ" (80). However, D'Elia and Dunne are of the opinion that Shun Chih did not become a Christian because he was "too immersed" in the "lust of the flesh" (D'Elia 49; Dunne 351).

Although Schall did not have success in converting the emperor at court in Peking, D'Elia and Allan maintain that the influence that Schall had on the affairs of state, on the revision of the calendar, and on the emperor personally, had ramifications for the Christian religion in the provinces (D'Elia 50; Allan 125). Therefore, Schall, like Ricci, was also able to create an "apostolate by radiation" (Dunne 93). Even if he did not have the personal contact with the quantity of officials from other provinces that Ricci did, Schall was able to ameliorate the esteem by which his religion was held throughout China because of his direct and intimate contact with the emperor which undoubtedly resulted in more Christian conversions amongst the Chinese. D'Elia states, "If the phenomenal success of the Jesuits at the Imperial Court failed in bringing about the conversion of the Emperor, it proved, nevertheless, most helpful, to Christian propaganda in the provinces" (50). Latourette provides evidence for these statements for he claims one account indicates that by the end of the Ming dynasty every province in China - with the exception of Kweichow and Yunnan - had Christians and that "by 1663 there were 109,900 Christians in the Empire" (107).

The reader may have observed that the pattern of behavior described above, again - to a certain extent - reflects the Jesuit pattern discerned and described previously in regard to Ricci and the other early Jesuits in their establishment of missions in different
cities of China in their "ascent to Peking" (Spence 1988:12). I have stated that the progression of relationships which becomes apparent between the Jesuits and the Chinese moves from the giving of gifts (sometimes omitted in the pattern), to the sharing of secular ideas - either or both of which resulted in the establishment of a more secure position for the Jesuits in their new environment - to the enlargement of the scope of opportunities in which to introduce the uninitiated to the tenets of Christianity.

The pattern which emerges between Schall and the imperial court conforms uniformly with all of the constituent elements of the structure outlined for Ricci and his companions, including the aspect of the giving of gifts. Up until this point, I have neglected to mention an incident which occurred when Schall was first invited to work on the imperial calendar by the Ming emperor in which this aspect of the pattern also manifested itself. Shortly after the missionary's arrival at the palace, the emperor Ch'ung Cheng summoned Schall to fix a forty year old spinet which had been given to the court by Ricci (Allan 125; Dunne 79; Rowbotham 78). Schall succeeded in doing so, and when he returned the musical instrument to the emperor, he also sent pictures which represented the life of Christ and some wax figures of the Adoration of the Magi. These gifts, though religious in nature, were appreciated by the emperor who is said to have enjoyed "these new toys" (Allan 126).

After sending the gifts to the Ming emperor, Schall clearly demonstrated his secular abilities to Ch'ung Cheng, as well as to the Manchu emperor Shun Chih. Above I have described how Schall not
only illustrated his competence in building cannons for war, predicting eclipses, and in revising the imperial calendar, but also by advising the latter emperor in affairs of state. The giving of gifts and the demonstration of secular competence allowed Schall to remain at the Ming court which provided him with the opportunity to illustrate his many talents and abilities to the Manchus. Because of his success in impressing the Manchu ruler in secular matters, he was able to achieve a more secure position for the missionaries in China as demonstrated by the building of the Nan T'ang church, the contribution of the laudatory inscription by the emperor himself, the building of the other Jesuit church in Peking, the receipt of permission to invite more Jesuits to China, and most importantly, the 1657 imperial rescript which "praised the Jesuit's religion" (Rowbotham 79, 80; D'Elia 50; Cary-Elwes 119). Of course, the winning of a more secure position for the missionaries in China enabled all of the missionaries to have further opportunities in which to spread their faith - which is the last movement of the Jesuit pattern of behavior established as precedence by Ricci and the other early Jesuits.

There is a slight difference in the first aspect of the Jesuit pattern as enacted by Schall. That is, I indicated earlier that the quality of gifts which were characteristically given to Chinese upon the establishment of new relationships with them were secular in nature - either a prism, a European figurine, a clock, or a spinet, for instance. However, in this case, Schall immediately sent religious articles as gifts upon his arrival at the Ming court. Perhaps the
reason for his feeling confident enough to do this was because the Chinese must have become accustomed - to some extent - to the ideas that these foreign missionaries represented by the early seventeenth century. By the time that Schall was employed by the imperial court, the Jesuits had already been living on the mainland for about fifty years. Therefore, by the 1630s, it was no longer necessary for Schall to "play it safe" and offer a strictly secular gift "as bait" in order to capture the interest of the Chinese (Sebes 1988:40). Rather, the interest of the Chinese in the intellects of the Jesuit missionaries had already been "caught" by this time, and, therefore, the quality of the gifts could rise to a new level and without the fear that any representations of Christianity would automatically alienate the Chinese. On the other hand, it should be noted that the religious gifts that were given to the emperor were pictures of the scenes of the life of Christ and the Adoration of the Magi. This imagery of the Christian art did not represent the death of Christ or the Incarnation - concepts of Christianity which were undoubtedly still carefully and slowly being introduced to the Chinese by the Jesuits in the second era of the Catholic missions in China.

The Shun-Chih emperor died in 1662, and it was after this date that the fate of Schall at the imperial court changed for the worse. The year of 1664 was a significant year in the seventy-three year old man's life: Schall suffered from a stroke and Yang Kuang-hsien, the man whom he had displaced a the Bureau of Astronomy, presented several indictments against Schall to the imperial ministry. Schall was accused on four counts: of high treason, "preaching a false
religion," "spreading false astronomical teachings", and most seriously, of the death of the second empress, as well as of Shun Chih himself (Rowbotham 84-86; Dunne 360-61). Cary-Elwes claims that the main charge was that Schall was accused of being, typically, "the advance guard of a Portuguese invasion," which I assume comes under the charge of high treason indicated by Rowbotham (119). Schall was stripped of his titles and placed in prison along with his colleagues Verbiest, Buglio and de Magalhaes. At some point five of Schall's "Christian scholar-colleagues were executed" (Dunne 361, 363). After many hearings, and the passing of time, Schall was first condemned to death by strangulation, then changed to one of beheading, then to the worst possible way of dying in Chinese eyes, by "dismemberment by the slicing of the living body" (Rowbotham 87). However, before any of these sentences could be carried out by the court in 1665 a terrible earthquake occurred in Peking in which three thousand people perished and a fire broke out in the imperial palace. The officials took this as an omen that the action they were taking against the Jesuits and their allies was wrong and Schall and his colleagues were released from prison (Dunne 363; Rowbotham 87; Allan 160-161). Due to all of this strain and to the stroke which afflicted Schall, this highly erudite and influential man who "ranks with Ricci," died a natural death at the Jesuit residence in Peking in 1666 (Dunne 365).

As indicated above, when influential Jesuits such as Ricci and Schall were in favor with the Chinese authorities, their apostolate of radiation had a positive influence in areas outside of the center from
which the power emanated; however, when a figure such as Schall fell into disfavor at the imperial court, this too had an effect on Christian missions throughout all of the provinces. When Schall and his allies were imprisoned in 1664, all of the other missionaries throughout China were negatively effected. According to Cary-Elwes' estimate, there were thirty-eight missionaries in China at this time, while Dunne counts thirty-three. Dunne maintains that three Dominicans were able to escape imprisonment, and remained in hiding in Fukien until the persecution was over. Four other Dominicans, twenty-five Jesuits, and one Franciscan were held in detention in Canton from 1665-1671. All Christian churches throughout China were closed down, and Christianity was officially denounced (Cary-Elwes 121; Dunne 363; Latourette 1929:116). This was all as a result of the accusations made against Schall by Yang and his allies, the Moslem astronomers, "who had not forgotten that the Jesuits had dispossessed them of the direction of the calendar" (Latourette 115). In other words, all of this misfortune occurred for the Catholic missionaries at this time because of the jealousy of the success of Schall at the court by these certain individuals (Cary-Elwes 119). Wisely, however, these Catholics of various orders used their period of imprisonment together to discuss their divergent views as to what they each felt was the most effective and sincere way to approach converting the Chinese, "and to seek, if possible, a more unified approach to the work of the apostolate" (Minamiki 1985:32). During their confinement this motley group of Catholics held formal conferences which lasted forty days, and terminated in 1668. The
focus of their discussions and the fruits of this rare opportunity to communicate intensely on such matters is explored fully in the following chapter.

After the death of Schall, and while the majority of missionaries in China were in prison in Canton, Yang Kuang Hsien resumed his position as President of the Board of Astronomy. As director of the calendar, he had all of the Western elements omitted and reverted to guessing at the significance of certain dates (Allan 177). Meanwhile, Verbiest, who had been sent to assist Schall on the calendar before the latter's death, was one of the four priests who was allowed to remain in Peking after his release from prison while the others were still imprisoned or in hiding (Allan 177). Somehow, Verbiest got a hold of the 1669 calendar which Yang was preparing to publish, and he immediately discerned that there were some significant errors in the work. Father Verbiest immediately took action by writing a memorial to K'ang Hsi, the young emperor who had just assumed the reigns of the government from the regents who were designated to be in control until he had come of age (Cary-Elwes 121; Dunne 367; Spence 1992:95). In order to determine whose version of the calendar was more correct - Yang's or Verbiest's, K'ang Hsi had each conduct a number of experiments in which Verbiest won. The outcome of these experiments convinced K'ang Hsi that the Westerner had something to offer to Chinese science, and, as a result, he dismissed Yang and assigned the position of President of the Board to Verbiest in 1669. Yang was disgraced
and was banished into a distant province (Rowbotham 92-93; Cary-Elwes 120).

Father Ferdinand Verbiest was Flemish, and was born in a small town in western Belgium. He studied philosophy at the University of Louvain before beginning his novitiate, and then studying theology in Rome. His original intention was to become a missionary in the Americas; however, fate determined that he was to become a missionary in China and remain one there for the rest of his life. He was sent to China in 1658, and began work at the imperial court in 1660 (Cameron 240; Latourette 116).

K'ang Hsi was a favored son of Shun Chih, and supposedly Schall was instrumental in choosing him as heir to the throne. Both Chinese and Jesuit histories maintain this was a wise decision, for the intellectually curious, pock marked and fertile Manchu (he fathered thirty-five or more children), who also had much Han blood, succeeded in establishing an extremely "united, wealthy, powerful," and "aggressive" China (Spence 1992:94-95;100; Rowbotham 115).

Fate brought Verbiest and K'ang Hsi together at the imperial court in the 1660s, but it took K'ang Hsi a few years before he really came to trust and respect the Jesuit to the extent that his father had trusted and admired Schall. Rowbotham maintains that it was not until 1676 that Verbiest had the quality of power in the court that Schall did (95). By this time, Verbiest had become K'ang Hsi's tutor, and he would go to the palace daily to instruct the emperor on subjects such as astronomy, hydraulics and mechanics as well as philosophy and music (Rowbotham 93, 96). He also became the
emperor's trusted advisor, interpreter, and arbiter as well as his friend (Cameron 241-42). Obviously, K'ang Hsi was also breaking the rules of etiquette of the court as outlined by the Board of Rites in regard to the emperor and his interactions with individuals on a daily level just as his father had in regard to Schall. In *Astronomia Perpetua*, one of the many books which Verbiest wrote in China, he states, "I used to go to the palace at break of day, and did not quit it until three or four in the afternoon; and during this time I remained alone with the emperor reading and explaining. Very often he would keep me to dinner, and entertain me with most dainty dishes, served on a gold plate. To appreciate fully these marks of friendship shown me by the emperor, a European must remember that the sovereign is revered as a divinity and is scarcely ever seen by anyone, especially not foreigners!" (Cameron 241).

Eventually the "reading and explaining" of secular subjects, led, in the typical Jesuit pattern, to Verbiest taking advantage of his time alone together with the emperor to turn his attention to religious issues. Allan aptly states, "Now this kind of work was exactly in accord with the policy of Ricci and the other Jesuits, for it opened up avenues of approach to the emperor's spiritual nature, and Verbiest did not fail to try and make K'ang Hsi conversant with the Christian Faith" (188). D'Elia's comment on this Jesuit moment in which the significant move from secular to religious issues occurred, is largely from the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, and is even more poetic. This scholar states that it was especially because of Kang Hsi's interest in "the chart of the heavens" that "Father Verbiest, like Schall at the time of
Shunchih, began to hope that 'as a star of old brought the Magi to the Adoration of the True God, so the Prince of the Far East through the knowledge of the stars would be brought to recognize and adore the Lord of the stars" (49). Although Verbiest was quite successful in making the emperor conversant with the tenets of the Christian faith, he was not successful in converting the son of Shun Chih through the application of this Jesuit method (Cameron 242; D'Elia 49; Allan 188; Rowbotham 94-95).

Some of the other responsibilities which Verbiest had besides directing the revision of the calendar, tutoring and attempting to convert the emperor was - along with the Jesuit Fathers Grimaldi, Pereira, and Thomas, who had joined him at court - to build canal systems, to create "hydraulic contrivances" for the imperial gardens, to update the astronomical instruments for the observatory and to make cannons to overcome the rebel Wu San Kuei (Cary-Elwes 121; Allan 188). These last two endeavors are worthy of elaboration. The astronomical observatory was first created during the thirteenth century during the reign of Kublai Khan. Because a lot of the instruments were no longer of any use, Verbiest was ordered to update these instruments, which he did (Allan 184-85). The observatory itself was and still is located on the eastern wall of Peking, where one can see some of these instruments which Verbiest made "exactly in accordance with Tycho Brahe's calculations" as well as some of the traditional Chinese art that was incorporated into the observatory (Fülöp-Miller 251). The scholar C.W. Allan describes a bronze equatorial armillary which can be
found there: "The multitude of circles at all angles is supported by four five-clawed dragons with distended jaws, fearsome horns, flowing manes and scaly bodies, a truly magnificent specimen" (184-185). Although it is unclear from the sources available as to whether the Chinese symbolism was part of the observatory before Verbiest, or whether this contribution was made during his time, it is still fascinating to recognize how western science and traditional Chinese art came together on a physical plane during the Jesuits' period at the court in this fascinating scientific workshop.

The other practical piece of work which Verbiest engaged in and upon which I would like to comment, is the cannon making activity which Schall was also pressured to participate in. Verbiest's contribution to this endeavor is especially worthy of attention not only because it is interesting to recognize that western science helped a Chinese military cause through a Christian missionary in seventeenth century China, but also because the ritual which was enacted by Verbiest and K'ang Hsi upon completion of the guns demonstrates how Christian and traditional Chinese symbolism were also a part of this event, and therefore, requires examination. Both Rowbotham and Allan describe the ceremony, but Allan's description is fuller and more colorful, so I shall quote the latter for the reader. After having produced 150 pieces of cannon, the day arrived when the guns were to be tested. Allan describes the following scene:

The emperor was there with his retinue of high officials and also numbers of the Tartar chieftains...Before testing the cannon Verbiest publicly blessed them. He made an altar of
one of the guns on which he erected the Cross. He then made obeisance nine times before this symbol of the Christian faith and recited the prayers of the Church. Sprinkling the pieces with holy water he baptized them each by the names of saints, which had already been engraved in the metal. After this ceremony he set the guns with very great care, using his own instruments, and when they were fired he had the satisfaction of seeing a number of hits at the targets. This demonstration was the occasion of a great festival on which the emperor we are told, drank out of a cup of gold, success to the war. Before the assembled dignitaries K'ang Hsi publicly commended Verbiest, and concluded by stripping off his embroidered coat with the Imperial Dragon which he gave the missionary (Allan 191).

I indicated earlier that Schall also named each one of his cannons after a female saint (Rowbotham 74). Rowbotham claims that engraving the name of a Christian saint in guns was "the fashion of the time in Europe" (98). With the Crusades in mind, it is not impossible to think that other Europeans may have made altars on top of their cannons as Verbiest did in China, even though the mere thought of doing such a thing might seem strikingly oxymoronic in the late twentieth century. The scene described above by Allan is not only interesting because Verbiest engraved the name of a saint in each cannon, and because he created an altar on top of a gun, sprinkled holy water, and said prayers; rather, it is fascinating because of the entire combination of elements which presented themselves in the scene. Here were all of the Christian rituals which were enacted by Verbiest, but the final act of the placing of the emperor's Dragon robe onto the back of the European Christian missionary as a gesture of gratitude is especially significant. That is,
this act was momentous not only because K'ang Hsi made such an offering in public, but also because Verbiest accepted it from him.

The fact that K'ang Hsi, the emperor, should take the clothing off of his back and place it on that of this missionary scholar-official is evidence of the depth of the friendship which had been established between the two men and a measure of the respect which the emperor held for Verbiest. It is also evidence of the extent to which K'ang Hsi was a humble man. K'ang Hsi's humility becomes especially clear when the symbolic significance of the emperor's robe is fully recognized. The above quotation indicates that K'ang Hsi's robe was an embroidered coat which had an Imperial Dragon upon it. During this dynasty, that of the Ching (1644-1911), "the dragon robe with its many five-clawed dragons embroidered with silk and gold threads became an institution" (Berliner 88). As a result, no one but the emperor in the entire kingdom was allowed to use this imperial image by law at the threat of execution (Berliner 88-89; Cammann 8). With recognition of the weight of the symbolic power that the dragon imagery on the Imperial Robe had, the significance of this gesture made by the emperor becomes even more poignant. On the other hand, in addition to the close association of the dragon with the imperial throne, the dragon also has had many other folkloric connotations all throughout Chinese history. The Chinese generally have considered the dragon to be a benevolent being who alternately lives in the sky or in the ocean. The dragon has traditionally been thought of as being in control of the rain, and therefore many Chinese have been known to pray to the dragon god
for rain; this has been particularly true with the agricultural peoples who have historically composed the majority of the Chinese population (Berliner 88; Williams 132-141). Upon recognition that there were and still are many connotations associated with the dragon in China which could be construed as being superstitious by the Catholic Church, it is also important to realize that Verbiest's acceptance of the robe by the emperor was just as significant as the giving of it to the priest by the emperor. Both of these individuals were accommodating each other. K'ang Hsi, in public, tolerated all of Verbiest's Christian rituals upon and about the cannons. In fact, it is obvious that the particulars of this ceremony were largely decided by and acted out by Verbiest and not by K'ang Hsi or the other non-Christian scholar-officials. Indeed, this fact demonstrated extreme toleration and accommodation on the emperor's part. Concurrently, as just pointed out, Verbiest also demonstrated the height of toleration and accommodation when he accepted the imperial robe with all of its non-Christian associations, but he also illustrated further accommodation when he "made obeisance nine times before this symbol of the Christian faith" (Allan 191; Cameron 241). That is, if the word "obeisance" can be interpreted to mean "kowtow" (that traditional Chinese gesture which I discussed earlier in regard to Ricci) then I feel compelled to point out that Verbiest performed the traditional Chinese gesture which was mostly performed as a ritual of respect before "parents on certain days of the year, by parents and everyone else to their ancestral shrines, by mandarins and everyone else to the emperor, and even by the emperor himself to
his parents and also to Heaven twice a year" before a Christian altar (Cameron 141). (Here Cameron neglects to mention that the kowtow was also traditionally performed before the image or tablet of Confucius.) This is an amazingly striking image to imagine, and indeed, probably the ultimate method of Jesuit accommodation in seventeenth century China!! It seems quite certain that the act of obeisance which was made nine times before the altar was the kowtow because, specifically, this gesture characteristically involves "three kneelings, each accompanied by touching the forehead to the floor three times" (Cameron 141). In my mind, three kneelings which encompass the touching of the forehead to the floor three times adds up to nine - the number of times which Verbiest is said to have made "obeisance" (Allan 191). Thus, Verbiest incorporated aspects of Chinese culture into a Christian ritual which was performed before, undoubtedly, Christian and non-Christian Chinese, and Christian European missionaries. The Jesuits were indeed willing to carry on as well as create new methods of cultural accommodation initiated by Vagnoni, Ruggieri, and Ricci. What a picture!

Indeed this was a picture about which many Europeans did not like to learn for as a result of Verbiest having received honors for such contributions as cannon making he was soon under attack just as Schall had been. The Dominican Domingo Fernandez Navarette, about whom I write more later, wrote a book in which he criticized the Jesuit Verbiest's methods of conversion, and cannon making was one of his targets. The issues this priest raised became especially debated in Spain and Italy. However, temporarily, at least,
Verbiest was vindicated, for as briefly mentioned earlier in relation to Schall, Pope Innocent XI, "to whom Verbiest had dedicated his Chinese translations of the Missal and other books," had written in a letter of 1681 words of appreciation which sanctioned the methods of the Jesuits, including that of cannon making (Allan 192; Rowbotham 98). Apparently he, if not many of the other Christian Europeans, believed the words of Verbiest who wrote in letters that were never published in Europe that "all his labours as astronomer, tutor or cannon founder had been with the sole object of advancing the cause of Christ and the establishment of the Church in China" (Allan 192).

Largely due to the favor which was shown to the Jesuits in the imperial court - as clearly demonstrated by the public ceremony discussed above - Christianity became more popular in Peking as well as in the provinces; once again the apostolate by radiation was made possible, but this time it was largely due to the stature and efforts of Verbiest (Latourette 117; D'Elia 49). Even though the Christian religion suffered with the persecution of Schall in 1664, it slowly came back to life as Verbiest increasingly demonstrated his competence and won the trust of the court (Rowbotham 104). That is, even though the edict of 1669 released the imprisoned missionaries and allowed all Christian missionaries to openly practice their religion, they were not legally allowed to disseminate their faith at this time; in addition, although the imperial edict of 1671 returned the churches and residences back to the missionaries, there was no official sanctioning of Chinese converting to Christianity at
this date either (Allan suggests that official sanctioning was not included to appease Yang's allies at court) (Allan 186-187). However, although these edicts did not legally state that Christianity was allowed to be spread, the prestige with which Verbiest, especially, as well as other Jesuits, were held at court - even early on after Verbiest had radically changed the imperial calendar by omitting an unnecessary thirteenth month - automatically raised the status of the Christian cause throughout China, and conversions rose the longer that Verbiest remained at K'ang Hsi's side. Latourette's assessment of the situation is undoubtedly accurate: "With some of the missionaries in such favor, officials in the provinces were inclined to wink at violations of the edicts against Christian teaching and worship" (1929:117). In fact, the period when Verbiest was at court with K'ang Hsi was truly one of the finest periods in the history of Catholic missions in China (Cary-Elwes 121). Latourette reports that conversions were numerically the strongest in and near Nanking and Shanghai, and that most of the converts were not from the official class; however some were of high rank and some were Manchus (1929:117). In Jonathan Spence's Emperor of China: Self-portrait of K'ang-hsi, the author has the emperor stating, "When I asked Verbiest for exact figures in 1688 he said there were 15,758 Christians just in Peking" (1974:84-85). Although I believe it is difficult to fully trust the statistics which are provided by scholars, Allan does state that "No sooner were the ruined mission stations repaired than converts were obtained, and such was the progress of the work that in the same year some twenty thousand people were
baptized. This was not merely amongst the common people, for the list included an uncle of the emperor, and a noted military leader" (187). D'Elia maintains that there were 300,000 Catholics in all of China in 1700, so it is quite apparent that during this period of Kang Hsi's reign the church was literally thriving (55).

Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians and the Paris Foreign Missions from countries as diverse as Italy, Spain, and France and, on a smaller scale, Germany continued to slowly flow into China after 1600 despite the agreement the pope had with the Portuguese government that they were the only nation with sovereignty over the countries in the East. In an effort to avoid conflicts with Portugal, Rome first established three vicariates apostolic in 1658 and by 1696 eight of them - in Chekiang, Fukien, Shansi, Shensi, Kiangshi, Szechwan, Yunnan, Kweichow, Hukwang - had been created (Cary-Elwes 130; Latourette 1929:125). He did this because, as mentioned briefly previously, the Portuguese were unable to sustain all of the missions in China any longer for as a colonial country, its power was on the wane. Because the Portuguese were unable to continue to finance the missions, especially after the Dutch attacks on Portuguese territory began, many missionaries - particularly in Macao - turned to trading and to selling goods which were occupations that were largely considered to be unsuitable for Catholic priests (Cary-Elwes 127-131). Therefore, the pope felt justified in reneging on Rome's agreement with Portugal due to the fact that the "Portuguese were no longer fulfilling their part of the bargain" (Cary-Elwes 133). China needed more missionaries and many orders
wanted to attempt to convert the Chinese. The vicariates apostolics were not under the auspices of any particular country, but held allegiance only to Rome. A vicar apostolic holds the same power as a bishop, but rules in the name of the pope rather than in his own name. Therefore, he is only accountable to the pope. There were some problems with this new arrangement because nationalistic attitudes existed amongst missionaries in regard to each other as well as in their attitudes toward conversion methods (Latourette 1929:125). That is, a Spanish Dominican might, on occasion, sincerely resent being under the auspices of an Italian Franciscan. However, despite these obstacles, the situation slowly dissolved the monopoly that Portugal had on all missionaries who entered China and thereby expanded the number of missions (both in terms of orders and nationalities represented) which were established in China in the seventeenth century.

While the power of Portugal was diminishing, the strength and power of France was on the increase. As Latourette states it, France, "in politics and culture was to be the most important figure of the latter half of the seventeenth and eighteenth century" (111-12). Under King Louis XIV, Catholic France was interested in expanding commerce and colonial power, and therefore found it natural to become involved in missionary activity. Verbiest had written "fervent and optimistic" letters in which he requested "large numbers of consecrated missionaries and abundant supplies of money" which supposedly greatly influenced the French monarch (Allan 195). Not long before his death, in fact, Father Verbiest sent
the delegate Philippe Couplet to the courts of Italy, France and Holland to reinforce his requests for money and new missionaries in China. The deciding factor in having France send French Jesuits to China in the mid-seventeenth century, however, was France's interest in expanding its geographical knowledge (Latourette 120; Allan 196; Cary-Elwes 139; Witek 72-73). Six "Mathematicians to the King" were appointed for the China mission, although none of these scholars, according to John Witek, had much knowledge about China or possessed "an empathy for and an understanding of Chinese beliefs and customs" (73; Allan 197). The six selected were the following: Joachim Bouvet (1656-1730), Jean-Francois Gerbillon (1654-1707), Louis Le Comte (1655-1728), Guy Tachard (1648-1712), Claude de Visdelou (1656-1737) Jean de Fontaney (1643-1710) (Witek 72; Allan 197).

The six French Jesuits quickly became familiar with Chinese customs and attitudes not long after setting foot on Chinese soil in 1687. After more than a month of an extremely difficult journey, the mathematicians were treated with suspicion by Chinese officials upon their arrival at Ningpo: they were dragged "into the presence of the Prefect, where they were obliged to prostrate themselves and perform the 'kowtow'" (Allan 199). Only after Verbiest had spoken personally with K'ang Hsi about the plight of these missionaries, and after the emperor had sent word to Ningpo officials to release the missionaries were they allowed to continue their journey to the capital. The French Jesuits finally arrived just outside of Peking on February 7, 1688, three years after their departure from France.
(D'Elia 103; Witek 77). However, it was with great sorrow, that the missionaries only then discovered that Father Ferdinand Verbiest, S.J., had passed away on January 28; they also learned that the empress dowager, K'ang Hsi's grandmother had died on January 27. Therefore all were in mourning, and the French mathematician missionaries were unable to be received by the court for 27 days (Allan 204; D'Elia 103).

Verbiest's funeral was on March 11, 1688, and, according to Allan, there was more "pomp and display" than was demonstrated at Ricci's funeral (202). This "pomp and display" was undoubtedly an intensive course in Chinese customs and traditions as well as a course in Chinese cultural accommodation for the French Jesuit priests who had just arrived in Peking, for they not only watched this Christian Chinese ceremony, they also participated in it. Cary-Elwes provides the translation of Father de Fonteney's description of Verbiest's funeral in a letter dated February 15, 1703:

"The obsequies of Fr. Verbiest took place, 11th March 1688. We assisted and this was the arrangement of the ceremony. The Mandarins, whom the Emperor sent to honour the illustrious departed, having arrived about 7 a.m., we went to the room where the Father's body was enclosed in its coffin. Chinese coffins are big, made of wood 3-4 inches thick, varnished and gilded outside, but closed with exceptional care to prevent the air getting in. The coffin was carried into the street and put on a stretcher under a kind of richly covered dome, and held up by four columns. The columns were decked in white satin hangings (i.e. the Chinese colour for mourning), and from one column to the other hung several festoons of silk in various other colours. The stretcher was tied on to two poles a foot in diameter, and of proportionate length, which
sixty to eighty men, lined up on both sides, were to carry on their shoulders. *The Father Superior with all the Jesuits of Peking went on their knees before the coffin in the middle of the street. We made three profound bows to the ground,* whilst the Christians who were present at that sad ceremony burst into tears, and cried out enough to melt the hardest hearts. The procession then set off in the following order.

"In front there was a picture twenty-five feet high and four across, adorned with silk streamers made of red taffeta on which was embroidered the name and dignity of Fr. Verbiest, written in great Chinese letters of gold. This, which several men held in the air, was preceded by a troop of instrumentalists and followed by another carrying flags, festoons, banderoles and streamers. Then came the cross in a fine niche adorned with columns and various banners made of silk. Several Christians followed, some with flags like the first, others with candles in their hands. Then came the picture of our Blessed Lady and the Infant Jesus in a niche, holding the globe of the world in his hands. The Christians who came next also had flags or candles like the previous ones.

"A picture of the Guardian Angel came next, accompanied in the same manner, and followed by a portrait of Fr. Verbiest, which was carried with all the symbols of the offices with which the Emperor had honoured him. *We came immediately behind in our mourning clothes, which are white in the Chinese manner,* as I have said; and *from time to time we showed our sadness by repeated sobs, according to the custom of the country.* The body of Fr. Verbiest followed, accompanied by the Mandarins whom the Emperor had named to honour the memory of that celebrated missionary. They were all on horseback; the first was the Emperor's father-in-law, the second his first captain of the guard, the third one of his gentleman, an others less distinguished. This whole procession, which was done in fine order and great modesty, was closed by fifty horsemen: the streets were lined on both sides by an immense crowd, who preserved a profound silence as they watched us pass.

"Our cemetery is outside the town in a garden which one of the last Chinese Emperors gave to the first missionaries of our Society. This garden is enclosed by a high wall; and a chapel and some small apartments have been built there.
"When we arrived at the door we went on our knees in the middle of the road before the body and we then again bowed three times. The tears of the assistants began again. The body was carried to near where it was supposed to be buried; an altar had been prepared there, on which stood a cross and candles. Fr. Superior then put on a surplice, recited the prayers and did the usual incensings according to the Ritual. We prostrated ourselves again three times before the coffin, which was taken off the stretcher to be put into the ground. Then it was that the cries of those present redoubled, and it was impossible to restrain one's tears.

"The grave is a kind of vault six feet deep by five, by seven. It was paved and walled entirely in brick. The coffin was placed in the middle on two little brick trestles, about one foot high. Then the walls of the vault were continued to about six or seven feet above the ground, ending in a dome and a cross on the top.

"Then some distance from the tomb a slab of white marble was set up....on which were written in Chinese and Latin, the name, age and nationality of the dead man, the date of his death and the length of time he had lived in China" (Cary-Elwes 140-142; italics mine).

Taking note of the italicized sentences in the above quotation should enhance the reader's ability to more readily discern the traditional Chinese customs which the Jesuits in Peking completely accommodated themselves to as full participants in a Christian funeral for a Catholic priest in China. Three which are clearly indicated above are a variation of the form of the kowtow, defined and discussed at an earlier point in regard to those to whom the gesture was performed in regard to the living: "we made three profound bows to the ground"; "we then again bowed three times"; "We prostrated ourselves again three times." Here the gesture of reverence is made in honor and respect of a deceased European Catholic priest (Minamiki 11; Cameron 141). The priests also dressed
in the traditional white mourning clothes: "We came immediately behind in our mourning clothes, which are white in the Chinese manner" (italics mine). In addition, the Jesuits actively participated in ritual wailing: "from time to time we showed our sadness by repeated sobs, according to the custom of the country."22 There is much evidence available which confirms de Fonteney's "customs of the country" as described above. In fact, I had the opportunity to observe a non-Christian funeral in 1982 in Hsin Chu, Taiwan in which many of the same customs were still being practised. All three of those in which the Jesuits were participants - that of kowtowing before the deceased, the wearing of white mourning clothes, and ritual wailing were a part of this ceremony as well.23 Regardless of whether or not the customs which de Fonteney described as having been participated in by the Catholic priests have persisted into the twentieth century or not, it is important to recognize that participation in these rituals were frequently difficult for the priests to adjust themselves to. In a letter written by de Chavagnac in 1701, he states that the kind of French Jesuit missionary which is needed in China is one who is capable of accommodating himself "to manners which are entirely opposed to the customs and character of the French nation" (Cary-Elwes 142). He goes on to state that although "'the Chinese pride themselves on being the most polished and cultured people in the world...it is impossible to imagine what it costs us to make ourselves civil and polite according to their tastes. The

22 For traditional Chinese funerary practices, see the work of J. J. M. de Groot, Laurence Thompson, C.K. Yang, Robert P. Weller and Francis L.K. Hsu.
23 For a narrative description of the Hsin Chu funeral, see Appendix IV.
etiquette of this country is the most aggravating and most irritating imaginable for a Frenchman; it is a labour to learn it and another to carry it out" (Cary-Elwes 143). However, as clearly indicated above - as well as many times previously - the Jesuits truly went out of their way in seeking to understand and to accommodate Chinese culture. Here too the Jesuits at the court of Peking made heroic efforts to sinicize themselves in order to have the opportunity to spread their faith, painful though it was for some. However, it should be kept in mind that the Jesuits at the court were not the only ones who were making an effort to understand individuals who came from radically a different culture than one's own. Recall the generosity and tolerance on the part of K'ang Hsi during the ceremony which celebrated the completion of the cannons by Verbiest. I pointed out during the discussion of that ritual that accommodation on the parts of both Verbiest and K'ang Hsi was quite apparent; at that time I suggested that K'ang Hsi had even done more accommodating than Verbiest since the ritual was predominantly a Christian one.

A couple of years after the French mathematician Jesuits arrived at K'ang Hsi's court, the emperor again demonstrated a sincere sensitivity toward Christian traditions and beliefs. The emperor announced in 1690 that he wanted to honor Verbiest posthumously by raising him to the rank of mandarin of the first order. As he planned on sending some court officials to his grave to honor him, K'ang Hsi asked Fathers Thomas, Gerbillon and Bouvet whether or not the ritual normally performed on such an occasion would be in violation of Christian tenets. Witek reports that the
following occurred between the priests and the emperor: "Not wanting to do anything contrary to the practices of the Christian law, the emperor asked if offering a cup of wine and then pouring it out would be against Christian principles. The three Jesuits replied that if one claimed nothing else than that the ceremony would honor the person in a civil way, this was not contrary to reason and consequently not contrary to the Christian law" (87). Once again it becomes obvious that the Jesuits were not the only individuals who were extending themselves to a large degree in order to tolerate and respect the ways of others. This tolerance and respect on the part of the emperor is especially significant to recognize especially in light of the fact that the Chinese were characteristically so intolerant of foreigners. This benign attitude of K'ang Hsi during the Ching dynasty could possibly have had to do with the fact that he was predominantly Manchu and not Han. This is merely speculation on my part, however, and I have no evidence for this assertion at this point.

It is understandable, actually, that K'ang Hsi, too, would grow and change in his behavior toward his missionary friends because he had such intimate contact with them on a daily level just as he did with Verbiest and as Shun Chih did with Schall. Gerbillon and Bouvet were ordered to remain at the court in Peking in order that the emperor could "profit by their scientific instruction" while the other four French Jesuits were sent to the provinces (Allan 206; Witek 89-90). These two Jesuits were kept on quite a rigorous schedule of tutoring the emperor daily in geometry, mathematics, and astronomy.
which they found to be quite exhausting, but at the same time were happy to have the opportunity "to advance the interests of Christianity" (Allan 207). The above reported conversation between the emperor and the Jesuits in regard to the ritual which took place to honor Verbiest as a mandarin, in fact, took place after the completion of a geometry lesson. On that occasion, the emperor was the one who took the opportunity to move the topic of discussion from secular matters to Christian ones. The relationship which Gerbillon and Bouvet had with this emperor was not unilateral for it appears that there was an equal give and take on both parts in regard to the sharing of each individual's respective culture and traditions whether that be secular or religious in nature. For example, not only did K'ang Hsi learn about Western science and Christianity from the Jesuits, but he also made sure that the best tutors were made available for these men to learn about Chinese and Manchu traditions and language. Allan states that K'ang Hsi took special interest in their language learning and that he personally superintended their studies. He also claims that after several years the priests had written some mathematical treatises in Chinese, and that the emperor had these works translated into Manchu. The most interesting aspect of this Jesuit-emperor collaboration, however, is the fact that K'ang Hsi wrote the introductions and prefaces to these works (Allan 207)! Obviously the quality of the relationships which existed between Bouvet and Gerbillon and K'ang Hsi was one of mutual cooperation: three individuals from two different cultures
making a sincere attempt to understand and share the knowledge that each had to offer.

The informal and symbiotic relationships which the Jesuits at court had with K'ang Hsi during this period provided the priests with ample opportunity to discuss Christian beliefs and traditions with him. However, K'ang Hsi was apparently informal in his relationships with other missionaries out in the provinces as well and these priests also felt free to talk about their religion with him. Periodically K'ang Hsi would tour the provinces and pay short, friendly visits with Franciscan, Dominican, and Jesuit missionaries as a part of his "system of personal government," to use Jonathan Spence's term (1966:134-35). Spence reports that on one occasion K'ang Hsi summoned two Jesuit priests to an audience with him while he was in Nanking whereupon he greeted them "'sitting cross-legged on his throne in the Tartar fashion'" (Spence 1966:134). After the emperor asked the priests personal questions about themselves - how long they had lived in China, what their names and ages were and what they had studied - the Jesuits "showed the Emperor a crucifix, in which he expressed polite interest" (Spence 1966:135). In addition, at "other points on his route the Emperor inquired after various churches," occasions upon which the topic of Christianity was most likely to have been raised (Spence 1966:135). Apparently, it was largely due to the accessibility and friendliness of K'ang Hsi that he came to know and trust the foreign missionaries and that he became familiar with the teachings of Christianity even if he never became convinced of its truth.
Just as the Jesuits at court were not the only priests with whom the emperor had opportunity to personally interact and thereby become more familiar with Christian teachings K'ang Hsi was not the only member of the imperial family with whom the missionaries were in a position to discuss Christianity after having considered some non-religious subject in an informal setting. On one occasion in 1691 the emperor's youngest brother arrived unannounced at the Jesuit residence. He requested of Fathers Bouvet and Giandomenico Gabini (1623-1694), the only two priests who were in, if he could see some maps and an atlas. Witek reports that the prince then began to ask questions about Christianity - whether everyone in Europe believed in the religion, where God became man, and if Christianity had ever been preached before in China. The Jesuits replied in the affirmative to the latter question and reminded him of the significance of the Nestorian Monument of Hsian-Fu which was discovered in 1625. The prince is reported to have reflected on the fact that the Son of God was born in a place which was not only far away from China but which was also far away from Europe. Witek speculates that the priests were quite aware that the content of their conversation would be reported to the emperor, and of the "impact" that this secular turned religious - and seemingly insignificant - conversation "could have in the capital" (88).

The informal behavior and accessibility of the imperial family undoubtedly worked in favor of the missionaries. Because K'ang Hsi got to know the Jesuits through his own personal interactions with them and from the reports of his family members, he apparently
came to understand and to trust them. K'ang Hsi's openness and friendliness toward the missionaries could only have enhanced the Christian missionary cause in China. Not only were he and his family friendly toward the missionaries in his private domains and in the residence of the priests, rather, K'ang Hsi also reached out to them outdoors as well. On one of K'ang Hsi southern tours, he stopped to chat with a priest who had set up a table with incense on the emperor's route; on another occasion when a priest offered up a Western book to the emperor's carriage as it passed, K'ang Hsi stopped to talk with him and practiced the few words of English that he knew (Spence 1966:135,137). De Fontaney expressed recognition of the significance of K'ang Hsi's "public expressions of imperial benevolence" toward the missionaries when he stated in a letter that "These imperial kindesses gave us much honor, because he manifested them to us in the view of the whole Court and the mandarins of the neighboring provinces, who upon returning to their appointments were influenced in favor of our holy law and of the missionary who preached it" (Spence 1966:137).

Other secular activities of these Jesuits at court, aside from tutoring the emperor and translating mathematical books into Chinese helped to secure the position of the missionaries in China. One was the help that the Jesuits provided in their diplomatic relations with Russia. In regard to this activity, the first treaty between a European power and China was signed in 1689 with the aid of two Jesuits, Fathers Gerbillon and Pereira and was known as the Sino-Russian Treaty of Nerchinsk (Allan 212). Allan's claim that
the emperor originally wanted the two Jesuits to participate in the negotiations strictly as interpreters but then wound up being more influential in the discussions which occurred between the Russians and the Chinese, differs from that stated by Joseph Sebes, S.J. in The Jesuits and the Sino-Russian Treaty of Nerchinsk (1689), a book which is combined with the original Portuguese and English translation of The Diary of Thomas Pereira, S.J. (Allan 211). Sebes claims that Gerbillon and Pereira were elevated in their position at the court from that of being the emperor's tutors to being declared private supervisors in the negotiations by public and official edict (110). As a result of their positions, they were instrumental in having a strong influence on the positive outcome of the resolution of the border dispute between the two countries. Undoubtedly, as Sebes claims, the success of this diplomatic mission was largely influential in having K'ang Hsi grant the famous Edict of Toleration of 1692 which for the very first time officially declared the legality of the promulgation of the Christian faith in China (Sebes 1962:78; Rowbotham 111). As Rowbotham states, "By affixing his official seal to the document the emperor gave the foreign religion a definite status in the empire and by doing so he performed an act which marked the climax of the Church's prosperity. As the discovery of the Nestorian tablet had proved the antiquity of the Christian faith, so the edict of 1692 established its legality" (111). At this point I would briefly like to reflect on the words of Thomas Pereira who records in his diary his feelings on being requested by the emperor to report on his contribution to the signing of the Treaty of
Nerchinsk. The Jesuit humbly recorded the following words: "First of all, I thank His Majesty for the honor of thinking of us and of sending someone to receive us and to convey our thoughts to His Majesty. As to His Majesty saying that he regards us as his own people and not as foreigners, and that in spite of the fact that the events concern me he wants to hear my own account of our dealings with the Moscovites, my answer is that for me, a foreigner, to be tolerated by him is more than I can ask. I was as useless as a bundle of straw, and hearing that His Majesty orders me to speak I tremble with the unaccustomed honor" (Sebes 1961:298; italics mine). These words are quite amazing to read for here it is clear that Pereira was not only grateful for being tolerated as a foreigner, but that he was grateful for not being regarded as a foreigner at all. If the words Pereira records were indeed the words of the emperor - that K'ang Hsi did not regard Pereira as a foreigner (in spirit, of course), then these words reflected an attitude on the part of the emperor which were the height of compliments that a Chinese emperor could ever have paid to a foreigner. If indeed the emperor did express these words in appreciation of the Jesuit contribution to the Russian negotiations, it is no wonder that the emperor shortly thereafter signed the Edict of Toleration as put forth by the Board of Rites.

The Edict of Toleration of 1692 was not won without a fight, however, even though the Jesuit participation in the signing of the treaty with the Russians worked to enhance the possibility that this "climax" would indeed occur. Ironically, it was a persecution of Christians which began in Hangchow in 1691 which forced the
emperor into taking a stronger stand in regard to the Christians than he had in the edicts of 1669 and 1671 (Rowbotham 110; Latourette 1929: 126). Prince Sosan, whom the Jesuits had befriended and won the respect of during the negotiations with the Russians, was instrumental in helping the Jesuits have their religion sanctioned by law in China. When the Jesuit Prosper Intorcetta wrote from the province to Gerbillon seeking help, Gerbillon promptly turned to Sosan. Although he could not be of immediate help, eventually he fought for the Jesuit cause and won. K'ang Hsi requested that the Jesuits write a memorial to him stating their desire for freedom from persecution. In doing so, the Jesuits also enumerated all of the services which the missionaries had provided for the Chinese since the time of Ricci. The emperor sent the memorial to the Board of Rites, which gave the request an unfavorable decision. It was at this point that Prince Sosan exerted his influence for he went before the Board and "spoke with such effect in favour of the missionaries that the decision was rescinded" and the Edict of Toleration went into effect in all of the provinces on this date of 1692 (Allan 217).

Because K'ang Hsi's Edict of Toleration is the only edict which was ever issued by the Chinese government which formally stated that it allowed freedom of worship of the Christian religion in China prior to the nineteenth century, I include the entire text below:

"I, your humble servant Ku Pu t'ai, first President of the Imperial Board of Rites (li Pu) and head of several other tribunals, present with respect this declaration to your Majesty, in most humble submission to his orders. We, I and my assessors, have deliberated upon the affair that has been
submitted to us and we have found that these Europeans have
crossed the wide ocean, and have come from the ends of the
earth, so attracted by your high wisdom and by that
incomparable virtue which charms all the nations and holds
them in obedience. At the present time they are in charge of
astronomy and the Tribunal of Mathematics. They have
applied themselves assiduously to the founding of cannon and
the making of war armaments, which were used in the recent
internal disturbances. When they were sent to Nipchou
[Nertchinsk] with our ambassadors to arrange a treaty of peace
with the Muscovites, they succeeded in bringing these
negotiations to a successful conclusion. They have, therefore,
rendered great service to the empire. The Europeans in the
provinces have never been accused of any misdemeanor or of
having caused any disorder. The doctrines that they teach are
not evil nor are they capable of leading the people astray or of
causimg disturbances.

"Everyone is permitted to go into the temples of the
Lamas, of the Ho-Shang and of Tao tze to worship but the
people are forbidden to serve God in the European churches
although the Europeans are guiltless of any crime, which does
not seem reasonable.

"We must then, leave all the churches of the empire in
the condition in which they existed formerly and we must
permit everyone to go there to worship God, without fear of
molestation.

"We await the order of your Majesty to promulgate and
enforce this law throughout the empire.

"Published the third day of the second moon of the
thirty-first year of the Reign of K'ang Hsi" (Rowbotham 110;
italics mine).

Again I use italics above to facilitate the reader's ability to
designate with ease the specific reasons for which the Jesuits were
rewarded with the freedom for "everyone" in China to worship in
European churches, and for those churches to be protected from
"molestation." That is, it is quite clear that the Jesuit's were being
shown appreciation for three reasons (and not only that of the
signing of the Treaty of Nerchinsk as Sebes speculates): for their scientific contributions (here no doubt the reference is, more specifically, to the calendar), for their cannon making activities and for their diplomatic aid in regard to the Russians. Although the years which followed, particularly those from 1692 to 1704 are sometimes referred to as the "Golden Period of Roman Catholic Missions in China," due to the large number of converts as a result of the edict, the reader should keep in mind that this law was put into effect as a result of persecution in the provinces and not without a struggle with some of the more conservative members of the Board of Rites who, according to Latourette, thought that the freedom of the "foreign faith" should be restricted rather than expanded in the late seventeenth century (Latourette 1929:26; Allan 218; Rowbotham 110). That is, the content of the Edict of Toleration pertaining to the welfare of Christianity in the empire was not unanimously agreed upon by all Chinese and Manchus although it did enhance the Christian project for a number of years.

Before I turn our attention to the difficulties with which Catholicism was confronted in China after 1704, I would like to focus on the "Golden Period" mentioned above. Rowbotham claims that in the year following the edict alone there were 20,000 converts which, as the scholar points out, is "striking testimony to the importance of imperial favor" (111). Allan indicates that many who feared being associated with the foreign religion prior to this edict, including officials and "people of high station in life," "came forward and requested baptism" (218). Latourette maintains that for fifteen years
following the edict the Christian communities "were marked by steady growth" (127). He states that according to one estimate by 1695 there were 75 priests in China: 32 European Jesuits, six Chinese Jesuits, five Spanish Augustinians, nine Spanish Dominicans, seven representatives of the Paris Foreign Missions, twelve Spanish Franciscans and four Italian Franciscans (Latourette 1929:123, 128). Canton is reported to have had seven churches in 1703, and by 1707 all the provinces in China supposedly had native Christians or missions with the exception of Kansu. The missionary scholar concludes his remarks on statistics by stating that the best estimate as to the number of Christians in China in 1705 is 300,000, but he also qualifies this statement by adding that "it was possibly very much less" (129). D'Elia's estimate is not too different. He reports that Father Intorcetta in 1671 indicated to the Propaganda that there were 273, 780 Christians in China (43).

The Christian Church benefited in other ways and possibly for another reason aside from those mentioned in the Edict of Toleration during the years of prosperity and growth. That is, shortly after the Edict of Toleration was signed, K'ang Hsi became ill and no one in the Manchu court was able to help him. Hence, Gerbillon and Bouvet suggested that he take quinine, also known at that time as Jesuit's Bark, and the emperor's fever disappeared (Allan 218; Rowbotham 111; Fülöp-Miller 256). K'ang Hsi demonstrated his appreciation for the Jesuit's help in restoring him to health by providing them with permanent lodgings within the grounds of the imperial palace. Rowbotham provides a description of the day upon which the Jesuits
received the news: "In 1693, the missionaries were summoned to the court, where, kneeling reverently before the empty throne, they listened to the reading of the rescript awarding them a piece of land within the huang ch'eng ("the Imperial City")" (112). Again, I assume that "kneeling reverently" is a variation of the kowtow or simply Rowbotham's words to describe the gesture. Whatever may be the case, Matteo Ricci was not the only Jesuit who was willing to kowtow before the empty throne - whatever the reason. These French Jesuits were following this particular practice of cultural accommodation, which the founder of the Catholic Mission in China had set a precedence for decades previously, while listening with respect to the beneficent words of K'ang Hsi being read before them.

Although the Jesuits received the good news with much joy, they soon petitioned the king for a plot of land within the palace upon which they could build a church for they felt that it was inappropriate for them to live in such "handsome quarters" when there was no "house of worship for the Lord of Heaven" beside them (Rowbotham 113). K'ang Hsi responded by allotting them with half of the amount for which they had asked, but provided some of the materials and a sum of money. The King of France sent a set of silver and other ornaments. Local Christians contributed diamonds and other kinds of jewels. The Jesuits were interested in creating a church which would capture the attention of the Chinese. In another letter of de Fontaney's, written in 1704, he states, "We have spared nothing... which might pique the Chinese curiosity and attract the mandarins and great persons of the Empire, that we might have the
opportunity of speaking to them of God and of the mysteries of our holy religion" (Rowbotham 113). Indeed this statement is characteristic of the Jesuit method. The attitude of de Fontaney reflected here is reminiscent of the early Jesuit tendency to attempt to attract the Chinese through such objects as prisms, figurines, spinets and clocks.

It is fascinating to imagine a structure which was predominantly Italian in architecture being erected within the grounds of the Chinese imperial palace at the turn of the eighteenth century. The structure was thirty-five feet long, thirty feet high and thirty wide. In front of the structure of the church there was a courtyard about fifty feet long and forty feet wide. On either side of the courtyard there were two rooms: one was used for instruction of the catechumens, while the other was what could be called the European room and was used for the reception of guests. This latter had portraits of Louis XIV, princes of the royal family of France, of the king of Spain and England and "other sovereigns," in addition to "beautiful musical instruments and scientific apparatus....also finely engraved picture books which proclaimed to the visitors the pomp and splendour of the court of France" (Rowbotham 316). It is not difficult to understand why "the Chinese would examine all that with profound curiosity" for up until this time the Chinese had "never been exposed to great works of Western art" (Cary-Elwes 145; Vanderstappen 122). Although both Rowbotham and Cary-Elwes provide translations of letters which include a description of the church, Cary-Elwes' includes the reaction of the Chinese to the
interior of this church. Therefore I include portions of this letter by de Fonteney:

"...The ceiling is entirely painted: it is in three parts; the middle represents a dome (toute ouvert) of an ornate design; there are marble columns that carry a row of arcades surmounted by a fine balustrade. The columns themselves are encased in another balustrade of beautiful design with vases of flowers tastefully spaced out: above, the Eternal Father may be seen seated in the clouds surrounded by a group of angels and holding the world in his hand.

"We failed to persuade the Chinese that this was painted on a flat surface; they could not believe that these columns were not straight as they appeared to be..."

"The reredos is painted just as the ceiling is...It is a pleasure to see the Chinese going forward to examine that part of the Church, which they suppose is behind the altar. When they get up to it, they stop, draw back a little, move forward, put out their hands, to see whether there is really neither elevation nor depth" (146).

It is perhaps apparent to the reader that the Chinese were not accustomed to Western conventions of painting and that they truly marveled at this novelty. There are many writings provided by the missionaries of the Ming and Ching dynasties which indicate the Chinese perplexity in regard to Western perspective and shading which are similar to those reactions of the Chinese in the Pei T'ang Church, as it was called, described above. Such comments as the following, as provided by Harrie Vanderstappen, are typical: one Chinese reflected on an image he viewed at the Nanking Catholic Church by stating, "the portrait was painted on the wall but it looks like a round body, protruding from the walls" (Vanderstappen 106). Another Chinese remarked, "every inch of beauty or ugliness in his
portraiture resembled the real person," and "his portraits were all like images reflected in a mirror" (Vanderstappen 108). Vanderstappen realizes that the missionaries were attempting to communicate a spiritual message within the framework of Western gifts and technical skill. However, the scholar concludes that because "the framework surrounding the spiritual message was much more easily appreciated than the complexities of divine revelation and human redemption...This led to an emphasis upon the framework itself rather than the purely spiritual" (122). I maintain and feel that I have demonstrated that the framework within which the Jesuits worked did succeed in capturing the attention of many Chinese, but that their interest often did not remain there. Rather, in many cases these missionaries were also successful in ultimately communicating their spiritual message. The three influential "chain reaction" converts described in an earlier chapter are evidence of how the initial framework enabled the missionaries to eventually teach Catholic truths and thereby succeeded in winning converts as a result. Of course, official sanction helped these missionaries to proclaim their spiritual message more freely from the confines of the "framework" of the Pei T'ang after the Edict of Toleration went into effect. Undoubtedly the inscription which was carved in Chinese and in marble over the main entrance of the Western structure also helped to give official status to the religion of the church: Chih Chien T'ien Chu T'ang - "The Temple of the Lord of Heaven, built by order of the emperor" (Rowbotham 316).
The church took four years to build and the completion of the structure was celebrated with great ceremony in December of 1703. Missionaries, officials, and scholars from many of the provinces, and princes came to celebrate the occasion. Once again the missionaries had succeeded in securing a stronger position for themselves in China through their secular activities: the reworking of the imperial calendar, the cannon making, the tutoring of the emperor in secular subjects, the successful negotiations with the Russians, and now the saving of the emperor's life with Jesuit's bark all served make the "Golden Days" possible, if only temporarily.

The first decade of the eighteenth century was especially the "high water mark" of the Catholic mission in China (Rowbotham 115). The Jesuits at court continued with their work in a number of secular capacities: Gerbillon and Bouvet still worked as the emperor's tutor; Grimaldi was the director of the Board of Mathematics; Pereyra worked on mechanical devices, and Gherardini taught courses on oil painting. However, the missionaries also did other kinds of work. When the Yellow River overflowed in 1704, they took care of the homeless (Rowbotham 114; Allan 220). One of the most significant secular endeavors for both China and Europe was the map making activity which occurred at this time. I mentioned earlier how the impetus for the French King sending the French Jesuit mathematicians to China was to gain geographical knowledge as well as to convert the Chinese. Little was known about the geography of this part of the world, and the West was very interested in increasing their knowledge in this area. On the Chinese part, map
making activity in China was ordered by K'ang Hsi after the above mentioned flood for conservancy purposes. Theodore Foss and Rowbotham suggest that it was the success of this Jesuit undertaking which so inspired the emperor to have a map of the northern area surrounding the Great Wall drawn, and eventually a map of the entire empire made by the Jesuits (this last endeavor took ten years) (Foss 223; Rowbotham 115; Allan 223). On K'ang Hsi's part, the mapping was primarily for the purpose of successfully monitoring his scattered local governments, and to understand and have knowledge of the extent of his own empire. For the missionaries, the surveying of the entire empire provided more opportunity in which to spread the word of Christianity as well to enhance their geographical knowledge. As Foss states, "When visiting out-of-the-way places, when working with native talent on the survey, or when meeting with local officials, they never forgot that their primary charge was to spread the Christian message" (239).

Secular activities undertaken at the command of K'ang Hsi ended soon after he was able to get a quite full and quite accurate view of his empire (Foss 210). The tolerant, intellectually curious, and successful emperor died in 1722 as the result of a "violent cold" he caught during one of his hunting trips. He was succeeded by Yin Chen - one of his many sons - who took the reign title of Yung Cheng (Rowbotham 115). As illustrated above, during the reign of K'ang Hsi, many Catholic missions were able to be established in China especially after the Edict of Toleration. Toward the end of his reign however, there was increasing dissention amongst the different
Christian orders of missionaries as to the methods of conversion and extent of cultural accommodation which was deemed appropriate. As indicated in the beginning of this chapter, the mendicant orders' views on how to go about converting the Chinese was radically different from that of the Jesuit method which had been established by Valignano, Ruggieri, and Ricci during the earliest period of Christian missions when the Jesuits still had a monopoly in this empire. I have also indicated herein that during the persecutions of 1644 many of these various orders had the opportunity to come together in a Canton prison to intensely debate these issues. Presently it is necessary that I turn our attention to a fuller consideration of the issues of dispute which existed amongst the orders after their arrival on the mainland in the early 1600s, and which came to a crisis point after the "Golden Days" of the missions and especially after the death of K'ang Hsi.
CHAPTER 6
THE CHINESE RITES CONTROVERSY: A QUESTION OF METHOD? 1643-1842

In earlier chapters I mentioned that after the mendicant orders came to China, differences of opinion as to how to proceed attempting to convert the Chinese amongst the orders arose. Primarily the issue was one of the Jesuit method versus that of the older and more established orders (Pastor 403). I have indicated that the Jesuit approach slowly evolved into one of cultural accommodation and pacific penetration in China; the Jesuits dressed like Confucian literati and studied the Confucian Classics in order to understand and win an acceptable place in Chinese society. In addition, because these were erudite men, they brought many objects, skills and other kinds of "Western Learning" to the middle kingdom about which the Chinese were eager to learn, and by doing so succeeded in winning a progressively more secure position for the mission in that country. I have also explained to some extent that the mendicant method of conversion was much different from that of the Jesuits. Most of the mendicants did not believe in the slow, careful and gradual approach of the Jesuits. Rather, they typically wore the habits which were characteristic of their respective European orders; they carried their crucifixes in their hands, and concentrated on preaching the gospel openly in the streets. Many of these mendicants had come from Goa and Manila where the process of Europeanizing Christian converts had been successful. Obviously this mendicant
method was radically different from the Jesuit approach which has been described throughout this paper. It took years of enacting and of reenacting the "Jesuit pattern" to establish what the Society of Jesus had in China by the time the mendicants were able to create permanent missions on the mainland. In fact, the Jesuits - as well as many China scholars - believe that the Christian mission found a place in China primarily, if not strictly, because of their method (Riestra 8; Noll vii). Therefore, when the mendicants arrived in China, the Jesuits, on the whole, were deeply disturbed by the mendicant methods, and the mendicants were likewise disapproving of the Jesuit approach which they found had been instituted in that land.

The Jesuits did not welcome the mendicant approach because, undoubtedly, they still agreed with Ruggieri's words that the mission was "a new and tender plant," which "would take but a breath of wind to destroy," and that "for this reason it is necessary that it be handled in these beginnings with great suavity and delicacy" (Dunne 125). Though of course the church had been successful in winning converts since Ricci and Ruggieri's time, the Jesuits largely felt that the state of the Catholic mission in China at the turn of the seventeenth century was by no means at such a secure stage that European Christian missionaries could risk experimenting with different missionary methods, and they were aware that the mendicants were typically not suave and delicate in their approach to proselytism. I indicated earlier that one priest was executed for his lack of tact in his application of his non-Riccian approach, and another was banished from the country. The Jesuits feared that
because it was likely that the mendicants would continue to behave in this manner that more executions, banishments and other kinds of persecutions of missionaries would occur. Unfortunately, the Jesuits were not disappointed for on many occasions the mendicants brought trouble upon themselves by their lack of discretion. For example, at the exact time that the Dominicans were in the process of sending a complaint about Jesuit methods to Manila, and the archbishop and bishop there were forwarding their objections to the pope in Rome, the Dominicans were in the process of being "expelled from the province on account of their own methods" (Cary-Elwes 149). The Jesuits, therefore, felt that the mendicants were a threat to the success of the entire Christian mission in China and not only to the mendicants themselves. After all, all of these men were Christians and were supposedly in this foreign land to preach the same truth. If a member of one order behaved in a manner which offended the sensibilities of the Chinese in any way, this behavior could and did have an effect on all the missionaries in China, not only those belonging to the particular order of the offender, as soon will become clear.

Before I begin to describe the missionary methods of the Jesuits with which the mendicants were in disagreement, it is important that I indicate that the Jesuit order was not unanimous on all issues in regard to the best way to go about converting the Chinese and in how to interpret certain aspects of Chinese tradition although up until this point I have perhaps given the impression that such was the case. For example, Father Nicholas Longobardi, who
was named Superior of the China Mission by Matteo Ricci before his
death, is claimed by a number of scholars to have differed with Ricci
on certain points. For example, in a letter of 1598, Longobardi states,
"A good number of books and pious objects should be sent...because
those are the things which give us standing with the Chinese in
accordance with our purpose: a purpose which is not to be obtained
by merely putting on show triangular pieces of glass and such-like
objects..." (Cary-Elwes 149). Obviously Longobardi here expresses
some ambivalence about the early Jesuit method of attracting
Chinese interest through the use of secular objects. In addition, Cary-
Elwes and Rowbotham maintain that Longobardi was critical of Ricci's
attempt to persuade the Chinese that the original meaning of the
Chinese Lord in Heaven in the Confucian texts was a personal creator
God, and therefore the equivalent of the Christian God. Apparently
Longobardi felt that this attempt was offensive to the contemporary
Neo-Confucianists who attributed a more materialistic and atheistic
meaning to the Confucian canon, and he expressed these ideas in a
treatise entitled Tradados historicos, politicos, ethics y religios de la
Monarchia de China which was later published by Navarette (Cary-
Elwes 101; Rowbotham 132). Longobardi further demonstrated
unresolved issues that were in his mind in regard to the mission
when he requested the opinions of the Jesuits on three points:
"Whether the Chinese had a true conception of (1) God (as implied in
the term Shang Ti) (2) spirits (Tien shen) and (3) souls (ling huan)
(Rowbotham 133). Although one Jesuit wrote a treatise which was
representative of one point of view, and another Jesuit wrote one
from another perspective, no final solution could be reached. However, Longobardi's request and the response he received indicate that the Jesuits were not all in agreement about how to interpret every aspect of Chinese culture. Rowbotham claims that it was because of Ricci's "unusual talents" that there was unity in the order during his lifetime (132). With his passing, and with the arrival of the mendicants who questioned the Jesuits, some members of the Society of Jesus began to openly express their ambivalences as indicated above. However, even a noted apologist for the mendicants maintains that ultimately, the majority of the Jesuits in China did adhere to Ricci's method after his death. J. S. Cummins states, "on the whole the majority of the Fathers accepted the Ricci approach to the Rites, which became official policy within the Order, and those who dissented did not influence Jesuit mission programmes or methods, though they strengthened the anxiety of the mendicants" (1986:60).

One area where scholars are in disagreement as to Longobardi's position is in regard to the ancestral and Confucian rituals which were briefly referred to in the final chapter on Matteo Ricci. At the end of chapter four, I indicate that Ricci was tolerant of Confucian and ancestral rituals although he stipulated that certain rules should be followed in order to assure that no "superstitious" elements enter into Christian participation of the ceremonies (Allan 56; Dunne 100). Latourette is not specific when he states that Longobardi took the "opposite position" from that of the Ricci method (1929:135); similarly, Allan simply states that Longobardi "felt that the Chinese observances were idolatrous" without specifying which ones. Dunne,
on the other hand, claims that the Jesuits were absolutely unanimous in regard to their interpretation of the ancestral and Confucian rituals, and that the only "sharp differences" of opinion amongst the Jesuits pertained to questions of terminology (it is unclear to me whether or not this statement can be ascertained as being true based simply on the three questions relating to God, spirits and souls as reported by Rowbotham and as offered above) (Dunne 295). In specific reference to Longobardi, however, Dunne clearly asserts that Longobardi had no ambivalence about the rites whatsoever. Dunne states, "Longobardi would later be cited by Navarette as an enemy of the rites, but Navarette was wrong. Strongly as he disagreed with the prevailing view in the matter of terminology, Longobardi agreed with the others about the rites" (295).

It is important to explore the extent to which Ricci's successor as Superior General was in agreement with the methods established by the founder of Catholic missions in China; the issues raised above concerning the rites and the questions of terminology in regard to Longobardi serve as an introduction to the main topic of concern in this chapter, that is, the Chinese Rites Controversy - which involves the issue of the rites and the question of terminology - both of which require much elaboration. Before turning to the Chinese Rites Controversy in specific, however, let us turn our attention to many of the other objections raised by the mendicants in regard to the Jesuit approach.

As indicated by Cummins and Dunne, the mendicants objected to the Jesuits' not promulgating the laws of the church in regard to
fasting, to the obligation to go to Mass on feast days and that of abstinence of work (Cummins 1993:7; Dunne 270). Dunne states that this charge is true, and the reason for it was peculiar to China at the time. He explains that the people in this country were so poor that they could not miss work, and the fact that the majority of the population lived on rice and herbs should be an indication of why none of these law were made mandatory by the Jesuits in China at this time. Dunne claims that these laws were simply an outgrowth of Europeanism which "tends to look upon any divergence from the external forms observed in the homeland as a betrayal of the faith" (272). He therefore maintains that it was not appropriate for these laws to be applied in a land such as China. Dunne also implies that it was because the mendicants did not have an understanding of the Chinese situation - which differed from that of Europe - that they could not understand this accommodation on the part of the Jesuits.

Dunne also indicates that the mendicant criticism of the Jesuit priests' procedure of administering baptism to Chinese women by failing "to apply saliva to their ears, salt to their mouths, and oil to their breast and head" demonstrates no recognition of Chinese attitudes towards having a man touch a woman in public and that this cultural value had to be taken in consideration (273-274). Similarly, the mendicans did not approve of the Jesuit method of dressing as Chinese literati or of their accommodation of the Chinese in regard to dress at all. In fact, Dunne relates an interesting story about a friar named Gaspar Alenda who went with Father Schall to visit a chapel in Peking in 1637. A Jesuit artist, "out of regard for
Chinese feelings on the subject of bare feet" had covered Christ's and the Apostles feet with shoes in a painting which hung there (247-8). This sight so upset the Franciscan that he wrote in a letter to a friend that "it gave me the deepest pain" (248). According to Dunne, this inability to accept a simple change of clothes on priests as well as on a representation of the Lord and his disciples arose from an inability or an unwillingness to distinguish between what aspects of Christianity were germane to European culture, and what aspects were the absolute truths of Christian dogma and divine revelation. In essence, Dunne attributes this ignorance to an inability to separate Christianity from different cultural expressions (228). Antonio Sisto Rosso, O.F.M. in his work Apostolic Legations to China, on the other hand, epitomizes the view of the mendicants in the following statement: "First, to convert a man, one had to change him and not convert oneself by excessive accommodation" (228). Thus, here are clearly stated two radically different views on the subject of accommodation by Jesuits and non-Jesuit orders in China.

The mendicants were also critical of the Jesuit method of the intellectual apostolate. The mendicants maintained that the preaching of the gospel was the reason all the missionaries were in China and the focus should be on that, not on areas of a secular nature, especially to the extent Jesuits had been known to concentrate on the latter in China (Dunne 270). Cummins maintains that the Jesuits were "dazzled" and "perhaps even hypnotized, by their own brilliance" and this caused them to be overly optimistic about their conversion methods (1986:418).
One of the main areas of criticism of the Jesuit method was the claim on the part of the mendicant orders that the Jesuits failed to preach the doctrine of the Crucifixion of Christ. I have previously provided the Jesuit defense in this regard, as I have explained the principle of *arcana* which the Jesuits followed. That is, I have indicated that the Jesuits did indeed reveal the story of Christ's Crucifixion and Passion but that they did so only gradually. I have explained that when the neophyte gave indications to the Jesuits of being educated enough about Christian teachings to understand and accept these beliefs that she would be informed of them. Thus, although the Jesuits introduced these mysteries slowly to those potential converts (as well as to others) who were open, receptive, and informed enough to learn of them, the Jesuits did not completely withhold these fundamental Christian teachings as the mendicants accused them of doing.

Cummins also names an intimately related mendicant objection to the Jesuit approach in regard to the Crucifixion and the Passion. He states that the Jesuits were also accused of "too discreetly concealing the crucifix from the Chinese" (1993: 7). Again, the Jesuits had their reasons for not carrying their crucifixes around in their hands constantly as many of the mendicants did. The reader simply needs to recall the story of the eunuch Ma Tang's reaction to the crucifix he found in Ricci's luggage related earlier in order understand the Jesuits' discretion in this matter. The Passion and the Crucifixion were completely alien ideas to many Chinese and possibly the most difficult to understand and accept. The Jesuits felt the need
not to flaunt these teachings or the object which represented them in
order not to alienate the Chinese before they were ready to
understand, at least, if not to believe (Dunne 278-279). Indeed, I
speculate that this is the same reason why the Nestorians did not
include mention of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection on the Hsi-an
Fu Monument along with a statement of their other beliefs, as
indicated in Chapter I (Legge 1966:40). The Nestorians, like the
Jesuits, also wanted to slowly introduce all of their Christian beliefs
to the Chinese and other ethnic groups in seventh century China so as
not to alienate them by advertising such foreign ideas on the
Monument. (It is interesting to note that there were no pictorial
representations of the crucifixion in the catacombs, and that the
"Church was several hundred years old before Christians began to
represent the crucifixion in anything but symbolic forms" (Dunne
278).)

George Dunne also states that the non-Jesuit orders criticized
the Society of Jesus for their outright refusal to say that Confucius
was in hell (270). This latter point infuriated the Spanish Dominican,
Fray Domingo Fernandez de Navarette, mentioned previously, to such
an extent, that it is reported by C.R. Boxer that he answers the
question "Was Confucius Saved?" by retorting "witheringly that since
Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, Seneca et al were irretrievably damned,
how much the more Confucius 'who was not worthy to kiss their
feet!'" (1968:164). Obviously we learn something about this
mendicant's attitude toward Chinese culture from this
pronouncement!
In J.S. Cummins' list of allegations against the Jesuits in his newly published work, *A Question of Rites*, this scholar adds that the Jesuits were also accused of "dabbling in astrology, even 'black magic', all for the greater glory of God" (7). Although he does not elaborate at this point, undoubtedly he here refers to the Jesuit work on the calendar which was not considered to be free of many "superstitious" beliefs by many European Christians as mentioned earlier.

The two final objections of the mendicants mentioned by Dunne and Cummins in their respective lists are the two most important because the differing interpretations of their significance is what led to a radical altering of the course of the Catholic mission in China: that of the ancestral and Confucian rites, and the question of Chinese terminology in regard to Christian concepts. It was the disagreement over these rites which slowly came to life after the arrival of the mendicant orders and which came to be known throughout the Christian world as the Chinese Rites Controversy.

Specifically, the Chinese Rites Controversy was a disagreement which began amongst missionaries in China in regard to three areas of Chinese life: "(1) the periodic ceremonies held in honor of Confucius, generally but not exclusively by the scholar class in halls or temples dedicated to this great national philosophical master; (2) the special ritual honors paid to one's ancestor's, modes of tribute and filial piety that were part of the very social fiber of China, and still are today; finally, (3) the semantic search for the most appropriate term(s) in Chinese to speak of and to the Christian God."
This latter is usually treated separately from the first two and designated the 'Term Question' or the 'Term Issue' (Noll vii). Although the controversy began in the mission field in seventeenth century China, it did not remain confined to that time and place by any means, for not only were the archbishop and bishop of Manila involved, but so were twenty-six popes; the Cardinals in the Holy Office of the Sacred Congregation of the Faith; two apostolic delegates; 160 scholars at the Sorbonne; the Kings of Spain, Portugal and France; the Jansenists; the preachers Fenelon and Bousset; the writers Leibnitz and Voltaire; the Jesuit confessor of Louis XIV; as well as two seventeenth century Chinese emperors, and twentieth century government officials from China and Japan over a period of 300 years (Minamiki 1985: x-xi; Rosso 15; Rowbotham 143; Noll vi). As is fully explained below, the Chinese Rites Controversy formally began in 1633 and did not end until 1939. As the religion scholar George Minamiki, S.J. points out, this lengthy and difficult conflict was primarily not one between Asians and Europeans, but rather was "a clash between two types of Western minds" (1985:261). He indicates, in fact, that the native Chinese Catholics were not directly involved in the decision making in regard to the rites as they pertained to Catholicism at all (1985: 253). J.S. Cummins agrees with Minamiki's evaluation of the situation, for he also states that the controversy was a "struggle between two types of Western minds, the one traditional and conservative, the other progressive and adventurous" (Cummins 1962: 1).

As indicated above, one concern of these two kinds of minds
were the ceremonies performed in honor of Confucius, or K'ung Fu Tzu (551-479 B.C.). The rites in honor of this great scholar and teacher began within the context of his own family. However, these rites became part of a state cult, primarily amongst the gentry class, years after his death when Han Dynasty (206 B.C. - 222 A.D.) government officials attempted to revive traditional Chinese values and in the process rediscovered the works of Confucius. His teachings "became the standard textbooks of Chinese education and were later recognized as the official canonical books of China" (Minamiki 1985:7). At this time, Confucius was also "credited with preserving the people's heritage, and thus he became the voice of the past" (Minamiki 1985:7).

In order to gain positions as government officials, Chinese were required to pass an examination which was largely based on Confucian Classics; consequently, Confucius became known as the patron of these scholars who ritually paid their respects to him, primarily in his wen miao, or temple, which was built on the same ground as all government schools. The manner in which the scholar officials paid their respects to Confucius characteristically involved the following: in front of an image of Confucius or a wooden tablet which was supposed to represent him (and which I discuss fully at a later point), his students offered up food and wine. The Confucian scholars also kowtowed in front of this image or tablet. In addition, on certain periodic occasions a bull or a pig would be slaughtered in the sage's honor. Sometimes pantomimes or musical performances were staged (Minamiki 1985:9). Particular rituals for each occasion,
at each location, during a particular time period, were prescribed by the Ministry of Rites beginning in the Yuan period (1278-1368) (Shyrock 1932:168-176).

By the time the Jesuits arrived in the sixteenth century, "the cult of Confucius was well established," and "his teachings exerted a widespread influence throughout the country" (Minamiki 1985:10). When Western missionaries observed the offerings, gestures, and slaughters described above in honor of Confucius, they had to decide whether these rituals implied that the Chinese considered the sage to be a god or whether they were merely paying him their respect as a scholar and teacher and model Chinese. Did the Chinese believe that the spirit of Confucius was present at these rituals? Did the Chinese believe that the spirit of Confucius partook of the food and wine offered to him? Since many of the rituals performed by the scholar class resembled rituals which are strictly reserved for the worship of God in Christianity, many of the Western priests had problems accepting these rites as being secular. Thus the problem of how to interpret Confucian rituals became an important issue in the Chinese Rites Controversy.

Because the teachings of Confucius were of such great import in Chinese society, his emphasis on filial piety was taken very seriously by the Chinese people. Actually, there are historical records which date from the first millennium before Christ that were later incorporated into the Confucian canon which indicate that filial piety has been an important part of Chinese tradition since 2200 B.C. (Addison 3). This is why Confucius referred to himself as being "only
a transmitter and not a maker, believing in and loving the ancients" (Dunne 295). Therefore, although Confucius stressed filial piety in his writings, he did so largely because this value had already existed as part of Chinese tradition for centuries. What is filial piety exactly? Perhaps an examination of the Chinese character which expresses this idea will help clarify the full meaning of this concept. The phrase filial piety or hsiao is represented by the character which "consists of the graph for old, supported by the graph for son placed underneath" (Thompson 1969: 39). This picture symbolizes the obligation of the child to respect and take care of the parents according to what is known as li, as briefly mentioned earlier, or "the norm of human behavior in all social circumstances" as outlined in detail in the Confucian Canon, specifically the Li Ching: Canon of Ritual and Protocol (Thompson 1969: 41, 124; Minamiki 1985: 4, 257). In this Canon details are given as to how children should behave toward their parents in life: "Thus the obedient son was expected to be neatly dressed when he appeared before his parents, and on wintry nights, he was to warm their bed for them" (Minamiki 1985: 4). The Confucian Hsiao Ching: Canon of Filiality maintains that "there is no crime greater than unfiliality" (Thompson 1969: 125, 40). Sinologist Laurence Thompson comments on this last assertion: "Lest this be thought to be a merely rhetorical statement, we mention the fact that unfilial conduct was a serious crime under law. It was a right of parents to put an unfilial child to death, or at least to denounce him to the authorities for punishment prescribed in the criminal statutes...cursing one's parents was a capital offence"
Religion scholar George Minamiki indicates that filial piety has ramifications for an individual beyond the parent/child relationship. He explains that this traditional Chinese virtue extends to "dealings with all the people who were related to him through lineage; that is, through marriage, descent and ancestry, and ultimately to his general conduct in society" (Minamiki 1985:4). Learning to be filial to one's parents prepares a child to be responsible in the other four major relationships that a person has in his or her life as defined by Confucius: father and son, husband and wife, ruler and minister, and friend and friend (Minamiki 1985:4). Filial piety helps to maintain the stability of all these relationships, and ideally serves to help achieve harmony in society. In essence, therefore, filial piety has traditionally been considered to be "the cornerstone of all morality" in accordance with Confucian teachings (Minamiki 1985:4).

The Confucian Canon not only describes how children should behave in regard to their parents in life; rather, the Confucian teachings also prescribe how children should behave toward their parents after the latter have died. That is, Confucianism maintains that filial piety must be continued to be demonstrated in outward form after death in order for harmony in society to be maintained. The assumption elaborated upon in the Canon is that the ties which exist between parents and children are not severed with death, but rather that they continue on afterwards in a different form. In the Confucian Li Ki: Book of Rites, it is stated that a filial child's responsibility towards his parents are shown "while they are alive,
by nourishing them; when they are dead, by all the rites of mourning; and when the mourning is over by sacrificing them...in his sacrifices we see his reverence and observance of the [proper] seasons" (Addison 25). It should be clear from this quotation that if every individual behaves in accordance with the rules of li, both before and after death occurs, there will not only be harmony in society, but in the universe.

One of the primary ways in which filial piety has traditionally been expressed by Chinese, as far back as the Neolithic period in fact, is through the "cult of familial dead," to use the expression of the scholar-priest F. A. Rouleau (Rouleau 615; Eliade 1984:5). The cult of familial dead refers to what is commonly known as ancestor worship, but to which I refer as ancestor veneration for reasons explained in Chapter I. Filial piety as expressed through ancestor veneration is the second aspect of the Chinese Rites Controversy with which I am here concerned. The ritual of ancestor veneration in traditional Chinese society may take slightly different forms depending on the specific occasion, location and economic means of the family involved; however, food and drink, flowers, incense, candles, a tablet, prostrations, and the burning of paper money are all characteristically fundamental ingredients of the ceremony (Thompson 56; Addison 37; Yang 39-40). The ritual is characteristically performed at the grave, in the clan temple24 (a building in which an extended family keeps the tablets of generations on display) and at the family altar located in the home.

24 Only if the family has the economic status to have one.
Many Chinese have commonly and traditionally believed that the spirit of the deceased has three souls and that each of these souls resides in three separate places: in the grave, in the spirit tablet and in the spirit world (Freedman 86; Addison 34; Emmons 17). (Thompson provides a variation of this belief and maintains that "the ancestors dwelt in three specific places: within the home, within the family or lineage cemetery, and within the lineage temple") (56). Thus, when a family offers food and drink at the gravesite or before the spirit tablet, which is called shen wei, "seat of the spirit," or shen chu "lodging place of the spirit," many traditional Chinese believe that the spirit of the deceased is really present and that he or she actually partakes of the food and drink which are offered (Addison 31). At the time of a food offering a family announcement of some sort may be made such as the birth of a child, a marriage arrangement, or the beginning of a journey. After a period of time has elapsed in which the spirit is perhaps believed to have partaken of the essence of the food, the family eats and drinks what has been offered (Yang 35; Addison 37; Ahern 9). As stated above, there are many variations of this ritual according to location, occasion, and family involved, but also the particulars included or excluded in this ritual are influenced by the historical period in which they are performed.

It was extremely difficult for the European missionaries who arrived in China in the sixteenth century to decide whether or not the ceremonies performed in honor of the dead were merely secular rituals of respect or whether there were any "superstitious" beliefs
(that is, non-Catholic) associated with them. That is, many of the questions that were asked by the missionaries in regard to the Confucian rituals also had to be asked in relation to the ancestral veneration rites. Because these rituals had the outer appearance of a religious ceremony to European Christian eyes, the missionaries had to ask themselves, as well as the Chinese, the following kinds of questions: Are the Chinese worshiping their ancestors as if they were gods? Do they actually and always believe that the spirits are present in the tablet (and elsewhere) and that they actually partake of the food offered by the living? Are the prostrations before the tablet and/or altar and grave a sign that the ancestors are being worshipped? One of the primary reasons why it was so difficult for the missionaries (as well as for all of the other numerous scholars, writers, and religious folk who were involved) to come to a consensus of opinion on the rites is because the beliefs associated with the ancestral rites especially were (and are) so varied amongst the individual Chinese. First, there were those who may have typically given a secular meaning to the ancestral rites in accordance with one interpretation of the Chinese Confucian Classics, especially the *Li Ki: Book of Rites*, on one end of the spectrum (Addison 15); then there were those individuals who literally worshipped their ancestors because they attributed godlike qualities to their deceased family members with hopes of establishing "favorable relations in order to avert harm and to obtain goods which they desire" (Addison 54; Thompson 44). James Thayer Addison beautifully summarizes the variety of categories of belief which were probable to have
existed during the beginning of the Chinese Rites Controversy as well as today by the Chinese population:

At one extreme we have the rites performed as a conventional memorial with no belief implied in the powers or even the existence of the deceased. At the other extreme we have the same rites performed with motives and desires scarcely distinguishable from those which express themselves in the service of gods and spirits. Toward the latter extreme tend the beliefs of the unlettered masses, toward the former the beliefs of the Chinese Classics and of all those who think and feel with harmony with the Classics. Between the two extremes and in obedience to one tendency or the other are innumerable gradations and variations of motive and meaning. Here the emphasis will be upon duty and the motive disinterested; there the purposes will be chiefly the fruit of selfish desire or fear. In most formal memorials there will be lurking an element of religion, and in the frankest effort to propitiate superior powers the element of filial duty will not be wholly absent (Addison 55).

Thus, it should be apparent why it was even a bit of a struggle for Matteo Ricci, one of the most "progressive and adventurous" of minds, to be completely unambiguous about the beliefs associated with the ancestral rites. When he first arrived in China, his initial reaction was to proclaim the rites as being superstitious. Only after twenty years of living in China did he declare in his Directive of 1603 (the original of which has been lost) that both the Confucian and ancestral rites were a "licit and an even indispensable aid in Christian missionary work" (Noll vii). Even at that time he expressed some reservation for in this important directive he stated that the ancestral ceremonies were "'perhaps' nonsuperstitious since there was no conclusive evidence that the rites were conceived of
superstitiously and much evidence that excluded such a conception" (Noll vii; my italics). The reader should again note the italicized words for here it can be postulated that Ricci was here indirectly referring to the Confucian Classics which, as stated previously, he believed expressed monotheistic beliefs. In other words, it can be ascertained that Matteo Ricci attempted to justify his acceptance of those ancestral rites which did not contain any Buddhist or Taoist elements by claiming that the majority of the Chinese population had strayed away from the native monotheistic Chinese religion expressed in the Classics (as Latourette points out there were many "religious customs" which they Jesuits "could not but condemn; The worship of hills and rivers, of Taoist and Buddhist divinities, and of native gods was in clear contradiction to Catholic teaching") (1929:134). If the monotheism found there was the true "'natural religion'" of the Chinese, then, of course, ancestor veneration could not have been "conceived of" as a religion although Ricci recognized that some superstitious elements had come with time to be associated with the rites as they were performed (Rule 109; Minamiki 21). This was why even the Jesuits - prior to the arrival of the mendicant orders - had forbidden Chinese Catholics to participate in certain aspects of both the Confucian and ancestral rituals. Specifically, Jesuits forbade Chinese Catholics to participate in the solemn ceremonies in honor of Confucius in which there was an animal sacrifice because this practice "'smacks of superstition'" (Minamiki 21). In regard to the ancestral rites, no burning of paper was allowed (many Chinese believed the burning of paper money
provided security for the soul of the deceased in the spirit world and the practice was associated with Buddhism); the converts were also required to repudiate the idea that the spirit of the deceased actually partook of the food which was offered during these rituals; and no prayers were permitted to be directed to the dead (Dunne 292). The Jesuits did allow, on the other hand, the keeping of a tablet with only the name of the deceased inscribed upon it. This tablet could be surrounded "with marks of honor: flowers, candles, incense" (Dunne 294). In addition to these artifacts which were sanctioned by the Jesuits were those customs which were most closely associated with the ancestral rites of mourning: the wearing of a white mourning garment, and the gesture of the kowtow which they simply considered to be a ritual of respect. As Dunne states, and as we have seen previously in our description of Verbiest's Catholic funeral in Chinese tradition, the Jesuits "not only permitted Christians to observe this custom, they observed it themselves" (294). Thus, Matteo Ricci and the other early Jesuits saw the rites as being originally civic and social in meaning, but through the course of time they had become "infected with erroneous preternatural or superstitious beliefs" (Dunne 295; Minamiki 21). These ancestral and Confucian rites, the priests maintained, were originally performed with the sole purpose of expressing filial piety (the Confucian rites as well since these rites also began within the context of the family before they became the manifestation of a state cult, as mentioned). Ricci believed that the presence of the Catholic missionary-scholars and their reintroduction of the original Confucian teachings would
gradually eliminate any superstitious elements which may still "perhaps" be associated with the rites, and thus the full truth of Christianity and thus salvation would be possible for all Chinese people.

It is not surprising that the Jesuits would choose not to forbid the use of the tablet at all since the tablet has been a fundamental part of the ancestral veneration ceremonies as far back as records of these rituals indicate. In classical ancestor veneration the spirit of the deceased was also characteristically believed to be present in the tablet; however, at that time, the ceremony also included a personator of the deceased to whom food and drink was offered and by whom it was eaten and drunk. This personator was a "mere figurehead" who was required to remain "as nearly as possible without motion or expression" (Addison 5). Though the personator has not been a part of the ceremony since the third century before Christ (except for certain sections of China such as Canton where this element of the tradition has been maintained during autumn and spring sacrifices) the presence of the tablet has persisted throughout the centuries, and the reverence with which the tablet has been viewed and treated has not changed much between 300 B.C. and the twentieth century. Although a variety of beliefs by different individuals holds true in regard to the tablet, because the spirit of the deceased has largely been traditionally believed to be truly present in the tablet by many Chinese, this artifact has always been treated with the utmost respect. During the Chou Dynasty (1122-256 B.C.), for instance, the tablet of the former and deceased emperor
was, on occasion, taken on martial expeditions to the accompaniment of the living emperor. During these outings, the tablets were guarded with great care by the royal family in order to show their "deep sense of filial piety and love" (Addison 19). In 1909, this quality of love and respect for the spirit in the tablet of the deceased was also demonstrated in the treatment shown the Empress Dowager's "seat of the spirit." The magnificent story of the journey which this tablet took follows:

The conveyance of Her Majesty's ancestral tablet from the tombs of the Eastern Hill to its resting place in the Temple of Ancestors in the Forbidden City was a ceremony in the highest degree impressive and indicative of the vitality of those feelings which make ancestor worship the most important factor in the life of the Chinese. The tablet, a simple strip of carved and lacquered wood, bearing the name of the deceased into Manchu and Chinese characters, had been officially present at the burial. With the closing of the great door of the tomb the spirit of the departed ruler is supposed to be translated to the tablet, and to the latter is therefore given honour equal to that which was accorded to the sovereign during her lifetime. Borne aloft in a gorgeous chariot draped with Imperial yellow silk and attended by a large mounted escort, Tzu Hsi's tablet journeyed slowly and solemnly, in three days' stages, from the Eastern Hills to Peking. At each stage it rested for the night in a specially constructed pavilion, being 'invited' by the Master of the Ceremonies, on his knees and with all solemnity, to be pleased to leave its chariot and rest. For the passage of this habitation of the spirit of the mighty dead the imperial road had been specially prepared and swept by an army of men; it had become a via sacra on which no profane feet might come or go. As the procession bearing the sacred tablet drew near to the gates of the capital, the Prince Regent and all the high officers of the Court knelt reverently to receive it. All traffic was stopped; every sound stilled in the streets, where the people knelt down to do homage to the memory... Slowly and
solemnly the chariot was borne through the main gate of the Forbidden City to the Temple of the Dynasty's ancestors, the most sacred spot in the Empire, where it was 'invited' to take its appointed place among the nine Ancestors and their thirty-five Imperial Consorts (Addison 33-34; final italics not mine).

Although this quotation seems to imply that the spirit of the deceased is transferred from the tomb to the tablet, it is important to keep in mind that there were a variety of beliefs in regard to in how many places and where exactly the spirit of the deceased resided when; regardless of this point, however, is the illustration in this quotation of just how significant the tablet has been throughout Chinese history. Although the story as provided by Addison simply mentions that the tablet only has the names of the deceased inscribed upon it in Manchu and Chinese characters, local traditions largely determine what is or is not written on a tablet; however, Addison and Yang maintain that a tablet would traditionally include the name of the deceased as well as the accomplishments and aspirations of the deceased (Addison 31; Yang 41). In addition it would characteristically include the words shen chu or shen wei, mentioned above, which would indicate the belief that the tablet is a habitat for the spirit (Addison 32). Thus it is apparent that the Jesuits not only realized that ancestor veneration was "the most important factor in Chinese life" (as was reflected in Ricci's Directive of 1603), but they also realized that the retention of the tablet was of the utmost significance for Catholic Chinese converts. The Jesuits recognized that they must make some accommodation for the retention of this culturally significant Chinese artifact, if the ethnic identity of the Catholic converts was not to be threatened, and if they
were not to feel alienated from their own culture. This was the Jesuit
evaluation of and response to the the situation in seventeenth
century China. The Jesuits determined that the tablet could be
maintained in the ancestral rites, but with the omission of the
inscription *shen chu* and *shen wei* as well as with a declaration of
disbelief in the presence of the spirit in the tablet. According to the
Jesuit method of cultural accommodation such as has just been
demonstrated in regard to the tablet, many traditional Chinese
customs could be maintained, but they would be given new symbolic
significance under the rubric of Christianity (as shall soon become
clear): it would simply be the responsibility of the missionaries to
educate the Chinese along these Christian lines. In this way, it was
possible for traditional Chinese customs and traditions to retain their
cultural significance for Chinese Catholic converts while adjustments
were made in the symbolic meanings associated with them to
become either Christian or secular in nature (Dunne 242; Minamiki
23; Allan 163).

The Chinese Rites Controversy called into question the Jesuit
method of cultural accommodation in regard to the Confucian and
ancestral rituals as well as Ricci's choice of Chinese words to
designate Christian concepts. This issue of terminology raised in
regard to the third aspect of controversy had already been an area of
dispute amongst the Jesuits themselves prior to the coming of the
mendicants as referred to briefly above. The main area of dispute
was whether words which already existed in the Chinese vocabulary
should be chosen to designate Christian terms or whether new ones
should be coined (Latourette 133; 282-83; Rowbothom 128-30; Trigault 154; Dunne 283). It was Ricci's view that words which were already in the Chinese vocabulary could be used, but that, again, through a process of education, the Chinese could come to define the terms with specific Christian denotations. This methodological thinking was analogous to that of the Jesuit adaptation and retention of the tablet. Just as continuity of Chinese heritage was maintained within a Christian context through a process of education and clarification of the Christian meaning of this artifact, so too, could Chinese words be retained with the Christian meanings clarified. Ricci chose the words Shang-ti and T'ien to designate the concept of God in the Christian sense, that is, "a living, omniscient Being without beginning and without end, the Creator of all things and the Ruler of all" (Rowbotham 129; Lancashire 32). He culled the word Shang-ti from the earliest Confucian texts (Shang Dynasty: 1766-1123 B.C.) where he felt he had deciphered monotheistic thinking in the writings. The word T'ien was also taken from Confucian texts but from a later period (Chou Dynasty: 1122-221 B.C.) where the word was interpreted by Ricci to have been used as the equivalent of "Heaven" or "Providence" in Western terms with the implication being that it referred to God in Heaven. The Chinese term T'ien-chu, which means "Lord of Heaven" was also used by Ricci in his writings. This word, though used in Buddhist scriptures to designate the term deity, was decided upon when a young catechumen "saluted the painting of Christ with the title "Lord of Heaven"" (Lancashire 34). Cummins also adds that Ricci chose this word because "it seemed to
him the the Chinese adored Heaven as the supreme numen, and so by referring to God as the 'Master of Heaven,' the Christians were showing that their God was greater than Heaven" (1986:45).

While Ricci's choice of words T'ien and Shang-ti (which he preferred over the term T'ien-chu) were again based on his study of the original meanings of the words in the oldest Confucian texts (just as his decision about the rites had largely been based on their original social and civic meaning), the mendicants, especially the Dominicans (and some Jesuits such as Longobardo and those in Japan), took an entirely different view of the connotations of these words, and therefore disapproved of their use to denote the Christian concept of God. The main difference between the conclusions reached by Ricci and his followers and the Dominicans and their allies was due to Ricci's reliance on the earliest Confucian texts, and the Dominican reliance on later Confucian texts and the beliefs of the present day Neo-Confucian scholars. The Dominicans did not search the Confucian texts for the original meaning of these words; they looked to the later Confucian writings when the connotations of the words Shang-ti and T'ien began to lose their meaning of a "governing personal deity" and assumed more of denotation of an "impersonal natural power" similar to that of the laws which governed the universe in Buddhism and Taoism (Lancashire 34; Rowbotham 28-29; Thompson 107-108). In addition, because the Neo-Confucianist writings emphasized this worldly activity (that is, the significance of correct human behavior as dictated by the rules of li which pertained to the five most significant relationships between
individuals), and because they did not speculate as to the possibility of the existence of an afterlife, the Dominicans and allies maintained that the Confucianists were atheists; therefore Christians had no business using their terminology for Catholic purposes (Rowbotham 128-29).

Although this "Term Question" of the Chinese Rites Controversy is the least relevant to my purpose of attempting to explain the history of the ancestral rites in relation to the Catholic Church, the conflicts which arose in regard to this aspect of the controversy parallel the quality of difficulties which were wrestled with by Catholics in relation to the rites. The main question of dispute involved the following kinds of questions: To what extent could traditional manifestations of Chinese culture be maintained and simply be given new Christian meaning? At what point were customs, words, traditions, and beliefs too non-Catholic to be considered to be retained even with Christian redefinition? This seemed to be the main area of dispute between the non-Jesuits (predominantly) and the Jesuits in all areas of the controversy.

Dunne suggests that the process of reeducating the Chinese was the simplest and most logical solution to many of these problems such as has been illustrated by the Term Question. In fact, he suggests that perhaps neither Ricci and allies nor the Dominicans and followers even needed to justify their acceptance or rejection of terminology to themselves by looking to original texts or contemporary thinking to determine what words did or did not mean to the Chinese. Rather, he suggests that to have simply informed the
Chinese of the Christian interpretation of terminology, for instance, would have been sufficient. Dunne claims that the debate could have been simplified by asking the right questions: "Regardless of the primitive meaning of Shang-ti, Tien-chu, t'ien-shen [angels], ling-hun [soul], can we confidently hope that constant explication of the Christian concept can infuse these terms with Christian meaning? Can we not say to the Chinese, 'whatever your ancestors understood or many of your contemporaries understand by Shang-ti, Christians by Shang-ti mean a being who is eternal, infinite, unique, omnipotent, creator of heaven and earth?'" (Dunne 286; my brackets). These words of Dunne truly epitomize the essence of cultural accommodation on the part of the Jesuits, for as Minamiki states, "Christianity was not meant to totally supplant another culture, but was rather to be implanted into the matrix of that culture" (22-23). Those mendicants who were accustomed to Europeanizing their converts did not view the situation this way, however (nor did the Jesuits who did not side with Ricci on the Term Question), and now it is time to be more specific as to the details of how this centuries long controversy which began between the mendicants and the majority of Jesuits over the rites and Term Question unfolded.

It has previously been mentioned that one of the first moves that the mendicants made to formally object to the Jesuit approach to conversion in China was in 1635 when the Dominican missionaries of Fukien sent their complaints to the Archbishop of Manila and the Bishop of Zebut. I also have also indicated that the archbishop sent
these objections on to Rome; however, he withdrew them in 1638, according to Cary-Elwes, when he was "better informed" (149; Latourette 136). The first major action on the part of a Dominican which took the dispute about missionary method out of the field and into the minds of those in Europe, was that of the Spaniard Juan Baptista Morales who framed his objections in the form of seventeen questions. Cummins claims that this decisive action was the "turning point in the whole affair" between the Jesuits and mendicants because if the Jesuits had welcomed the mendicants and had been at least willing to discuss their different conversion approaches with the latter perhaps the problems could have been resolved amongst the Christian missionaries in China (1986:55). Rowbotham also claims that the Dominicans "in defense of their action...used every effort to come to a discussion and argument before they made their appeal to the central authority outside of China" (134). Cummins even goes so far as to suggest that if the Jesuits had not wanted to maintain a monopoly in China that there was the possibility there would have been no Chinese Rites Controversy, and that "history would have a different story to tell" (1986:401). Whether or not it is the fault of the Jesuits that the Chinese Rites Controversy did indeed occur because of their unwillingness to negotiate with the mendicants does not change history, however; therefore, I shall continue with that story.

The seventeen questions which were presented by Morales in 1643 to the Propaganda Fide (previously referred to as the Congregation for the Propaganda of the Faith - the organ of the
Church which was in charge of the missions) and then passed on to the Holy Office (where theologians were designated to evaluate the situation) are the following (as reported by Latourette):

"Were Chinese Christians, he asked, obliged as were other Catholics to go to confession and to take communion at least once a year? Might missionaries in administering baptism to women omit the saliva and the salt, and might they be excused from giving to women extreme unction? Were Chinese to be permitted to charge an interest rate of thirty per cent, and when those who made their living by lending money became Christians were they to be allowed to continue in their profession? Might Christians contribute to community sacrifices to pagan divinities? Might they be present at the required official sacrifices if they would conceal about their persons a cross and adore that while pretending to be worshipping the idol? Might they join in sacrifices to Confucius and at funerals? Might they join in honoring ancestral tablets and in making offerings to the dead at other times than at funerals? Should applicants for baptism be informed that their new faith forbade all idolatry and sacrifice? Might Christians apply to Confucius the term sheng or "holy"? Might they have in their churches tablets to the Emperor wishing him, as was customary, ten thousand years of life? Was it permissible to say masses for Chinese non-Christians who had died? Since some Chinese were scandalized by the crucifixion, was it necessary to speak to them of it or to show them a crucifix?" (Latourette 1929:136; Minamiki 1985: 26, 267).

At the beginning of this chapter I raised many of the the issues of the controversy enumerated by Morales and here phrased by Latourette. However, it is beyond the scope of this project to discuss each and every one of them to any great extent. Therefore, I will confine our discussion to those issues which pertained primarily to the ancestral rites, somewhat to the Confucian rites, and to the issue of terminology only as it relates to these rites.
The Decree of September 12, 1645 by the Congregation for the Propaganda of the Faith, as approved by Pope Innocent X, in response to the submission of the question by Morales was the first ruling on the Chinese Rites Controversy. Fundamentally, the Propaganda judged against the methods of the Jesuits as described by Morales "until His Holiness or the Holy See will have ordained otherwise" (Noll 5). His Holiness and the Holy See had the opportunity to ordain otherwise eleven years later in response to the four questions which were submitted to the Propaganda Fide in 1655 and which were forward to the Holy Office by Pope Alexander the VII. These four questions were presented to Rome by a highly respected Jesuit priest, Father Martin Martini (who compiled China's first atlas) out of dissatisfaction not only with the Decree of 1645 but with the way in which the situation in China was presented to the Holy Office by the Dominican Morales (Rowbotham 135; Latourette 137). As Dunne states in regard to Morales' submission, "His description of the rites assumes as established all the questions that were in fact disputed" (298). Perhaps a look at the wording of Morales' submission in comparison to that of Martini's will enable the reader to more fully understand why Rome judged against the Jesuits in the first decree, and why they judged in favor of them in their evaluation of the information with which they were provided by the Jesuit Martini in the second decision which took the form of a rescript on March 23, 1656 by the Holy Office, and as approved by Pope Alexander VII.
Question #8 from Document #1 of the 100 Roman Documents Relating to the Chinese Rites Controversy (1645-1941) submitted by Morales and question #3 of Document #2 submitted by Martini both are concerned with whether or not Chinese Catholics should be allowed to participate in Confucian rituals in China. Presented first is #8,Document #1:

The Chinese have a teacher learned in moral philosophy. He died a long time ago. His name was Confucius. He is known all over China for his teaching, his rules, his writings. Kings and all others, whatever their condition or social level may be, regard him as someone to imitate and follow, at least as a philosopher. They venerate and praise him as a saint. In every city and town temples are built in his honor.

Twice a year governors are required to offer a solemn sacrifice in his temple. They themselves function as priests. Twice a month in the course of the year they are required to sacrifice without solemnity. Some scholars flock to him for help. Here are the things they offer in sacrifice: a whole slain pig, a whole she-goat, candles, wine, flowers, incense, etc. All scholars when they receive their degree, have to enter the temple of Confucius, genuflect, and make an offering of candles and incense before his altar.

All that liturgy - the sacrifice, the reverence - is formally intended by the Chinese as thanksgiving for the good teaching that he has left them in his writings. It is to ask him through his merits the blessings of talent, wisdom, and intelligence.

The question is, whether those who are or will be Christian governors and scholars, when they are summoned, may go into Confucius' temple, offer or assist at such a sacrifice, genuflect before the altar, partake of something from those idolatrous sacrifices and oblations. The pagans believe that whoever eats something from those sacrifices will make great progress in his studies and degrees.

Could they be allowed to do this, as was spelled out in the preceding question, carrying a crucifix in their hands? If
they are forbidden to do this, the people will riot. Missionaries will be exiled. It will be hard to make converts. Conversions may stop altogether.

The decision: It cannot be allowed. As the case is presented, Christians may not pretend to participate (Noll 2).

One of the most striking aspects of #8 of this document is that Morales mentions the solemn ceremonies of Confucius when we know, in fact, that the Jesuits did not permit the Chinese Catholic converts to participate in these ceremonies because they "smack" of superstition, as indicated earlier (Minamiki 21). Surely the mendicants did not think that these rituals of animal sacrifice should possibly be permitted when the Jesuits did not. After all, the mendicants were the ones who were supposed to be the priests who were "traditional and conservative" (Cummins 1962:1). The second most remarkable area of this text is the choice of words with which Morales describes the Confucian rituals. The Dominican maintains that the Chinese revere the teacher-philosopher as a "saint," and he refers to the Confucian governors as "priests." In addition, Confucian buildings are here referred to as "temples," and the artifact upon which candles and incense are placed is called an "altar." Morales here maintains that the individuals who participate in these rituals "genuflect," and that the purposed of the entire "liturgy" is to ask for the "blessing" of Confucius. Obviously all of the words I have here quoted are words which are characteristically associated with Christianity, with the exception of the word "temple," which typically has a religious connotation for non-Christian religions in the English language. The terms "idolatrous," "sacrifices," and "oblations" are also not exactly terms which are neutral in connotation. In sum, all of the
words to which I have here called attention are words which are used to describe religious people, places or actions or things which are non-Catholic. In addition, this section of the document also makes an assumption about the beliefs of the "pagans" who participate in the ritual where it states, "whoever eats something from those sacrifices will make great progress in his studies and degrees," which, of course, goes against Catholic teaching. Therefore, it is not surprising to find that the Decree of 1645 was decided in favor of the Dominican position (and that of the other mendicants) as described by the Dominican Morales: as Minamiki states, "the rites were already presumed to be of a religious character, and it was this description which the theologians relied upon to make their judgements on the various propositions" (1985:29). How could these Catholics have judged otherwise when the rites were described as if they were being performed in honor of Confucius as if he were a god or a least a saint (whom the Catholic Church did not recognize as being one), and from whom they requested his "blessings of talent, wisdom, and intelligence."

Martini's question #3 from Document #2 is also concerned with Confucian rituals, as stated above:

The question: May Christian scholars perform the ceremony for the receiving of degrees that takes place in a hall of Confucius? There is no sacrifice, no minister from an idolatrous sect. Nothing at all is arranged by idolaters. Students and philosophers come together to acknowledge Confucius as their teacher. From the time when they were first begun, these rites were admittedly civil and political, just for civil honor.
All who are to receive degrees proceed together into a hall of Confucius. Waiting for them there are chancellors, doctors, and examiners. There before the name of the philosopher they all bow together and perform the ceremonies that are customary among the Chinese. They do not offer anything at all. They do the same things all students do for their teachers while they are alive. So, after acknowledging Confucius as their teacher, they receive their decrees from the chancellors, and depart. Besides, that hall of Confucius is a gymnasium. It is not properly a so-called temple. It is closed to everybody except students.

According to what was explained above, the Sacred Congregation ruled that the aforesaid ceremonies should be permitted to Chinese Christians. The celebration seems to be merely civil and political (Noll 5).

Martini makes no mention here of solemn sacrifices to Confucius. He simply describes the ceremony which takes place for examinees who passed their examinations. As stated previously, the reason for this is undoubtedly the fact that the Jesuits did not permit the solemn ceremonies and did not feel the need to call attention to the ritual in Rome.

Martini's word choice is significant: instead of using "temple," as Morales does, he uses "hall," or "gymnasium" and even explicitly states that the latter "is not properly a so-called temple." Instead of using " genuflect," a word which has religious connotations in the West, he uses "bow" which does not. This document specifically states that no "idolaters" or anything "idolatrous" is involved on these occasions, and proclaims that these rites are "civil and political." One of the main arguments found here is that of the claim that all of the rituals, such as bowing, are also performed in honor of the living not only of the dead. This is a point which the Jesuits use on many
occasions to justify their interpretations of certain customs which otherwise may be considered to be idolatrous by some Christians as shall become clear later. Here Martini takes it for granted that the ceremonies he describes are strictly civil and political in nature just as Morales appears to have taken it for granted that the ceremonies he described were religious in nature (or, at least, he made no attempt to describe the ceremonies in non-religious nomenclature). Therefore, the Sacred Congregation made its decision in favor of the Jesuit position as it pertained to the Confucian rituals as described by a Jesuit. To repeat, the Propaganda Fide permitted the ceremonies "according to what was explained" because "the celebration seems to be merely civil and political."

I would also like to include a discussion and comparison of the questions which pertain to the ancestral veneration rituals by Morales and Martini although the text of that submitted by the latter missionary is rather lengthy; however, the ancestral rituals are not only central to the Chinese Rites Controversy, but are the very heart of this dissertation. I present the Dominican text as presented in #9, Document #1 first:

The Chinese have a religiously observed custom, a teaching handed down by Confucius. Everywhere in China temples are built and dedicated to grandparents and ancestors. In every one of them members of the same family gather twice a year. With great display of ceremony they offer solemn sacrifices to their ancestors. They place a picture or a statue of their deceased parents or grandparents on the altar beautifully adorned with candles, flowers, and incense. Present at this sacrifice is one who acts as priest, and his assistants. they offer meats, wine, candles, incense, goats' heads, etc.
What the Chinese intend by this sacrifice is to render thanks to their ancestors. It is to show reverence for the good things from them, and for the good things they hope to receive from them. Prostrate before their altar they say many prayers, asking for health, a long life, abundant harvests, large families, economic success, and to be delivered from all evils. This sacrifice also takes place in their homes, and at the ceremonies, but with less solemnity.

The question is: Could Christians pretend outwardly, as was said above, to assist at such a sacrifice? Could they join with the pagans playing an active part in such sacrifice - in a temple, at home, at the ceremony, publicly, privately? How can Christians be permitted to do this? If they are absolutely forbidden to do this, they will lose the faith. Or, to put it more precisely, they will stop acting like Christians.

The decision: In no way may Chinese Christians pretend outwardly to assist at sacrifices honoring ancestors. They may not join in prayers, or in any superstitious heathen rites for them. Much less may they take any active part in such rites" (Noll 2-3).

Again Morales posed his questions in religious terms. He stated that Chinese "religiously" observed Confucian teachings by performing rituals in honor of ancestors in "temples" (as well as at home and in cemeteries) with the assistance of "priests." The wording is also phrased in such a way that the author of the text seems to be implying that the people prayed in thanksgiving and for future blessings to the ancestors as if they were gods (and not merely as members of the Communion of Saints as shall be discussed at a later point) especially when they request that they "be delivered from all evils." This latter phrase, "to be delivered from all evils" may have been particularly influential in determining the negative decision of the Propaganda Fide against these questions as worded because these terms echo almost exactly the last line of the
Catholic prayer, "The Our Father." In both versions of this "perfect prayer" offered in the Bible by Luke (11.2-4) and Matthew (6.9-13) the last line is "but deliver us from evil" (Lawlor 382). It is not unlikely that the theologians who made the decision felt that the Chinese were religiously worshipping their ancestors in a manner which was reserved for the Christian concept of God, "Our Father." Thus they declared that Chinese Christians could not outwardly pretend to assist in the sacrifices nor could they "join in prayers, or in any superstitious heathen rites for them."

Question #4 of Document #2 submitted by Father Martini follows:

The question: Could Christians be allowed the ceremonies which philosophers propose for the deceased as long as nothing superstitious is involved?

Another question: Could Christians perform permissible ceremonies together with pagan relatives?

Still another: Could Christians be present even when pagans perform superstitious actions, especially if they profess the Catholic faith? They would not be cooperating, nor endorsing what the pagans do. But it would surely be noticed, if blood relatives were absent. It would cause enmity and hatred. The Chinese do not think that souls of the deceased are gods. They do not hope or ask anything from them.

There are three ways in which they honor their dead. First, when someone dies, whether a Christian or a pagan, they always prepare a sort of altar in the home of the deceased. They place on it an image of the deceased, or a tablet on which the name of the deceased is inscribed. They decorate the altar with incense, flowers, and candles. Behind the altar they lay the body of the deceased in a coffin.

All who enter those homes to mourn, genuflect three or four times before the inscribed tablet, or before the image of the deceased. They lie prostrate, their heads touching the floor. They carry candles and incense to burn on the altar, or rather before the tablet or image of the deceased.
The second way takes place twice a year in the halls of their ancestors. The Chinese call them halls, not temples. (The word for temple is Tsu Tang, [Citang]). These are really family memorials. Only persons of high station or wealthy relatives have them. No deceased persons are buried in them, but in the mountains. Within there is just an image of a distinguished ancestor. Then on the steps, some higher than others, tablets are arranged to a span's height. On these the names of the deceased in that family are inscribed, their rank, their dignity, their sex, their age, and the date of their death, even of infants and of girls. Twice a year all the relatives gather in this hall. The more affluent of these offer meats, wines, candles, and incense.

Poorer people are not able to have these halls. They keep the tablets of their deceased at home, either in a special place, or even on the altar where saints' images are kept, for lack of space, because the house is small. They do not venerate these tablets. They do not offer them anything. They are there because there is no room for them anywhere else. The Chinese ceremonies described above take place only in a hall for the deceased. If they do not have a hall, they omit the ceremonies.

The third way is what takes place at the graves of the deceased. In accordance with Chinese law these are all in the mountains, away from cities. Children or relatives come to these at least once a year around the beginning of May. They tidy up the graves, uproot the weeds and grasses that have sprung up. They weep, they wail, they genuflect, as was stated in the first way. They set out cooked foods and wine. After they have finished weeping, they eat and drink.

In the light of what was said above, the Sacred Congregation ruled that Chinese converts could be allowed to use these ceremonies honoring their deceased, even with pagans, as long as they are not doing anything superstitious. They can even be present with pagans when they are doing superstitious things, especially if they profess their Catholic faith, and if there is no danger of subversion, and when hatred and enmities can not be otherwise avoided.

His Holiness approved these answers and decisions (Noll 5-6).
According to Rowbotham, this ruling is the most pro-Jesuit out of all of the judgements made during the span of the Rites controversy (136). The Sacred Congregation ruled in favor of the the ancestral rites "in light of" the way in which the questions were asked. Here Martini appears to be directly addressing question #9, Document #1 when he overtly states that "The Chinese do not think that souls of the deceased are gods. They do not hope or ask anything from them." This is the interpretation I have given of Morales' questions in my comment above; that is, there I state that Morales appears to imply that the Chinese do worship their ancestors as gods and ask them for blessings the way that they would ask the Christian God. It is also interesting to note that Martini states that the Chinese "do not venerate these tablets" in reference to the tablets which were traditionally called shen chu or shen wei. In other words, Martini presents the Jesuit interpretation of the meaning of the tablet as being taught to the Chinese Catholic converts, and he does not discuss the variety of interpretations which may exist amongst the vast population of Chinese. On the other hand, although Morales does not raise the issue of the tablets in #9 of Document #1, he does do so in #11 of that Document where it states, "To preserve the memory of their ancestors the Chinese use tablets on which are written the names of their deceased. They call these the places where their souls dwell. They believe the soul of their dead come and are present in the tablets to receive the sacrifices and offerings...they kneel down, pray, and expect help from those dead persons in their needs and labors" (Noll 3). To reiterate once again, it is not surprising, when we
recognize the differences in the wording of these two documents, that the Propaganda Fide decided against the tablets in regard to Morales' question, and in favor of them in response to Martini's. Martini appears to deliberately avoid mention of any controversy about the meaning of the tablet and the intentions of those who keep them; Morales, on the other hand, does not raise the issue of the possibility of redirecting Chinese thinking along Christian lines in regard to the tablet. There does not seem to be any possibility of negotiation of meanings or interpretations here. The mendicants, then, based on what we have examined here, appear to have simply wanted to negate Chinese culture and did not seem aware that cultural elements could become Christianized, while Martini did not seem to want to openly admit to the authorities in Rome that there was any ambiguity about the significance of some of the customs and artifacts and beliefs of Chinese which the Jesuits presented to the Propaganda Fide. Both missionaries posed their questions and presented their side of the situation as if it were unequivocally the truth.

There are two other comments I would like to make about Martini's question #4, Document #2. The first one is another in regard to the tablet: in the second paragraph where he discusses funeral rites, Martini mentions a tablet "on which the name of the deceased is inscribed," but in the fourth paragraph of the question, he describes tablets upon which more biographical information and accomplishments are inscribed than just the name of the deceased. Therefore, it is noteworthy that the Jesuits appear, from this
document, to have been open to tolerating more than just the name of the deceased being maintained on a Christian tablet just as long as the inscription *shen wei* or *shen chu* have been omitted.

The final observation I would like to share in reference to Martini are his use of the two words "genuflect" and "altar." I indicate earlier (along with Minamiki) that these words are characteristically religious terms which were used by Morales and could largely have determined the judgement against the questions as posed by him. Here it is surprising that Martini did not use more neutral terms such as "bowing," which he did in #3, and "table" which also does not have a religious connotation. It is also interesting to note that the use of these terms did not work against him as it possibly could have for in the ruling of 1645, in response to #12, Document #1 the judgement was given that Chinese could "genuflect" (that is, *kowtow*) before the altar of the deceased "as long as the table is an ordinary piece of furniture and not a true altar" (Noll 4). In other words, it is surprising that the Jesuit would use the word "altar" and not the word "table" instead.

These two decrees of 1645 and 1656 laid the groundwork for the Chinese Rites Controversy which lasted for so long. Of course, none of the individuals involved in these first judgements could have had any idea how long the controversy would last or, indeed, that there would even have been one. It is because of the presentation of two radically different European perspectives of the Chinese situation to officials in Rome, who had no opportunity to study or to experience the issues involved in the Rites Controversy personally.
(and who were therefore completely dependent on the words of these missionaries), that such could have been the case. Surprisingly, Rowbotham appears to blame the entire controversy which was begun by the contrast between the declarations of these two decrees on the Jesuits, whom, he claimed, "refused to look upon the Rites as nonreligious ceremonies" (136). From my perspective, Dunne provides a more balanced view of the situation, for he states that although some individuals have viewed the two decrees as being contradictory, in fact, they are not. He maintains that the matter was really quite simple: "If the rites were what de Morales had said they were, the could not be tolerated. If Martini's description was correct, they could be permitted" (299). Indeed, it appears as if there are at least four world views here with which to contend: the Chinese themselves, who did not uniformly interpret, respond to and participate in the rites; the Jesuits, who were were primarily unanimous on the rites but not the terminology involved in the dispute; the mendicants, who also were not completely unified in their view of the controversy. (As Henri Bernard-Maitre, S.J. comments on the interpretations of the Jesuits and the mendicants, "both groups had members who strayed over the mental frontier into the other's territory" (Cummins 1986:59)). Finally, we have the world view of the religious officials in Rome (at least), who had to base their extremely important judgements on the Chinese world after having been filtered through the respective world views of the Jesuits and the mendicants. To repeat my observation, it appears that the crux of the matter was not only in deciding what was
superstitious from a Catholic point of view, but disagreement between the perspectives of the Jesuits and the mendicants as to what elements of Chinese culture could be retained (even if they did have evidence of beliefs which were against Catholic teaching) in order that through a process of Christian education by the missionaries they could become laicized or Christianized. Perhaps if more of a triologue had existed among the officials in Rome, the Jesuits and the mendicants, the controversy would not have lasted so long (actually, a "quatralogue" which included the Chinese would have been the ideal situation, from my point of view).

The next Instruction given by Rome in regard to China was made in 1659 (no specific date provided) (Noll 6). I mentioned earlier that the Paris Foreign Mission Society was one of the organizations which was sent to China by France; I also indicated that in one of Rome's first moves to bring new non-Jesuit missionaries to China, but also no longer under the auspices of Portugal, Rome assigned three Vicars Apostolics to work in Tonkin and Cochin China. These three Vicars were all from the Paris Foreign Mission Society and they were a secular, not a regular clergy. Their main mission was to create a native clergy which would of course be needed in the future even if European missionaries did not continue to be persecuted and expelled on occasion. The three Vicars, who were now directly responsible to the Holy See rather than to the Portuguese King, were given guidelines to follow in China by Rome (Latourette 111-115; Minamiki 1985:31). As Noll states, the extent to which this Instruction mandated flexibility in the China mission
field could have aborted the Chinese Rites Controversy if all of the missionaries there had been so instructed, and if they had all followed its directions (6). This Instruction is so significant as to also merit partial inclusion here. Although the document does not exclusively address the rites, it does indeed clearly address the issue of method. The third part of the Instruction follows:

Do not try to persuade the Chinese to change their rites, their customs, their ways, as long as these are not openly opposed to religion and good morals. What would be sillier than to import France, Spain, Italy, or any other country of Europe into China? Don't import these, but the faith. The faith does not reject or crush the rites and customs of any race, as long as these are not evil. Rather, it wants to preserve them.

Generally speaking, men prize and love their own ways, and especially their own nations, more than others. That is the way they are built. There is no more effective cause of hatred and estrangement than to change a country's customs, especially those people have been used to from time immemorial. This is particularly true if, in place of the customs that have been suppressed, you substitute the practices of your own country. Do not disdain Chinese ways because they are different from European ways. Rather, do everything you can to get used to them.

Admire and praise what is deserving of praise. What is not praiseworthy need not be heralded with flattery. The prudent thing would be either to withhold judgement, or at least not to condemn hastily and rashly. What is evidently evil should be removed more by signs of disapproval than by words. Eliminate evils gradually, seizing the opportunity when minds are ready to receive the truth" (Noll 6-7).

I agree with Noll's assertion that had "the guidelines here been followed throughout the China mission in the years following" there would have been no controversy because everyone would have been uniformly practicing the Jesuit method (Noll 6). This Instruction is
noteworthy precisely for that reason. It condemns the Europeanizing methods of the large majority of mendicant orders: "What would be sillier than to import France, Spain, Italy, or any other country into China?"; it makes a distinction between cultural manifestations of a particular country and "the body of dogmatic and moral truths" of Christianity (Dunne 222): "Don't import these, but the faith"; It clearly recommends retention of as many of the customs and traditions of the Chinese as is possible (just as the Jesuits had been striving to do since their arrival in that country in the sixteenth century): "The faith does not reject or crush the rites and customs of any race...it wants to preserve them." It encourages cultural accommodation and pacific penetration to the utmost: "Do not disdain Chinese ways because they are different from European ways. Rather, do everything you can to get used to them." (Here the reader should be reminded of the letter of the Jesuit de Chavagnac written in 1701 where he describes the supreme effort he had to make in order to accommodate himself "to manners which are entirely opposed to the customs and character of the French nation" (Cary-Elwes 142)); It encourages the elimination of manifestations of Chinese culture or religion which are in contradiction to Catholic teaching only gradually: "Eliminate evils gradually, seizing the opportunity when minds are ready to receive the truth." (Here I am reminded of a statement of Ricci's which is often quoted and which reflects an early moment in which he experienced ambivalent feelings about the rites: Ricci stated that although the rites are civil and social in nature, they were ""instituted for the benefit of the
living rather than for that of the dead"; he also added that the rites are not superstitious, but that "for those who have accepted the teaching of Christianity, it would seem much better to replace this custom with alms for the poor and for the salvation of souls" (Rule 114). I also wonder if the last piece of advice to seize the "opportunity when minds are ready to receive the truth" was supposed to apply to the teaching of such difficult mysteries as the Crucifixion and the Passion. If so, this Document would be, in my estimation, the most pro-Jesuit out of all of those which made statements on the China mission for it was the slow introduction of these teachings which most upset the mendicants about the Jesuit approach.

The Instruction of 1659 was not uniformly followed throughout the remainder of the China mission and the controversy did continue. However, before the conflict became more heated, the guidelines given in the Instruction of 1659 were temporarily agreed upon by the majority of Jesuits and mendicants who were gathered together against their wills while being held in detention in Canton during the persecution which began in 1664. This was the period of persecution which began after the death of the Shun-Chih Emperor and was largely a result of the literatis' jealousy of Schall's revision of the calendar. It was during this period that the members of different orders (although the majority were Jesuits) took advantage of their situation and held conferences over a period of forty days in which they discussed their different views on the Rites Controversy. They came to an agreement upon the rites as well as to other aspects of
conversion methods in China and, as a result, drew up forty-two articles in 1668 to solidify their agreement. It was the forty-first article which concerned the Confucian and ancestral rites and which caused the most heated discussion amongst them, but which in its final version stated that "the responses given by the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition [the Holy Office] and approved by Our Holy Father Alexander VII in the year 1656 must be followed unconditionally" (Minamiki 1985:33). Everyone present in the prison signed the voted upon articles with the exception of the Franciscan Antonio Cabellero. In addition, Minamiki states that when two of the articles were subsequently changed without the knowledge of all the individuals involved, the Dominican Domingo Fernandez Navarrete "felt he was no longer bound by the articles...escaped from prison and returned to Europe, whereupon he repudiated the resolutions of the Canton conferences" (Minamiki neglects to mention which of the articles were changed and in what way) (34). It was at this time that Navarette wrote the most anti-Jesuit work in the history of the Rites Controversy by the the publication of his "widely read" Tradados historicos, politicos, ethical y religiosos de la Monarchia de China mentioned briefly previously (Rowbotham 137). It was largely due to this work that the issues of the controversy went beyond the confines of the Church and became open to public "'impassioned'' discussion (Cary-Elwes 151).

Although the non-Jesuits who were detained in the Canton prisons signed the agreement of 1668 which sanctioned Rome's Decree of 1656, the majority of the Dominicans were dissatisfied with
this latter ruling. Latourette claims that the Jesuits had nearly won over all of the Augustinians, "and only the Dominicans continued as a body to stand against it" (1929:138). Therefore, the Dominicans held many meetings to discuss the issue primarily because they felt that much of the information provided by Martini to Rome was "misleading" (Cummins 1993). As a result, they drafted 22 questions to be submitted to Rome by their representative, Friar Juan Polanco. The Holy Office responded to the Dominican questions in the third major decision reached by Rome in the Decree of November 13, 1669 which left both the Decree of 1645 (favoring the mendicants), and the Decree of 1656 (favoring the Jesuits), in effect. The ruling ultimately left the decisions to be made in the China mission field entirely to the "consciences of the missionaries" (Noll 7). Latourette comments that the "Jesuits were getting the better of the controversy, for in the uncertainty much latitude would be allowed them" (1929:138). Rowbotham maintains that the vagueness of the decision, which was "dominated both by ignorance of the facts and by caution with reference to the grave implications of the problem," only intensified the controversy (Rowbotham 136). Essentially, each order behaved as they had always done after this decree, and no uniform missionary method was established.

One Dominican who did not agree with the strictly anti-Jesuit position of his order was the native Chinese priest Gregory Lopez who, in the 1680s, wrote two works in defense of the Ricci approach. His writings served to counterbalance Navarette's work. However, it did not make the situation any better, and according to Rowbotham,
the situation began to turn into one which involved a lot of bitterness and unhappiness amongst many, if not all, of the individuals involved (138).

On March 26, 1693, Charles Maigrot, a member of the Paris Foreign Mission Society (a notably anti-Jesuit organization), and Vicar Apostolic of Fujian, issued an Edict in which he forbade any Riccian methods from being practiced under his area of jurisdiction (Noll 7; Rowbotham 138-40; Latourette 1929:139; Minamiki 37-40). (This Edict of 1693 later became the first of the four part document published by Rome in 1704.) Of the seven articles which were supposed to serve as guidelines, the third through the sixth are the most concerned with the Confucian and ancestral rites. In the third article he states that the information provided by Martini in the Decree of 1656 was not accurate, therefore the missionaries were not under obligation to follow the ruling of the Holy See in this ruling; in the fourth article, Maigrot forbade Christians from participating in the solemn rites in honor of Confucius; in the next article, although he discouraged the retention of ancestral tablets in the home, he permitted them to be kept there only if the name of the deceased was inscribed on the artifact and "no exhortations to worship" were made (Latourette 139). However, the document also adds that "in a place where tablets are set up in private homes there should be a statement written in bold characters setting forth what Christians believe about the dead, and what the devotion of children and grandchildren toward their ancestors ought to be" (Noll 9). In regard to terminology, the mandate forbade in the first article the use of the
terms *Shang Ti* and *T'ien* and commanded the use of *T'ien Chu* (Noll 9). In addition to issuing this mandate, Maigrot sent Louis Quemener to Rome with copies of this Edict of 1693, with a request that the Holy Office reopen the question of the Rites Controversy in China (Latourette 139; Minamiki 38). Because Rome did not pay immediate attention to this issue, Maigrot's representative in Rome, Nicolas Charmot, had the controversy brought to the attention of the theological faculty at the Sorbonne. They welcomed news of the anti-Jesuit mandate as they were in the process of attempting to censor the writings of two Jesuits, Louis Le Comte and Charles Le Gobien, and were in the midst of a theological debate with the Jesuits over these writings. Bringing the attention of Maigrot's Edict to the Sorbonne had the effect that Maigrot and allies wanted: Rome reopened the "entire question" in 1697, and "in 1700 the theological faculty of the University of Paris formally disapproved of the Jesuit position and censured some books that had appeared in its behalf" (Latourette 1929:134; Minamiki 1985:39-40; Cary-Elwes 152).

At this point numerous publications and pamphlets began to be published on the Rites Controversy in Europe. Even the Protestant philosopher Leibnitz got involved in the dispute: he wrote in defense of the Jesuits out of fear of complete failure of the China mission (Latourette 1929:135). Rowbotham goes so far as to state that the roar which occurred over Le Comte's work created the effect of spreading "Sinophilism" in Europe (144).

While the debate at the Sorbonne was in process, the Jesuits in China - at the prompting of Father Le Comte - decided to "seek some
official declaration concerning the rites" (Minamiki 1985:40). Therefore, five Peking Jesuit priests - Filipo Grimaldi, Anton Thomas, Jean Francois Gerbillon, Thomas Pereyra and Joachim Bouvet - drew up a petition which requested that K'ang Hsi make a formal statement on his interpretation of the issues involved in the Rites Controversy (Minamiki 1985:40-41; Rowbotham 144-45; Rouleau 613). Minamiki provides George A. Kennedy's translation of the original Manchu text which was the language in which the petition was presented to the emperor:

The worshipping of Master K'ung is a means of honoring his teaching. Inasmuch as his teaching has been accepted, how would it appear if there were no ceremony of kneeling and performing kowtow? Hence this is the real sense in which the empire unanimously reveres Master K'ung and makes him its teacher. It is not true that he is worshipped in order to seek wisdom or to pray for official rank or salary.

Performance of the ceremony of sacrifice to the dead is a means of showing sincere affection for members of the family and thankful devotion to ancestors of the clan. So since early rulers established the rite of sacrifice, regularly after the death of parents, brothers, relatives, and friends, sacrifices have been offered annually, summer and winter, at stated times. This is simply what is meant by completely manifesting a spirit of love. The setting up of tablets of deceased ancestors does not mean that the souls of the ancestors are thought to be actually residing in this wood. It is not true that good luck and fortune are being sought thereby. The purpose of those performing sacrifice is only that they may concentrate their devotion as though the persons were present, so by arranging a sacrifice they have the illusion of meeting them in the flesh. The real purpose of it is that they shall not forget their relatives of the same clan, but shall keep them in memory forever and without end (1985:41).
Minamiki also indicates that at the end of the petition the fathers add they they are not certain whether what they have stated is "right or not," and they also request that the emperor give them "instruction or correction" in their regard (1985:41). This memorial was sent to the emperor on November 30, 1700, and K'ang Hsi responded immediately by Decree the same day. The words of his imperial rescript as provided by Minamiki and Rosso follow: "What is here written is very good, and is in harmony with the Great Way. To reverence Heaven, to serve ruler and parents, to be respectful towards teachers and elders - this is the code of all people of the empire. So this is correct, and there is no part that requires emendation" (Minamiki 1985:41-42; Rosso 143).25 The Jesuits did not present their memorial to K'ang Hsi by using any words which indicate ambivalence on their part. They stated in a straight forward manner what the Jesuit position was and did not present the situation as if it were a controversial matter which needed resolution. This strategy is analogous to the way in which the Jesuits presented their questions to the Holy Office in 1651 and which resulted in the Decree of 1656 in their favor. In this memorial to K'ang Hsi, the Jesuits sought confirmation that the rites were indeed merely civil and political in nature, and they got the confirmation they needed from the emperor.

K'ang Hsi's Decree was sent to Rome along with the opinions of many Chinese scholars as well as from an Augustinian Bishop Alvaro

---

25For an authenticated copy of K'ang Hsi's Decree of November 30, 1700, see Rouleau 613.
de Benevente which favored the Jesuit point of view (Latourette 1929:140; Cary-Elwes 152). Although Cary-Elwes and Rowbotham indicate that there were some positive responses to the Jesuits having sought confirmation from the highest officer of state in China that the rites were not religious in nature, Rowbotham and Minamiki also indicate that there was a lot of criticism of the Jesuits for this action (Cary-Elwes 152; Rowbotham 146). These critics felt that it was inappropriate to appeal to the head of a "heathen" nation on matters of ecclesiasticism and theology (Rowbotham 146; Minamiki 1985:42).

Whether or not the imperial Declaration of 1700 had any significant effect in Rome can be seen in the next most significant decree which was issued by Pope Clement XI in 1704. Due to Maigrot's request, Innocent XII (who died in 1700) reopened the question of the Rites Controversy in Rome in 1697. Four cardinals were assigned to review the questions and the objections to them. For seven years these men sifted "though a mass of somewhat contradictory testimonies to get to the actual facts concerning the controverted rites" (Minamiki 1985:50). Based on the evidence provided by Minamiki and the document itself, the office apparently did make a sincere effort to be fair to both sides (Minamiki 1985:50; Noll 21). They consulted the Vicars Apostolics Beryte and Rosalie in China who were opposed to the rites as well as the Jesuits Francis Noel and Gasper Castner. After the cardinals had reviewed the material, it was submitted to theologians before a final decision was reached by the Holy Office. Minamiki states that although this entire
seven year process of exploration of the rites issues was "painstaking," the religious officials and the theologians really needed more time due to the conflicting evidence, the literal geographical distance which existed between them and the country where the rites were a problem, as well as because of "the 'distance' between the European and Asian cultures" which separated them (Minamiki 1985:50). In other words, Minamiki here suggests that the Holy Office did the best that it could do to conclude with the fairest decision it possibly could under the limitations within which it worked. The religion scholar also maintains that the office would have taken more time had it not been for several pressures to make a decision quickly: the Maigrot mandate and his appeal for Rome's help; the decision of the Sorbonne which censured the Jesuits; K'ang Hsi's imperial rescript of 1700; and the pressing need to establish a uniform missionary method in China (Minamiki 1985:50-51).

The Decree of 1704 is much longer than the decrees of 1645 and 1656. It is divided into four parts and provides thorough explanations for its decisions and even cites the Chinese books which were used in reaching an understanding of Chinese culture which enabled the cardinals, theologians and pope to reach the decisions therein. The first part is the exact duplicate of Maigrot's Edict of 1693; the second part provides the questions raised by Maigrot's Edict; the third offers the decisions of the Sacred Congregation and the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition; the fourth provides Pope Clement XI's Decree of November 20, 1704 which confirms and approves the decisions described in the document.
The decisions which are the most relevant to this project are the following: In response to the questions as to whether or not European names for God should be used in China the answer is negative due to the fact that there are no Chinese characters to express this concept and because the European names "would not be able to awaken any idea of the thing signified" (Noll 21). In response to the question as to whether or not the Chinese terms Shang Ti and T'ien could be used to express the Christian concept of God in Chinese, the answer is in the negative due to the fact that by these terms the Chinese do not mean a creator God in the Christian sense, but rather they "mean nothing other than a power of the sky residing in the sky itself, the same words could mean the corporeal and visible sky, or anything else whatever" (Noll 21). In other words, Rome decided against the use of these words because of the lack of specificity in regard to their use. (Maigrot's statement in this section of the document recognizes that many missionaries have looked to the Confucian Minamiki in their original meaning to justify their use of these words; however, he concludes that since the majority of present day Chinese do not hold this view, neither of these terms should be used to refer to God by Catholics; of course he is primarily referring to the Jesuits and especially to Ricci) (Noll 12). In response to the third section of this article as to whether or not Chinese Christians and missionaries in China should exclusively use the term Tien Chu, meaning "Lord of Heaven," the answer is in the affirmative. The document states, "Yes, in this matter there is no disagreement between sides" (Noll 21). No further elaboration as to why this term
was acceptable is offered.

Although Maigrot's Edict combines the Confucian and ancestral ceremonies together in one question, both of which he claims are "tainted with superstition," the Holy Office responds to each of these ceremonies separately (Noll 13). The objections made to the Confucian solemn ceremonies by Maigrot are as follows: many Chinese consider Confucius not only as a teacher but also as a "saint"; "prayers" are prescribed to Confucius in which he is referred to as Sheng which means "sanctity rather than wisdom, or wisdom and sanctity combined" (Noll 13). Maigrot suggests that the use of this adjective in regard to Confucius may indicate that the people believe him to be a kind of god; in every city there are temples, known as miao dedicated to him; in these temples reside the tablet of Confucius upon which is inscribed, "'Here resides the spirit of Confucius, the holy and wise Proto-Teacher'"; In addition, the solemn ceremonies to Confucius are described by Maigrot: in front of the Confucian tablet candles are lighted, incense is burned, silk is offered, a slain animal is immolated, and wine is poured. The spirit of Confucius is invited and the offerings are made to him. All present partake of the slain animal and "all join in a hymn of praise as they eat" (Noll 14). Although Maigrot does not include a description or question in regard to the less solemn Confucian ceremonies, which involve rituals which occur to commemorate the passing of an imperial examination, the becoming of a literati, or the rites which take place at the new and full moon, the Holy Office does rule on them in this decree because of their treatment in Martini's petition
(Noll 22; Minamiki 45). Therefore, a brief description is provided by the Holy Office. The ceremonies during the new moon and the full moon are essentially the same: the literati of each city go to the "temple or shrine" of Confucius early in the morning where candles and incense are lighted, prostrations are offered before the tablet or statue of Confucius, and where wine, vegetables and fruits are offered (the food and drink are sometimes omitted during the full moon ritual). The rituals which commemorate the passing of examinations or the taking of office are the same as those which are enacted at the new and full moon with the exception that there is never any offering of wine, food or vegetables, according to this document. The Decree of 1704 forbade Christians to participate in both the solemn and less solemn ceremonies for Confucius because "these sacrifices or oblations are tainted with superstition," which, obviously, is in agreement with Maigrot's perspective on the issue (Noll 22).

It is important to keep in mind that when Rome was reviewing Maigrot's Edict of 1693 which was included in this Decree of 1704, that the Holy Office was also reviewing all of the other conflicting evidence which it had at its disposal. For example, it is certain that they were also reviewing Morales' petition of 1645 which clearly states that the ceremonies in honor of Confucius were not only performed in thanksgiving for his good teaching, but also "to ask of him through his merits the blessings of talent, wisdom and intelligence" (Noll 2). Morales also states that "the pagans believe that whoever eats something from those sacrifices will make great
progress in his studies and decrees" (Noll 2). In other words, here Morales maintains that the performance of the ceremonies in honor of Confucius enabled the living to profit in some way, and therefore attributes to Confucius supernatural powers. Undoubtedly, this information, as presented by Morales, was instrumental in helping the Holy Office to reach its negative judgement in this later decree.

In one of the articles presented in his Edict, Maigrot offers a description of the solemn and less solemn ceremonies performed in honor of the ancestors. It states that in the solemn ceremonies, "Everything is done more or less according to the rite described in the solemn oblations offered to Confucius" (Noll 16). They are performed either at the temples (he states, "rather than simple halls") or ancestral shrines (Noll 15); special vessels are used which cannot be used for any other purpose, and special vestments are worn which cannot be worn for any other occasions. Maigrot states that incense is burned (although no mention is made of candles), and explicit words are used which invite the spirit of the deceased to inhabit the tablets. The animal fat is placed over charcoal which causes the smoke to ascend while the pouring of the wine over the sticks takes place which signifies the descent of the spirits (this stick section is not mentioned in the description of the Confucian solemn ceremony). Here also the spirits of the ancestors are invited to enjoy the offerings. Sometimes prayers are said to the deceased ancestors by the living "asking for private blessings" (Noll 17). This part of the document continues by stating that the Chinese have believed since antiquity that "blessings are granted when the aforesaid oblations
are properly performed, not only by Xang Ti [Shang Ti], and the other spirits - of the mountains, that is, of the rivers, etc., but also by the spirits of the deceased" (Noll 17; my brackets). However, the article also explains that even Chinese who are atheists feel that "beneficial influences flow out to the offerers and bystanders" when the offerings are made to the ancestors" (Noll 17).

The less solemn ceremonies are also explained in this document even though Maigrot does not raise the issue in his Edict, as stated. These less solemn rituals are enacted either in the same "halls or temples," at the home altar or at the grave (Noll 18). They are performed once a month, at the new moon, at the full moon and during Chinese New Year. Again, at the "halls or temples," beautiful vestments are worn; hands are ritually washed; "bows and genuflections" are made (Noll 18). Candles and incense are lighted; the tablet is placed on the "altar or table"; wine is poured over a bundle of sticks; and fruits and tea are placed before the tablet (Noll 18). "Finally, with more bows and genuflections the departing spirits are, as it were, bid farewell" (Noll 18). The ritual which takes place at the full moon and the new moon is less elaborate: the tablet is not removed from its tabernacle; no wine is poured, but fruit and tea "and the other things are carried out" (Noll 18). Those who cannot afford "halls or temples" perform these rituals in their homes at the appropriate times: they light candles, burn incense, serve wine, tea, fruit "and other things like that" (Noll 18). They also "bow and genuflect, but with less solemnity" (Noll 19). At the grave the ritual is the same as that which takes place in the home, but they also pour
wine, clean the graves and weep.

The answers in the document which are in response to the questions where these descriptions are found do not permit Christians to in any way participate in the solemn or less solemn ancestral ceremonies held in the "temples or halls," at home or at the gravesite because "all these things are inseparable from superstition, according to what was recorded in the questions. They should not be allowed to Christians" (Noll 22). The Christians are permitted to be physically present at these rituals just as long as they do not participate and as long as they profess their faith. This article also maintains that Christians can participate in ceremonies which are "within the limits of civil and political rites" which is to be determined by the Reverend Patriarch of Antioch, the Visitor General in the Chinese Empire, and of the vicars apostolics and bishops. The answer also recommends that Christians gradually "do away with pagan ceremonies, so that gradually those rites may become the practice established in this matter by Christians and for Christians, which the Catholic Church has piously prescribed for the dead" (Noll 22). The fifth answer states that tablets cannot be kept in the home which have any other inscriptions on them except for the name of the deceased; in addition, a declaration of what Catholics believe about the deceased, and "what the duties of children and descendents should be toward their ancestors" should be placed next to the tablet (Noll 23).

I stated earlier that it appears that the Holy Office made a sincere effort to be fair in weighing the positions of the opposing
parties in the controversy. Evidence of this can be seen in the word choice of the answers given by the Holy Office in this document. For instance, it should be clear from my summaries above that in Maigrot's descriptions he consistently uses religious terminology to describe Confucian and ancestral ceremonies while the Holy Office uses both the religious terms of Morales and Maigrot in addition to using the more neutral terms which were found in Martini's document. Therefore, I sometimes state "temple or hall," "sacrifice or offering," and "genuflect or bow" when I am reiterating the words used by the Holy Office. The Office claimed that it tried to consider the information it had received from both parties as truth and made their decision based on that: the document states in regard to the Holy Office that "Different reports were made to it at different times. The answers it gave were always based on the supposition that the reports were true. But it has never been in the habit of declaring whether these reports were true or false" (Noll 23; Minamiki 49; Rouleau 613). For this same reason, where in Maigrot's mandate of 1693 it states that Martini's exposition "was not true in many respects," especially the calling of the Confucian ceremonies "political," the Holy Office replied in the document of 1704 that it could not make a judgement because more information was needed (Noll 23).

Although it is apparent that the Holy Office attempted to be fair in its evaluation of the China controversy, it did predominantly decide against the Jesuits with the exception of the ruling in relation to the tablets: I have previously indicated that the Jesuits also
allowed the retention of the tablets predominantly with only the name of he deceased upon them (although the Martini document mentions that more biographical information is included on the tablet than just the name of the deceased in the family halls, as indicated). The only difference between the decision on the tablets by the Holy Office and by that of the Jesuits is the former's requirement that a profession of the Christian belief about the deceased and about "what the duties of children and descendants should be toward their ancestors" be made and kept next to the tablet in the home (Noll 23). This last requirement by the Holy Office is especially interesting and worthy of examination because my interpretation of what this statement means is that the Holy Office does seem quite aware of the value and significance which filial piety traditionally has had in Chinese culture, and it appears to have made some attempt at cultural accommodation here. It is ironic that although the majority of the judgements in this Decree of 1704 are against the Jesuit method, in regard to the tablet, the Holy Office goes even further than the Jesuits in cultural accommodation by having the Christians include this statement which goes beyond that of a declaration of Christian belief and includes a statement which demonstrates a traditional Chinese value. This is further evidence, in my view, that the Europeans who had the difficult task of making these decisions on the rites in Rome, not only attempted to be fair, but also attempted not to "reject or crush the rites and customs of any race...rather,...to preserve them," as was stated in the Instruction of 1659 to the three Vicars Apostolics in China (Noll 6).
Before I proceed with a discussion of other areas of the Decree of 1704, I would like to briefly mention that George Dunne provides a photostat of a Chinese Christian tablet from the Ching Dynasty (1644-1912) which includes the name of the deceased and a statement of Christian belief in regard to the dead, as well as a statement of "what the duties of the children and ancestors should be toward their ancestors" (Noll 23). This wooden tablet has a cross inscribed upon it and is accompanied by the words, "Worship the true Lord, creator of heaven, earth and all things, and show filial piety to ancestors and parents" (239). The inscription also elaborates on the Christian interpretation of filial piety for it states that it is through one's parents that an individual receives the "greatest favors from God" (293). The tablet also makes a declaration that the spirit of the deceased does not return home after death (as many traditional Chinese have and do believe), and concludes by stating "the filial son or kind grandson sets up a tablet or a picture by no means that their spirits might dwell therein, but in order to serve as a reminder of his debt" (293). Although Dunne does not provide any additional information about this tablet, it is possible that it evolved in response to the 1704 Decree which required that a Christian statement of belief about the dead and about the duty of children to their ancestors be placed next to the tablet. Instead of placing these statements next to the tablet, however, this prescription is inscribed directly upon the tablet. It has not come to my attention that any other decree specifically prescribes that the inscription be placed directly on the tablet; even if no such declaration exists, it is doubtful
that there would be any objection to the inclusion of the words on
the tablet rather than next to it after the Decree of 1704 had been
promulgated.

There is further evidence that Rome attempted not to "crush"
all of the customs of the Chinese in this document of 1704 where, as
I report above, the Holy Office ruled that civil and political rites
could indeed be participated in by Christians. However, it is not at all
clear from the document what kind of rites would be considered of
this nature; indeed, perhaps the Holy Office did not have any idea as
to what these rites were either, and therefore, that is why they left it
to the discretion of the religious officials in China to decide.

The statement made by the Holy Office in the decree which
suggests doing away with pagan ceremonies, on the other hand, "so
that gradually those rites may become the practice established in
this matter by Christians and for Christians, which the Catholic
Church has piously prescribed for the dead," is a bit perplexing to
me (Noll 22). Does the Holy Office here mean to suggest that
European customs must be adopted in order for ceremonies for the
dead to be performed by Chinese in a Christian manner? There is no
indication whatsoever that any of the Chinese customs which are
performed in honor of the dead can be maintained and still be
considered to be Christian, with the exception of the retention and
adaptation of the tablet (of course, which is why none of the Chinese
are allowed to participate in the rites). Therefore, on one hand,
although the Holy Office did make some accommodation of Chinese
culture in regard to the tablet, there is no indication that it
recognized the possibility that other customs or traditions could also have been retained - though changed, after a process of Christianizing and/or secularizing had occurred. In my mind then, there does seem to be a bit of a contradiction here in this ruling. The Holy Office was aware that the tablets were largely traditionally believed to hold the spirit (or one of them) of the deceased; those involved in the declaration of the decree believed they were capable of transforming this non-Catholic belief into a Christian one whereby they possibly drew parallels between the fourth commandment, "Honor they father and thy mother" and the fundamental Chinese teaching on the significance of filial piety (I have no proof of this: what I offer here is my own speculation as to how and why the Church decided to retain and accommodate the tablet; Christians had also traditionally been taught to be filial, so this value did not go against Christian teaching) (Deuteronomy 5:16). This quality of accommodation and paralleling of beliefs was exactly what Matteo Ricci had done in his conversion efforts. In regard to his cultural accommodation methods, one of his first steps (second, to be precise) was to dress himself as a Chinese literati. However, by making himself appear as a Confucian literati on the outside, he, of course did not become any less Christian on the inside. What to the outer eye originally meant one thing to the traditional Chinese who had not before known a Christian literati, changed with the coming of Ricci. Similarly, the Holy Office found it possible to retain the Chinese tablet by simply omitting a few words and adding some next to it (or on it?) - thereby retaining an important element of Chinese culture
while changing its significance by purposefully imbuing it with Christian meaning. In addition, the paralleling of Chinese and Christian beliefs which was done by the Church in regard to the tablet is also analogous to a fundamental strategy of Ricci's as indicated in my description of his *Treatise on Friendship* (where he shows a correspondence between Christian and Confucian teachings on loving others and as expressed in behavior) and his *The True Meaning of the Lord in Heaven* (where he demonstrates a parallel between his interpretation of the meaning of God in early Confucian texts with the Christian concept of the creator God). The Holy Office presumably saw a parallel between the fourth commandment and the Chinese tradition of filial piety and made this accommodation in regard to the tablet, but not in regard to other Chinese customs associated with rites for the dead. As indicated in the Decree of 1704, the Holy Office thought that the missionaries and the Chinese Catholics should simply "do away with pagan ceremonies" (Noll 22). My main question here then is, "do away" with them and replace them with what? Italian Christian funerary customs? Spanish Christian funerary customs? Portuguese Christian funerary customs? Perhaps they too believed, like Ricci at that early point of his mission, that the rites for the dead should be discontinued altogether and merely replaced by "'alms for the poor and for salvation of souls'" (Rule 114).

The Decree of 1704 is not any more specific than to state that the primary reason given for the judgement against the Confucian ceremonies and the ancestral rites (with the exception of the
retention of the tablet), as indicated, is because, from the perspective of Rome, it was impossible to separate superstitious (that is, non-Catholic) beliefs from those which were not or which were at least secular in nature. Based on the information with which the Holy Office was provided in the three documents which I have at my disposal (that of Morales, Martini and Maigrot), it is possible to speculate that the Holy Office appears to have judged against the Confucian ceremonies and the ancestral ceremonies for two specific reasons: because it was impossible for them to tell whether or not Confucius and the ancestors were being worshipped as if they were gods - especially since some of the evidence indicates that the Chinese did expect progress to be made, or blessings or goodness to occur from having performed the oblations (even by those who were professed atheists, as indicated); in addition, with the exception of the animal fat being poured over the charcoal and the wine being poured over the sticks in the ancestral ceremonies and the animal sacrifice and offering of silk in the Confucian ceremonies, the rituals performed in their honor too uncomfortably, perhaps, resembled some aspects of the Catholic mass celebrated in honor of the Christian God: the burning of incense and lighting of candles, the genuflections before the altar, the wearing of vestments and using of vessels (in the 1704 document only described as pertaining to the ancestral ceremonies) which were designated to be used only for this ritual purpose, the use of ritualistic words, and most significantly, the offering of food and wine during the ceremony (the body and blood of Christ) which was eaten and drunk by the Christian worshippers.
Perhaps the question which those in the Holy Office asked themselves was, "How could the Chinese not be worshipping Confucius and their ancestors when many of their rituals so closely resemble our Christian mass?" Again, I have no evidence at my disposal that these were their thought processes exactly; however, based on the general statement that the office did make - that it was impossible to separate superstitious elements from the rites - this is my understanding of how they reached their judgements based on my knowledge of the documents they had in front of the them, and my knowledge of the rituals involved in the Catholic mass.

The publication of the Decree of 1704 did not occur until after the Papal Legate, Charles Maillard de Tournon, Patriarch of Antioch, was sent to China. Tournon set sail for China a year before the Decree became official, but according to Minamiki, at that time he was aware of the "general content of the unpublished decree" (1985:53). The Legate was sent to China for a number of different reasons: to assure that when the contents of the final Decree of 1704 was published, the transition would be a smooth one; that the mission would not end in disaster as a result of the of the negative judgements against Catholic participation in the traditional Chinese rites; that all of the missionaries follow the directives of this decree (Latourette 141); to establish "an official home for the direct representative of the Roman see in Peking...which would have taken precedence over all other Catholic establishments in the capital" (Rowbotham 151; Minamiki 53).

By the time Tournon arrived in China, K'ang Hsi had begun to
lose patience with the missionaries because of their internal squabbling and disagreement over the rites (Allan 226). He was also eager to learn how his imperial rescript of 1700 had been received in Rome (Minamiki 54). The emperor attempted to discuss the rites issue with Tournon, but the latter would not cooperate because he knew that Rome had already made a firm decision in their regard; however, at this early stage of his visit Tournon did not reveal the contents of that decree of 1704. Therefore, when Tournon asked K'ang Hsi for permission to appoint a papal representative to reside in the capital, K'ang Hsi replied in the affirmative, but with the stipulation that the priest would have had to reside in the capital for at least ten years. This meant that the missionary would have had to have been a Jesuit, and therefore would have been in favor of Christian participation in the rites (Rowbotham 152). Needless to say, Tournon was not happy with this response and blamed the Jesuits for this imperial qualification (Rowbotham 152).

During Tournon's five year stay in China, K'ang Hsi demonstrated his irritation with Maigrot's Edict of 1693 against the rites. The emperor had Maigrot called to Jehol in Manchuria to illustrate his knowledge of Confucian writings and the Chinese language, and the latter failed this test miserably. As a result of his disgust with the missionary, K'ang Hsi had Maigrot banished from China in an Edict of 1706. This same edict declared that all missionaries who remained in China must obtain an imperial permit, or p'iao in order to remain in China as a missionary. In order to be able to obtain the permit, missionaries had to demonstrate that they
were followers of Ricci's methods and that they took his stand on the rites when personally questioned by K'ang Hsi himself (Noll 27). All other missionaries would have to leave the country (Rosso 243; Minamiki 56; Latourette 1929:144). At this point, Tournon was in Nanking. When he heard the news of the content of the Edict of 1706, the legate reacted in 1707 by promulgating the contents of Rome's Decree of 1704 (although at this point it was still unpublished and the final form had not even reached the legate in China) (Minamiki 55; Noll 27). Tournon's *Regula* of January 25, 1707 gave specific directives as to how the missionaries should respond to the questions which would be asked by K'ang Hsi during the imperial examination. The Cardinal began the decree by stating that "By what we proclaim in public we want to be able to distinguish the choice seed of the Lord's word from pernicious growths of superstition" (Noll 28). It also stated that all missionaries, "even the Society of Jesus" must respond in the manner which he outlines or else suffer "under penalty of automatic excommunication" (Noll 28-29). Tournon made it clear that there was no other way to interpret the aspects of Chinese culture under question as it pertained to Christianity other than the way in which he stated the situation in the *Regula* because these were the words of the present pope. He stated, "there can be no justification for side-stepping this decree, or for interpreting it in some other way, e.g. by appealing to the decree of Pope Alexander VII issued in 1656" (Noll 2-30). In essence, the Patriarch of Antioch stated in the *Regula* that Christians could not participate in solemn and less solemn rituals in honor of Confucius or the ancestors; that
the "customary" Chinese use of tablets could not be allowed (no elaboration on the Christian adaptation of the tablet is here mentioned); that the Christian God could not be referred to as *Shang Ti* or *T’ien*. In other words, Tournon's decree stated fundamentally what the Decree of 1704 did, only with the addition of the threat of excommunication (Noll 27-30).

Because some of the missionaries doubted Tournon's authority and had hopes that the missionaries who went to Rome to try to gain some kind of modification of his *Regula* would be successful, most of the Jesuits and Augustinians obtained the *p’iao*; other missionaries, such as those members of the Paris Mission Society, trusted the authority of Tournon and left for the coast or went into hiding. Some of the Franciscans did not seek the *p’iao*, but received K’ang Hsi's permission to remain in the country. The rest were exiled. K’ang Hsi reacted by threatening death to those missionaries who preached against the rites. He ordered Legate Tournon out of the country, but also demanded that the priest remain in Macao in semi-imprisonment until the emperor received a response from Rome through the missionaries that had been sent there to try to gain a modification of the ruling (Latourette 1929:145; Cary-Elwes 155).

The Tournon episode played a major part in the deterioration of the relationship which existed between the emperor and the Christian Church in China; however, the part that the Legate played in the drama ended soon after he was banished to Macao. The missionaries did not return from Rome with news which would lift the ban on Christian participation in the rites, and Tournon died on
the island off the coast of Canton in 1710. This Legate had made enemies of K'ang Hsi for not following the words of his imperial rescript of 1700 in his own country; he also made enemies of the Jesuits, whose policies he was there to overturn; in addition, the Portuguese were against him for not having received permission from that government to come and declare a decree of such importance in China. However, Charles de Tournon, Patriarch of Antioch, did not die without having received his cardinal's hat in Macao - for he had been elevated to this position by the Pope in 1707 (Latourette 1929:146).

The emperor had sent two envoys to Rome to try to have the Decree of 1704 rescinded. The first envoy was shipwrecked, but the second did arrive in Rome and was given a hearing there (Cary-Elwes 156). However, Pope Clement XI had no intention of reneging on the judgements made in the Decree of 1704, nor did he disapprove of Tournon's Regula of 1707. Thereby, in a Decree of September 25, 1710, this Pope confirmed the Decree of 1704 as well as the Regula of 1707 which included the threat of excommunication if the Decree of 1704 was not followed. In this newest decree the Holy Office added that it would send out an "instruction" which would enable the decrees to be better implemented and to help create harmony in the China mission field (Noll 49; Minamiki 1985:57). It also included an order for all ecclesiastical and lay persons to cease publishing information about the Rites Controversy in China in order to end "the long, bitter quarreling between parties" which was "scandalizing the faithful" (Noll 50). In order to enforce this new prohibition, the pope
added that anyone who continued to publish after this decree would be excommunicated. In addition, any religious people who were involved in such a publication would automatically be "deprived of active and passive voice" (Noll 50). However, the Holy Office decided that because the controversy had caused so much divisiveness amongst Catholics for so many years, that further strict directives were needed. Therefore, on March 19, 1715 Rome published the Apostolic Constitution *Ex illa die* of Clement XI, "which takes a very strong stand against the Chinese Rites" (Noll 41). The final decree on the Rites Controversy (that is, until the twentieth century), that of July 11, 1742 and known as *Ex quo singulari*, states that the purpose of the Constitution of 1715 was "to bridle those feisty spirits" (the text of *Ex illa die* is included in the later bull of 1742) (Noll 50). *Ex quo singulari* states that in that Constitution the pope rejected any more excuses on the part of missionaries in China not to abide by the orders in the decrees made by Rome. The Constitution stated that the evasion of the execution of the decrees had "caused grave damage to Our pontifical authority, scandal to the faithful, and detriment to the salvation of souls" (Noll 53). In order to avoid these kinds of evasions in the future, the Pope ordered that every missionary obey all of the preceding responses of the Holy Office "exactly, totally, absolutely, inviolably, and firmly" with the threat of excommunication, and the religious people being denied an active and passive voice (Noll 53). In addition, the pope ordered in this Constitution that before beginning to perform any work of the church in China, every missionary - no matter what his status or
organization affiliation, "even the Society of Jesus," must take an oath which holds them to the decisions of the Holy Office (Noll 53). The missionaries who took the oath were required to sign it, and to send the Holy Office a written record they had taken it. The text of the oath of the Constitution of 1715 follows:

    I (Name), missionary to China, or to the Kingdom of (Name), or to the Province of (Name), sent or destined by the Holy See, or by my superiors, according to faculties granted them by the Holy See, will fully and faithfully obey the precept and apostolic mandate about the Chinese rites and ceremonies of Clement XI, by Divine Providence Pope. This Constitution prescribed the formula for this oath. I will observe the papal decree exactly, absolutely, and inviolably. I will fulfill it without any hesitation. It is well known to me; I have carefully read Clement XI's Constitution.

    But if (God forbid!) I should in any way transgress, as often happens, I acknowledge and declare that I am subject to the penalties imposed by the aforesaid Constitution. With my hand on the holy Gospels, I so promise, now, and swear. So help me God, and these Holy Gospels of God (Noll 54).

Father Charles Castorano, vicar of the Bishop of Peking, had the chore of promulgating the 1715 papal edict in China. When the emperor heard of its contents, he had the vicar imprisoned and then banished to Canton. K'ang Hsi "issued a statement" in which he ordered missionaries not to take any action on the edict until his papal envoy had returned from Rome; in addition, the emperor had the document returned to the Procureur of the Propaganda at Canton with his comments on it (Rowbotham 166; Minamiki 62). Minamiki reports while many of the missionaries were opposed to the decree, they took the oath with hopes that further modifications would be
made in the future. In addition, there was that one statement in the
decrees which left the decision as to whether or not some rites could
be considered civil and political to high ecclesiastical authorities in
China. This statement provided the opportunity "for further
confusion, altercation, and evasion" on the part of the missionaries
(Minamiki 1985:63; Rowbotham 171).

As a result of the way in which the Bull ex illa die of 1715 was
received in China, the Holy Office decided to send another papal
legate to that country. Jean Ambrose Charles Mezzabarba, Patriarch
of Alexandria, and Vicar Apostolic was chosen for the task of
enforcing the Apostolic Constitution of Clement XI. The legate, who
- unlike Tournon - went with the approval of Portugal, arrived in
Peking in 1720. Although he was well received by the court, the
emperor was eager to know the true purpose of Mezzabarba's
mission. The latter postponed revealing his true purpose as long as
possible; however, at K'ang Hsi's demand, the legate had Ex illa die
translated into Chinese, and had it delivered to the emperor. Upon
reading it, the emperor became extremely angry, and is said to have
returned the document to the legate all marked with comments in
red. Cary-Elwes indicates that K'ang Hsi wrote the following:

"All that can be said about this decree is that one asks oneself
how the Europeans, ignorant and contemptible as they are, presume
to deliver judgment on the lofty teaching of the Chinese, seeing that
they know neither their manners, their customs nor their letters.
Today the Legate presents a decree which teaches a doctrine similar
to that of the impious sects of the Hoxans and Tassus [Buddhists and
Taoists] who tear one another with pitiless cruelty. *It is not advisable to allow the Europeans to proclaim their law in China.* They must be forbidden to speak of it; and in this way many difficulties and embarrassments will be avoided" (157-58; brackets mine; italics not mine). At another point after K'ang Hsi had read the decree of 1704, he said with sarcasm to Mezzabarba (as reported by Latourette): "if the Pope's decree were inspired, Maigrot must be the Holy Spirit, for the document corresponded with Maigrot's position" (149).

As a result of the emperor's response to *Ex illa die*, and to the arguments of some of the missionaries that the entire Catholic mission would fail if at least some supplementary statements were not added to the decree, Mezzabarba wrote an important Pastoral Letter on November 21, 1721 from Macao after he had left the mainland for his return trip home (Latourette 148; Rowbotham 166; Noll 46). It was addressed to all missionaries, bishops, vicars apostolics "in China and surrounding countries" (Noll 46). In the letter, on the one hand, he stated that in no way could any aspect of *Ex illa die* be modified or disobeyed. On the other hand, he added "eight permissions" which demonstrated a compromise on his part although Latourette and Minamiki explain them as being an attempt to interpret "the clauses which permitted the ceremonies of a purely civil or political character" of *Ex illa die* (Latourette 148; Minamiki 1985:66). Mezzabarba's "eight permissions" allowed the following:

First. In their own homes Chinese Christians are allowed to use funeral tablets simply inscribed with the name of the
deceased. Beside the tablet there should be an apt explanation
of Christian belief about death. The tablets should be so
constructed that there is no hint of superstition. All scandal
must be avoided.

Second. Civil ceremonies in honor of the dead which are
not superstitious, or suspected of being so are permitted.

Third. The civil cult to Confucius is permitted as well as
the use of the tablet in his honor, provided it is free of
superstitious inscriptions and is accompanied with the required
declaration of what Catholics believe. Likewise, before the
corrected tablet it is permissible to light candles, burn incense,
and serve food.

Fourth. It is permitted to use candles and incense at
funeral services as long as the required declaration is given in
writing.

Fifth. Genuflections and prostrations are allowed before
a corrected tablet, and also before the coffin and deceased
person.

Sixth. Tables can be prepared with delicacies, fruits,
meat and other customary foods, either in front of or around
the coffin where there is a corrected tablet. There should be
the required declaration, and with no hint of superstition, all
should show respect and love for the dead.

Seventh. The bow called Ko-teu [Ke Tou] is permitted
before a corrected tablet both at the Chinese New Year, and at
other times of the Year.

Eighth. Candles can be lighted, incense can be burned
before corrected tablets. Also before the tomb, where food can
be served, as long as the precautions mentioned above are
taken (Noll 57).

In his pastoral letter, the Patriarch of Alexandria forbade the
missionaries to discuss these "eight permissions" with anyone other
than other missionaries or to have them translated into Chinese "or
any Oriental language" (Noll 58). As Minamiki points out, the main
difference between the first permission and that which is stated in
Ex illa die in regard to the tablet, is that in Ex illa die, the tablet can
be tolerated, while in Mezzabarba's letter, they "are allowed"
(Minamiki 1985:66; Noll 57); in Mezzabarba's second permission, civil ceremonies in honor of the dead "are permitted," while in the decree of 1704, "performance is not forbidden" (Noll 57; Minamiki 1985:66); in Ex illa die, the Chinese were forbidden to participate in solemn and less solemn ceremonies in honor of Confucius, while in the third permission, the Confucian rite can be considered civil and "is permitted" (Noll 57); Again, as pointed out by Minamiki, certain specific ritualistic artifacts and gestures are permitted "under specified conditions" (such as the lighting of candles, burning of incense, kowtowing, and preparation of foods, whereas in the 1704 document all of these were disapproved of as being part of the solemn and less solemn ceremonies in honor of Confucius and the ancestors. Minamiki succinctly summarizes the papal letter: "Some of Mezzabarba's permissions coincided with decisions in the decree of 1704; others seem to reverse these decisions; and still others can be seen as further specifications of the general terms found in the decision of 1704" (Minamiki 1985: 67). Obviously, it seems like the permissions largely contradicted what Ex illa die confirmed. How were the missionaries expected to follow the directives of 1704 and the permissions a the same time? That more confusion and disagreement resulted as a result of this letter can be seen by the two opposing actions which were taken by ecclesiastical leaders in China: the Bishop of Peking issued two pastoral letters declaring that missionaries should follow both Ex illa die and the "eight permissions," while the Vicar Apostolic of Shenshi published a letter to his subordinates which forbade them to abide by the "eight
permissions" (Allan 253; Minamiki 1985:67-68; Latourette 150). Needless to state, the Jesuits "welcomed them" and supposedly disobeyed the legate order on threat of excommunication to have them translated and distributed amongst their flock (Latourette 149). As Allan states the new situation, "So far from ending the controversy it increased it, for now there were three parties, those who took the part of the Jesuits, those who obeyed the Pope, and those who favoured the accommodating position of the legate" (251-252).

The next action which was taken by the Church was in response to the pastoral letters of the Bishop of Peking which ordered that all missionaries follow both the Ex illa die and the "eight permissions" of Mezzabarba. On September 26, 1735 Pope Clement XII issued a brief in which he nullified these letters of Francis, Bishop of Peking. Minamiki suggests that although "there had been some preliminary understanding in Rome regarding them...somehow in the development of events, these permissions went far beyond any concessions Rome...intended to make" (1985:273). In other words, the scholar suggests that since Mezzabarba was the papal legate, there must have been some reason as to why he could have taken the liberty to draw up the eight permissions. On the other hand, because the permissions did go too far, and caused more controversy, the Church had to nullify these permissions, not by reprimanding Mezzabarba, but by directing its disapproval of their application in China to the Bishop of Peking's pastoral letters. At the same time, the Holy Office felt the need to
make it clear in this brief that all decisions which were to be made concerning the Rites Controversy must come for Rome. The document states, "We reserve to ourselves and to the Holy See the right to tell the Christians living in China what We and the Holy See think is right, after deliberating carefully about anything having to do with this subject matter (Noll 59; Minamiki 1985:68).

As stated above, the 1742 bull, *Ex quo singulari* was the final decree to be issued by the Holy Office until the twentieth century. This document reiterated the history of the Chinese Rites Controversy from its very beginning: it included a description of the Decrees of 1645 (in response to Morales); 1656 (in response to Martini); 1669 (in response to Polanco); 1704 (in response to Maigrot); the complete texts of the 1710 decree (which confirmed the Decree of 1704 and Tournon's *Regula* of 1707); and of *Ex illa die* of 1715 (which took a strong stand against the rites including the disallowal of the tablet, and included the taking of an oath); the 1721 pastoral letter of Mezzabarba (which included the "eight permissions"), and the 1735 Brief of Clement XII (which annulled the two pastoral letters of the Bishop of Peking) (Noll 47-60). *Ex quo singulari* then proceeded to explain that because of the commotion caused by the "eight permissions," an elaborate inquiry into each and every one of the permissions was initiated in Rome. Theologians, cardinals, and missionaries who had lived in China and who were in Rome at the time - in addition to Chinese students who were in Rome studying for the clergy were all summoned to the Vatican to provide their perspectives on the permissions. As a result of this extensive
inquiry which began under Benedict XII, and was completed under Benedict XIV, the "eight permissions" were pronounced in this bull as being "null, void, invalid, and completely futile and ineffective" (Noll 60). In addition, the bull of 1742 attempted to clarify that clause in *Ex illa die* which was ambiguous as to what rites were to be considered civil and political and which ones were not. This was accomplished by inclusion of the statement that only those rites which were not condemned by apostolic decree could be considered in this category. That is, the bull states that in response to the statement in *Ex illa die*, "What we have said so far does not prevent them from performing in honor of the dead other rites, if there are any, which are not really superstitious," the words "if there are any' should be understood of rites and ceremonies different from those which that Pontiff in his Apostolic Constitution had just forbidden" (Noll 60). *Ex quo singulari* also added a strongly worded order to all missionaries in China that every aspect of this Constitution must be followed. It stated, "we order and expressly command that each and every thing in this Constitution of Ours be observed exactly, integrally, absolutely, inviolably, and unchangeably" under the threat of excommunication, and the return to Europe for punishment (Noll 61). To reinforce the commitment of the missionaries in China to all of the mandates specified in this bull, a new addition was made to the oath which missionaries were already required to take at this time. In the middle of the former oath was inserted the following:

I will obey them exactly, absolutely, and inviolably. I will fulfill them unhesitatingly. As best I can, I will see to it
that the Chinese Christians, whose spiritual direction I happen in any way to have, will obey them in the same way. Moreover, as far as I can, I will never allow these same Christians to practice the Chinese rites and ceremonies that were permitted in the Alexandrian Patriarch's Pastoral Letter, dated at Macao on November 4, 1721, and condemned by His Holiness, Pope Benedict XIV (Noll 62).

The inclusion of this new section to the oath is evidence that the Holy Office was indeed making every effort to put an end to the controversy and to unify the missionary effort. Before abandoning the issue, however, (in the form of official decrees, at least) the Holy Office ended this lengthy decree of 1742, *Ex quo singulari*, by reminding the missionaries that they are disciples of Jesus Christ who "should believe that they have been sent by Him, not for temporal joys, but for great struggles; not for honors, but for humiliations; not for a vacation, but to work; not to retire, but to bring forth much fruit in suffering" (Noll 62).

Although this bull did succeed in putting an end to papal decrees on the issue, the document did not cause all disagreement as to how to interpret the decrees to a stop. Indeed, one of the most obvious reasons for the continued lack of unity was due to the fact, as Minamiki and Joseph Krahil, S.J. point out, that while the bull of 1742 confirms *Ex illa die* of 1715 - which, significantly, is based largely on the Decree of 1704 which allowed the retention of the corrected tablet - this bull also completely nullified the use of Mezzabarba's "eight permissions" which also allowed the corrected tablet (Minamiki 75; Krahil 45-46). Therefore, because the decrees contradicted each other, the problem of uniformity in the mission
field continued. Some bishops allowed the use of the corrected tablets while others did not (Krahl 39-47).

In addition, other concerns about the rites continued after this decree. For example, Bishop Piloti, Vicar Apostolic of Shensi and Shesi, maintained that if candles, incense and the kowtow were all excluded from funeral rites, "the Christians would have absolutely no exterior sign left with which to express their affection and respect for their dead at funerals," (Krahl 45). This statement echoes the question I asked earlier in response to the 1704 decree which denied Catholic Chinese participation in even the less solemn ceremonies of Confucius and the ancestors. If the reader recalls, at that point I asked, with what did the Holy Office expect the traditions to be replaced? European ones? The answer which Piloti received from the Holy Office when he finally took it upon himself to ask for clarification of these issues does not provide, in my estimation, a satisfactory reason to mollify Piloti's concern about Chinese funerals and my speculation about these Chinese customs. The Congregation of Propaganda wrote to Piloti stating that the corrected tablet with only the name of the deceased and a declaration which clearly indicated Christian teaching about the dead and filial piety was permitted (no indication as to whether the declaration should be made next to or on the tablet was given) (Krahl 47). The justification for this affirmation given by the Holy Office was that while the intention of Ex illa die was merely to temporarily tolerate certain Chinese traditions with the hope that they would eventually be phased out, the intention of Mezzabarba's permissions was to permit them and thereby
confirmed them for good. Joseph Krahl, S.J. states, "By permitting some rites, Clement XI endeavored to make Chinese Christians gradually give up their national rites and embrace the customs of the universal Church. On the contrary, the permissions of Mezzabarba aimed rather at confirming them in these customs" (47). Just what are, exactly, "the customs of the universal Church"? Were they Jewish in origin? Were they Roman? I am uncertain that the Church sincerely knew at this time. (Krahl does not elaborate on this point.) Perhaps the Holy Office, too (as well as many of the mendicants who followed the tradition of Europeanism), found it difficult to consistently, clearly and absolutely distinguish between the revealed religion of Christianity and its accompanying "dogmatic and moral truths which constituted its deposit of faith" and cultural forms (Dunne 227). Indeed, it seems possible to me that when George Dunne states, "that certain Christians were unable to make the necessary distinction between the universal, absolute, and immutable Christianity and the particular, relative, and adaptable in its cultural forms," he could also have been referring to the Holy Office (227). I make this statement with the realization that it must have been very difficult for Rome to make many of the decisions it was required to based on the testimony of other individuals about a country in which none of the ecclesiastical decision makers had ever stepped foot.

According to Krahl, although Rome became increasingly aware through the receipt of such letters as that sent by Piloti that there was still differentiation between interpretation and enforcement of
the decrees throughout China, the Holy Office also accepted this fact of life and was simply pleased to have called a halt to the argument on a formal level. Essentially, the Office had hopes that eventually the Chinese rites would gradually be completely replaced by the "rites of the Church" (48). Whatever that meant!

It is mandatory that the reader remain aware that all throughout the years in which these papal decrees were issued - especially those which were declared after the turn of the eighteenth century - that the Church in China was in much more of a precarious position than it had been since the very beginning of the founding of the Catholic Church by Matteo Ricci, or at least since the "Golden Period of Roman Catholic Missions" which existed for about a decade in China after Kang Hsi's Edict of Toleration of 1692. As D'Elia states, between the years 1700 and 1842, Catholic missions in China "just managed to exist" (55). After the "Golden Period" in which the missions thrived, the missionaries soon began to fall into disfavor with the emperor because of all the dissension which occurred amongst them in regard to the rites, because of the Church's apparent disregard for his imperial decree of 1700 which stated that the rites of concern were civil and political, and because of Tournon unsuccessful embassy and Regula of 1707 - which was based on the Holy Office's Decree of 1704 which judged against the rites so harshly. After this change in attitude occurred, when there were persecutions in the provinces, K'ang Hsi would no longer make an effort to put them to a halt. In addition, because those Chinese who disliked the presence of the missionaries in their country recognized
that the latter were not as highly favored by the emperor as they had once been, they felt freer to persecute the missionaries. In fact, in 1717, one provincial magistrate of Kwangtung wrote a memorial to the emperor which strongly suggested that the European traders in Canton and missionaries throughout China might "prove pernicious" just as they had in Manila and Batavia (Latourette 1929:157). In response to this memorial, K'ang Hsi issued an imperial statement which ordered all native Chinese Catholics to renounce their faith and again demanded that all missionaries who did not have the p'iao must return to their countries. However, Latourette claims that this decree was not strongly enforced (1929:157).

A year after K'ang Hsi's death in 1723, there is evidence that there were 300,000 Christians and 300 churches in China, and despite the discouraging situation, missionaries continued to find ways to enter the China mission field (Latourette 1929:158). Of course, when Yung Cheng, K'ang Hsi's son, assumed the throne upon his father's death, the missionaries at the Peking court continued their scientific, astronomical, cartographical and teaching pursuits there.

The security of the Church in China became less and less firm with each emperor who followed K'ang Hsi to the throne until the early nineteenth century when China's international diplomatic relations forced the government to be more tolerant of Christians (D'Elia 55). Yung Cheng, in response to a memorial from the Viceroy of the province of Fukian, commanded that all missionaries - with the exception of those who had talents which would be useful at the
court in Peking - must be sent to Macao, while all churches must be confiscated and used for other purposes, and all Chinese must relinquish their Christian faith. This decree was issued on January 10, 1724, and the results were quite successful (Latourette 1929:159; Allan 261; Cary-Elwes 161). That is, the decree was largely enforced, and from this point until the 1800s, the church largely survived in China in secrecy (Cary-Elwes 159; D'Elia 53; Minamiki 1985:67). There were different reasons given for this 1724 persecution: one was attributed to the "imprudences of the Dominicans in Fukien" (which they denied) in reference to their lack of respect for Chinese tradition, and continuance of placing men and women in the same room for worship; another was the accusation that one of the Jesuit priests had tried to help another one of K'ang Hsi's sons to win the throne instead of Yung Cheng (Cary-Elwes 161-62; Latourette 1929:159). Allan maintains that the reason was primarily political: according to this scholar, Yung Cheng was fearful that with missionaries in every province asking for allegiance to the pope, soon allegiance to the kings of their European countries would be expected of the Chinese. In a speech which Yung Cheng made to the Peking missionaries who tried to fight the decree of 1724, the emperor stated, after asking them how they would feel if he sent "a troop of bonzes and lamas" into their countries to preach their doctrines, "Should we not soon be merely the subjects of your kings? The converts you have made already recognize nobody but you, and in a time of trouble they would listen to no other voice than yours. I know that at present we have nothing to fear, but when foreign ships
shall come in their thousands and tens of thousands, then it may be that some disaster will ensue" (Allan 264). Whatever the reason may have been for this particular persecution, however, it was under the reign of Yung Cheng that the Christian religion again became proscribed in China, and it was during his time on the throne that the provincial missionaries were expelled (Allan 281).

Although persecutions became more serious under the reign of Yung Cheng, they became worse after the throne was assumed by his successor Chien Lung in 1735. Although, again, the Peking missionaries tried to convince the emperor to soften the preceding edicts against Christianity, Chien Lung responded in 1735 by reinforcing former decrees: at this time he forbade Chinese and specifically Chinese and Manchu bannermen from practicing the Christian religion (Latourette 162). However, as both Latourette and Allan point out, these decrees were not evenly and strictly enforced in all provinces of China - either during the reign of Yung Cheng or that of Chien Lung (Latourette 1929:162; Allan 282). This was why it was possible for the Church to survive in China despite the imperial decrees. Although there were no longer churches that were permitted to be used for Christian purposes outside of Peking, many European missionaries were able to continue their ministry in the provinces by travelling around "disguised as merchants and tradesmen, travelling by boat or on the backs of mules, staying at inns or temples and secretly visiting their flocks in order to impart spiritual consolation" (Allan 282). Missionaries did so at the risk of their lives, however, and frequently they were caught by some
unfriendly official, tortured and killed. As a result of this happening to Spanish Dominican priests in 1745 - once again in Fukien - and due to its being reported to the emperor, Chien Lung issued a decree in 1746 which ordered all officials in the provinces to deliberately search for missionaries who were still in hiding. As a result of this decree many missionaries were martyred in several different provinces: Many of these priests were strangled or beheaded, while the luckier ones were only tortured, and made to languish in prison before being exiled (Latourette 1929:161-166; Cary-EIwes 166-170). The reason given for the intensification of the persecution of Christians in this Edict of 1746 is worthy of attention especially because it was issued only four years after the final decree of the Rites Controversy was declared by the Church. In the decree of 1746 it was stated that the Christian religion did not belong in China because it "is most detrimental to the manners and customs" of China (Allan 284). I would like to suggest here that although there were many reasons given for the persecutions of Christians in China throughout the history of the mission, the fact that the Catholic Church ruled against incorporation of the majority of the most significant traditional rites of the Chinese undoubtedly had a lot to do with the continuance and intensification of persecutions of the missionaries until the nineteenth century - as these few words quoted from the decree of 1746 illustrate.

It is beyond the scope of this project to trace the persecutions which Chinese Catholics and European missionaries experienced to any further extent. In general, however, the Church continued to
exist throughout the extended periods of persecution largely in
secrecy, with the exception of the missionaries who were useful to
the emperors at court. Due to the underground nature of the
mission, much of the history of the Church during this time is
difficult to trace anyway, as both Latourette and Cary-Elwes testify
(Latourette 1929:156; Cary-Elwes 175). However, before I conclude
this section on the history of the China mission, I must inform the
reader of the situation of the Jesuits in the late eighteenth century:
in 1773, the Pope found it necessary to declare the dissolution of the
Society of Jesuits because "'it can no longer effect the purposes for
which it was founded'" (Allan 287). Latourette maintains that most
of the reasons for the dissolution were to be found in Europe
although the controversy over the rites and the Jesuit reluctance and
tardiness in following the Church's edicts on them were likely to
have contributed to its dissolution (Latourette 1929: 166). This
Church action also had a negative effect on the China mission: not
only did many Chinese Catholics become "perplexed and bewildered,"
and as a result, "lost their zeal," but this meant that no new Jesuit
recruits replenished the mission at the Peking court (Allan 288).
However, this situation was placated by the arrival of the Lazarists
who were sent by the French government to help continue the flow
of knowledge about China to scholars in Europe as well as for
evangelization purposes (Allan 288; Cary-Elwes 170-79). (The
Society of Jesus was restored in 1814, incidentally, the same year
that the last of the ex-Jesuits died in Peking) (Allan 289; Latourette
167).
Although the Catholic mission in China "just managed to exist" between 1700 and 1842, it declined only temporarily: in 1700 there were approximately 300,000 Christians, but in 1800 there were only 200,000. By the mid nineteenth century, however, the figure was back up to 300,000 (D'Elia 55). Indeed these figures are quite amazing considering the extent to which both European missionaries and Chinese native Catholics were persecuted, and had to practice their faith in secrecy.
CHAPTER 7
The Twentieth Century: The Church Reevaluates
the 1742 bull Ex quo singulari

By the early twentieth century, the situation of Christian missionaries in China largely had been changed due to the shift which had taken place in China's diplomatic relations with the West. The Treaty of Nanking, signed August 29, 1842, as a result of the first Opium War with Great Britain allowed trading rights and the import of opium into China as well as the creation of treaty ports along the coast (D'Elia 55; Coye and Livingston 132). In 1844, the French and the Americans also obtained treaties with China. Some of the most prominent provisions outlined in these documents are the following: Hong Kong was ceded to Great Britain; the ports of Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo and Shanghai became established as foreign residences and were open to trade; Chinese and British officials were placed on an "equal footing of equality"; regular tariffs were established; and China was required to pay an indemnity for the opium destroyed by a Chinese Commissioner (Hughes 18; Latourette 1929: 229). The establishment of these western powers in the ports of China had an effect on the government's policy toward the practice of Christianity (Hughes 18-19). (Norway, Sweden, Russia and Belgium also established similar treaties within the next ten years.) In fact, "Imperial toleration" of Christianity came with the treaties of France in 1844 and gradually other powers (D'Elia 54; Latourette 1929: 230). D'Elia reports that the Peking Convention of 1860 maintained that "It shall be promulgated throughout the length and breadth of
the land that it is permitted to all subjects, in all parts of China, to
propagate and practice the teachings of the Catholic Religion" (56).

As a result of these International Treaties, new missionaries
began to enter the country. Many established hospitals, asylums,
orphanages and seminaries (D'Elia 56-58; Latourette 1929: 829). The
first Protestant missionary, Robert Morrison, was sent to China by
the London Missionary Society in 1805 and other reinforcements
were sent after that date. The Germans and the Americans also
began to send Protestant missionaries in the early nineteenth
century (Latourette 1929: 211; 216-217). By the 1930s, at least
twenty Protestant denominations had established themselves in
China (Cary-Elwes 295). In regard to the Catholic mission, "the
greatest burst of missionary energy ever known in China" occurred
in 1900 (D'Elia 6). Numerous missions from North and South
America, Europe and Australia flowed into this country. By 1930
there were 2,068 Catholic foreign missions established (D'Elia 62).
Although the International Treaties with Western Powers which
began in the 1840s made it possible for Catholic missionaries to pour
into this country in such large numbers, the personal situations of
Christian missionaries were often difficult and sometimes deadly in
many parts of China for various historical reasons - the description of
which, again, go beyond the scope of this paper (D'Elia 59-60;
Latourette 1929: 242-244; Cary-Elwes 181-249). However, despite
all of the hardships Catholic missionaries had to endure, by 1933
D'Elia approximates that there were 2,623,560 Chinese Catholics as a
result of all the missionary activity that was successfully
accomplished by this date (119).

Beyond the situation and statistics of Christian missionary activity which occurred into early twentieth century China were other significant historical activities that took place and which forced the Church to reevaluate its position on the issue of the Chinese rites as expressed in the 1742 bull *Ex quo singulari*. Although this bull disallowed any further official discussion of the Chinese Rites Controversy within the Catholic Church, the issue became active again due to an incident which occurred in Japan. In order to "bring about the spiritual mobilization and unification of the people" state Shinto had been instituted by the Japanese military government in the early 1930s which required that all citizens pay their ritualized respect before a government shrine (Minamiki 1980: 207). On May 5, 1932, a few Catholic students from Sophia University in Japan refused to pay homage at Yasukuni Shrine, and thus the Church was necessarily involved in the rites issue once again. In addition, because the Japanese had occupied and seized Manchuria (Manchukuo) and because there the Japanese army had instituted Wangtiao, a form of Confucianism, "as the unifying spirit of the new regime," all citizens were required to pay homage to Confucian shrines (Minamiki 1985: xi). This also caused a crisis of conscience for Catholics in Manchuria and the Church's attention concerning the rites were again directly centered on the Chinese rites. Only when the Japanese government declared in writing to the Catholic Church that the rituals performed before the Shinto shrine in Japan and before the Confucian shrines in Manchuria were "non-
religious and only civil in meaning" did the Church finally put the
issue of the Chinese Rites Controversy to rest for good: "On December
8, 1939...the Sacred Congregation of the the Propagation of the Faith
issued the Instructio circa quasdam caeremonias super ritibus
sinensibus (Instruction on certain ceremonies of the Chinese rites), a
decree that announced to the native Catholics and missionaries in
China a new stand the Church was taking with regard to the
ceremonies in honor of Confucius and the ancestors. The decree
nullified many of the prohibitions laid upon the consciences of the
people and, quite naturally, abolished the anti-rite oath enjoined
upon the missionaries by the bull of 1742" (Minamiki 1985: xii).

The "prohibitions laid upon the consciences of the people," of
course refers to the right of Catholics of Chinese ancestry, which had
been denied by Ex quo singulari of 1742, to venerate their ancestors
and to pay homage to Confucius as expressed in the 1939 Instruction
of the Propaganda Fide known as Plane compertum est, approved by
Pope Pius XII. The Instruction specifically states that "the Chinese
government has said repeatedly and openly that all are free to
profess whatever religion they prefer. It is not the government's
intention to issue laws or commands about religious matters.
Therefore, the ceremonies which the public authorities either stage
or prescribe in honor of Confucius are not carried out with the
intention of rendering religious worship, but only for this purpose:
to cultivate and display suitable honor for a very illustrious man, and
the respect due the traditions of ancestors" (Noll 88). It also states in
regard to the ancestral and Confucian rites in general that "although
in earlier times they were tied with pagan rites, now that customs
and minds have changed with the flow of the centuries, merely
preserve civil expression of devotion toward ancestors or of
patriotism, or of respect for fellow countrymen" (Noll 88). (Minamiki
reports that the Church had submitted questions to these
governments, and although the responses were only concerned with
the civil nature of the Shinto and Confucian Shrines, "the Church took
the occasion to extrapolate its decision and apply it to funerals,
weddings and other rites performed in the ordinary social lives of
the people" (1985:215).) My interpretation of the above *Plane
compertum est* statements are twofold: The governments of Japan
and Manchukuo realize that particular individuals may have
religious beliefs in regard to the Confucian and ancestral rituals
although the governmental position on the rites is that they are
secular. This is why the government found it necessary to include the
statement about religious freedom for its people in the same
declaration on the Confucian and ancestral rites. This is also why the
Church found it necessary to include the statement about the need
for Catholics to "remain passive" or to "make only signs of that
respect which could rightly be thought of as merely civil" when in
attendance at public ceremonies that might "present the appearance
of superstition" (Noll 88). However, *Plane compertum est* appears to
contradict itself when it also states that the rites are civil expressions
which have become so with "the flow of the centuries." If they are
believed to have become fully secularized with the passage of time,
how can it be possible that some may have the "appearance of
superstition" when the external manifestations of the rites have not changed to any significant degree (Noll 88)? And why advise Catholics to remain passive in such cases? From my view, this is the Church's way of acknowledging that although the official stance of the government is that the rites are civil and that the Church has decided to accept and act on this official declaration, the government - as stated - as well as the Catholic Church are aware that some individuals may still have religious beliefs associated with the rites. It may be that the situation in Japan and China in the 1930s was analogous to that of the Jesuit age when there were a variety of beliefs associated with the rituals but, K'ang Hsi, the emperor, declared them to be civil in meaning as quoted earlier (Rowbotham 145). In the twentieth century, however, I speculate - based on the wording of this December 8, 1939 document - that the Church decided it was wiser to accept the official position of the government if it wanted to have more success than in previous centuries in converting Chinese to the Catholic faith and to avoid causing, in George Dunne's words, another "death blow" to "the cause of Christianity in China" as quoted by Minamiki (1985:220).

There is plenty of scholarship which provides strong evidence that many Chinese still have many religious beliefs (non-Catholic) associated with, in particular, the ancestral rites deep into the twentieth century. Even the liturgist Reverend Anscar Chupungco asks in his work Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy, the following question: "Was it a fact that in 1939 the Chinese no longer regarded their ancestral worship as religious cult?" (Chupungco briefly
mocks the idea that a "pagan" ritual had to be declared secular by the church before it could later be sacralized. This is undoubtedly in reference to the fact that the ancestral rites later were performed within the Church - even within the Mass of the Church - although the Reverend does not elaborate on this point at all.) I assert that the situation was - and still is to a large extent - the same in 1939 as it was in 1925 when James Addison maintained that there always has been a variety of beliefs associated with the performance of ancestral rituals in Chinese society ranging from completely secular motives to extremely religious ones - concurrent with all of the "innumerable gradations and variations of motive and meaning" which fall between two extremes (55). Laurence Thompson also provides further evidence for this. In 1989, with the revised publication of his book *Chinese Religion: An Introduction*, the scholar states that there is no "generally accepted interpretation of the real purport" of the enactment of the ancestral ritual services (45). However, at least several other contemporary scholars' findings provide evidence for the deification of ancestors by some Chinese. For example, Charles Emmons, in his work *Chinese Ghosts and ESP* of 1982 provides us with a passage which summarizes the work of a few academics on the supernatural beliefs found to be held by Chinese in regard to ancestor veneration. He states, "Although a lack of ancestor worship is one way to make a spirit restless, and restless spirits can be dangerous for the living, anthropologists disagree on whether Chinese are afraid of their own ancestors. Hsu..claims they are not: 'The ancestral spirits will help their own descendents
whenever they can...They are never offended by their descendents and they never cause disasters to befall the coming generations.' Freedman...on the other hand, states that ancestors can be hostile at times" (Emmons 22). Emmons himself provides evidence that if the ancestral rites are not performed properly that some Chinese believe that bad events will occur in the lives of the living family members (23). All of these scholars indicate that the ancestors have the power to help or hurt their living descendents just as deities are believed to have the ability to. Therefore, it indeed seems likely that the Church was aware that not all beliefs held in regard to the Confucian and ancestral rites were uniformly secularized in 1939 but simply that this would be the Church's position in relation to them. Chupungco overtly states at one point that the "1939 Plane Compertum of the Propaganda Fide did precisely the impossible, when it declared the Chinese ancestral rites to have lost their religious significance" (1982:13). Whatever the specific motives of the Church may have been, since 1939 Chinese Catholics have not been prevented from participating in Confucian and ancestral rituals by Church ruling.
CHAPTER 8
The Evolution of the Performance of the Chinese and
Chinese American Catholic Ancestor Memorial Service

"I went to the mission field in '52 and I never heard about it" (per. com.1993). These were the words of Sister Janet Carroll, M.M., Executive Secretary of the United States Catholic China Bureau, an institution which fosters a supportive relationship with the Chinese Catholic Church in mainland China and which is located at Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey. This poignant comment was made to me in reference to the Church's changed position on the performance of the ancestral rites by Chinese Catholics as formalized in the 1939 Instruction *Plane compertum est.* I learned from an interview with Sister Janet at Seton Hall University on 24 January 1994 that she entered the Maryknoll Sisters Congregation and was professed in 1955, holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Social Service from New York University and a Master's of Arts Degree in International Relations from Yale University. In addition, she is also a recipient of Papal honors: in 1987 she received the Medal Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice for her service on the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations from 1979-1980. Sister Janet was also a missionary in Taiwan from 1956-1972 where she worked in various socio-pastoral ministries in several different urban and rural environments - one of which was Hsin Chu where I lived in the early 1980s. Sister informs me that when she first went to Taiwan in the 1950s, she was not at all aware that the Church had declared that the Chinese ancestral memorial services were secular
and that the Church also had indicated that the traditional ancestral tablets were permissible to be used by Chinese Catholics just as long as they were "inscribed with nothing but the person's name" by the above named Instruction; as a result, she and her fellow missionaries would not allow Chinese Catholics to participate in the rites or to own an ancestral tablet (1994; Noll 89). Sister states that "the popular understanding among the people was that that they did indeed worship their ancestors. They used those expressions. And we naturally took that more or less literally and that would be conflictual with our own understanding of worshipping only to God. So along the process of those who were preparing, for example, with good faith to become Catholics would be certain points in their preparation - would have to make decisions about how to handle these customs and traditions and practices in their families which probably had varying degrees of understanding of about how exactly how religious they were and how much they were social and cultural customs." (Here we have further evidence for the variety of beliefs associated with the tablet and the ancestors.) Sister proceeds to state in our interview that when a Chinese catechumen was ready to make a commitment to becoming a Catholic, she and the other missionaries would require them to "remove the ancestor plaque from the home." She also adds that if the individual was reluctant to do so, she or one of her colleagues would remove it. She states that removal of the plaque was especially difficult for the daughters-in-law who were responsible for "taking care of all of the formalities in regard to the ancestors - [such as] taking the food to the temple on certain feast
days..." (my brackets). Therefore, when the missionaries would take it upon themselves to do away with the tablets, Sister claims, they "would just destroy them casually not knowing or fully appreciating, of course, the meaning that they had for the people."

Reverend Edward J. Flanigan, a Maryknoll priest and Director of the Chinese Language School at the Taichung Society House and Language School in Taichung, Taiwan describes similar experiences to that of Sister Janet Carroll on the tape he sent to me from Taiwan although his past missionary practices do differ from hers in a significant way. Before I proceed to report on Father Flanigan's personal experiences in the field, however, I would just like to state that I had a telephone interview and a personal interview with Sister Janet Carroll; therefore, I was able to clarify certain points with her. In Father Flanigan's case, he sent a tape to me, recorded on 12 February, 1994, in which he describes his experience with the ancestral memorial service and traditional Chinese customs and beliefs associated with it. However, because I was not with him when he recorded his words, I can only claim that I have done my best in order to interpret them here.

Father Flanigan begins his monologue by stating that from the time of the Chinese Rites Controversy such practices as the use of joss sticks (long incense sticks) and ancestral tablets had been "cut out"; he goes on to state that "things that were pretty much taken for granted in Chinese society were proscribed and considered superstition and not allowed to be done. All these years right up until the time we arrived here in China some thirty years ago, the
Maryknoll Fathers in Taiwan." From this statement, it appears that neither the joss sticks, which have always been traditionally used during Chinese ancestral veneration ceremonies, nor ancestral tablets were allowed to be used when the Maryknoll Fathers arrived there in the early 1960s (Addison 37). However, from a statement he makes later on the tape, it becomes obvious that, although the joss sticks were still not allowed to be used by Chinese Catholics after these Maryknoll Fathers arrived thirty years ago, that the ancestral tablets were permitted but with some modification. That is, at a later point, Father Flanigan states that when it came time for a family to be baptized, "the first thing we would do was take out the ancestor tablets - take the wood out that had the characters on it and cover over the two characters that says 'shen wei,' the place of the spirit...we'd take a piece of paper, and cover over the two characters, the 'shen wei,' then put the ancestor tablet back in the house. That's what we do... The Protestants would make them throw it away or smash it up or do something with it." Father Flanigan does not seem to be aware that other Maryknoll missionaries had been doing the same as the Protestants at least ten years earlier as Sister Janet Carroll's personal experience story provided above clearly indicates. Although Father does not overtly mention his awareness of the 1939 Plane compertum est Instruction, it is clear that the attitude and behavior of this group of Catholic missionaries was different than those with whom Sister Janet was associated and that had arrived in Taiwan in the early 1950s - at least in regard to the ancestral tablet. (It is interesting to note that the joss sticks were still considered to
be "superstitious," to use Father Flanigan's words, while the modified ancestral tablet was acceptable in the early 1960s. Sister Janet and I did not discuss the joss sticks.) Thus, based on the information provided in this chapter up until this point, we can see that the ancestral memorial tablet was not permitted by at least some Catholic missionaries in Taiwan in the 1950s (despite the 1939 Instruction), but that the modified version of the tablet was permitted by at least some Catholic missionaries in Taiwan in the 1960s (whether or not the missionaries described by Father Flanigan were aware of *Plane compertum est* is unclear, but it appears as though they probably were).

Additional information provided by Sister Janet Carroll during our interview in relation to her experiences in the Chinese missionary field in the 1950s concerns the taking of the oath that was required of all Catholic missionaries from the eighteenth century until 1939. It seemed likely to me that because Sister was completely unaware of the Instructions in *Plane compertum est* in the 1950s - as evidenced by the missionaries not permitting the ancestral tablet at all at that time - that these missionaries may also have been continuing to take the revised form of the oath provided in the 1742 bull *Ex quo singulari*. Upon my asking Sister about this practice, she replies, "No. In fact I never knew about that even among our priests until I studied about it in later years until I was back from Taiwan. But I don't know how common it was and how late it was that priests had to continue to take that oath who were going to countries with Confucian - with Chinese cultural traditions..."
Father Flanigan did not mention the oath but we can be almost certain that he and his fellow missionaries did not take the oath in consideration of the fact that this group allowed the modified form of the tablet.

Sister Janet Carroll does recall eventually allowing the retention of the ancestral tablet by Chinese Catholics with the deletion of the characters which mean "indwelling of the spirit"; She believed - until she learned otherwise after leaving the field - that this permission occurred in the 1960s after Vatican II took place and after the public performance of an ancestral memorial service in Taiwan by Cardinal Yu Pin, the only Chinese Cardinal at the time (Gutheinz 152).

This extremely significant public performance of an ancestral memorial ritual by Cardinal Yu Pin - at the time, rector of Fujen Catholic University, Taipei - took place, specifically, in the "Chung-hsieng auditorium of the middle school at the state-run Pedagogical University in Taipei, the capital of Taiwan" on January 27, 1971 in the presence of more than one thousand individuals (Gutheinz 152). Reverend Mark Fang, whom Sister Maria Hsu of the Archdiocese of San Francisco (per. com. 1994) refers to as "the most famous liturgist in Taiwan," and who is Dean of the Graduate School of Religious Sciences at Fujen Catholic University, (per. com. 1993) indicates that in addition to "Catholic bishops, priests, sisters and lay Christians there were also several officers and functionaries of the government as participants." Father Flanigan indicates on his tape that this "wonderful" affair was televised, and Sister Janet states in our
interview in regard to the event: "I remember it well." The reason that this ritual performance of an ancestral memorial service was so significant should be obvious to the reader. After centuries of the Church not permitting the participation of Chinese Catholics in ancestral memorial services nor the keeping of an ancestral tablet (until 1939 at least), now a leading figure in the Church was publicly performing an ancestral memorial service before an audience of thousands. How could the position and behavior of Church officials have undergone such a radical transformation within the twentieth century? The reason such a historically important event could have occurred for Chinese Catholics in the early 1970s is due to the impact that Vatican II had on the thinking and policies of the Church. In order to fully understand how and why Cardinal Yu Pin could have presided over such a ceremony and the ramifications which this ritual had for Chinese Catholics all over the world, it is necessary to characterize at least some of the developments which occurred within the Church as a result of Vatican II - at least in regard to how these developments had a direct influence on the eventual integration of the Chinese ancestral memorial service into the Catholic liturgy. 26

The Second Vatican Council was announced by Pope John XXIII in 1959 and held from 1962 to 1965 at Saint Peter's Basilica in Rome. Two thousand, nine hundred and eight delegates were invited to the

---

26 For brief summaries and clearly articulated overviews of all of the outcomes of Vatican II, see McBrien 1992: 21-22; Rahner and Darlap 205; and Dulles 19-33.
council. Two hundred individuals were theologians - some of whom were non-Catholics. All together eighty-six international bodies and governments were present. The purpose of the Council was to discuss reform within the Church, to call for Christian and world unity and to reestablish the way in which the Christian message was to be proclaimed throughout the world. On June 3 of 1963, Pope John XXIII died, and Pope Paul VI carried on with the goals of the Council emphasizing "the pastoral orientation of the council...[which] was to deal with the nature of the church and the function of the bishops, to make an effort toward the unity of Christians, and to set in motion a dialogue with the contemporary world" (Rahner and Darlap 201). Mainly the Council changed the emphasis of how the Church was to operate in the modern world. Instead of the Church continuing to be authoritarian and hierarchical in nature, it reaffirmed the right of the bishops to have power in the church without denying the infallibility of the pope as declared in Vatican I in the nineteenth century. As religion scholar Avery Dulles states, "The individual bishops were portrayed not as mere lieutenants of the pope but as pastors in their own right" (25). In order to foster this sense of collegiality, national and regional episcopal conferences, the worldwide synod of bishops, priests' senates, national, diocesan and parish councils have been established in order to enable all priests to be able to actively participate in the decision making of the church since the Council. (The laity were also strongly encouraged to more actively participate in Church affairs and not to be as passive as they had become prior to the the Council in The Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity,
Apostolicam actuositatum (Abbott 495).)

One of the most significant changes which took place during Vatican Council II was the clear definition of the Church as a world Church. That is, according to Karl Rahner, at this time the Church made a radical historical break from the way it had characteristically defined itself and communicated the Christian message to the world. In his article "Towards a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II," he asserts that the Church realized that it had predominantly been behaving as if it were an "export firm which exported a European religion as a commodity it did not really want to change but sent throughout the world together with the rest of the culture and civilization it considered superior" (717). The changing position on the part of the Church was exemplified by the fact that there were indigenous episcopal sees from Asia and Africa present at Vatican II whereas at Vatican I there were only Western representatives of these continents (Rahner 718). Rahner recognizes that there were antecedents to the Council's declaring itself as a world Church which sought the input of cultures from the entire globe such as the Jesuit effort to appreciate Chinese culture prior to and during the Chinese Rites Controversy, but that it has only been since Vatican II that "a world Church as such begins to act through the reciprocal influence exercised by all its components" (717). What the Church has been endeavoring to do since Vatican II is to respect all cultures throughout the world - both Christian and non-Christian; to look for the "seed" of the Christian message in each non-Christian culture and to help perfect those cultures by imbuing them with the
word of God in order for them to reach their "God-intended perfection" as phrased by Louis J. Luzbetak, S.V.D. (67:73). In other words, the Church recognized in the Council that each local church, each culture, has something special and unique to offer to the universal Catholic Church and that it does not need to crush this uniqueness or "genius" of a people in order to Christianize it (Chupungco 1982:75). (Chupungco defines genius as "the natural thought and language pattern, the spontaneous mode of reacting interiorly to reality, and the manner in which the intellectual, emotional and effective sensitivity is exteriorized" (1982:76). He also equates genius with the worldview of a culture (1982:75).) As one of the most significant Documents of Vatican II, the Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity, Ad Gentes, clearly states, "Working to plant the Church, and thoroughly enriched with the treasures of mysticism adorning the Church's religious tradition, religious communities should strive to give expression to these treasures and to hand them on in a manner harmonious with the nature and the genius of each nation. Let them reflect attentively on how Christian religious life may be able to assimilate the ascetic and contemplative traditions whose seeds were sometimes already planted by God in ancient cultures prior to preaching the gospel" (Abbott 606-607).

One of the ways in which the Church has gone about assimilating its traditions into non-Christian cultures both within Western and non-Western contexts is through the process of inculturation. Luzbetak equates the terms inculturation, incarnation and contextualization. He defines these terms to mean "the various
processes by which a local church integrates the Gospel message (the 'text') with its local culture (the 'context')" (69). The Catholic scholar states, "The text and context must be blended into that one, God-intended reality called 'Christian living'...(69). Similarly, Avery Dulles provides William Reiser's definition of the word: "the process of a deep, sympathetic adaptation to and appropriation of a local cultural setting in which the Church finds itself in a way that does not compromise its basic faith in Christ." (37). Dulles points out that the Church is being called upon to "insert itself" into six continents which include Europe, Asia, Africa, Oceania, and the two Americas (37); however, as alluded to briefly above, the Church also recognizes that there are a plurality of non-European based cultures or subcultures within the West and which also are deserving of recognition and of Christian expression. In sum, Luzbetak states that "today when speaking of contextualization as we are, every local church throughout the world is meant, including the local church of the West. The Gospel must be inculcated on all six continents and in every age, whether in Britain or in New Britain, in Ireland or New Ireland, whether in a distant non-Christian land or in one's own Western de-Christianized or deeply Christian home parish" (71). Within the context of this paper, we are concerned both with how the Christian message is proclaimed in distant Taiwan as well as within the deeply Christian Chinese American home parish. Presently, I need to continue to trace the evolution of the actual performance of the Chinese ancestral memorial service within the Catholic Church, and that is why I must elaborate upon the significance and details of
Cardinal Yu Pin's first public performance in 1971. By closely examining the material we have available to us in regard to this ceremony, hopefully we shall see how the changes which were instituted during Vatican II allowed for the traditional ritual of ancestor veneration to become an integrated part of the Catholic liturgy.

Before I return our attention to Cardinal Yu Pin's performance of the ancestral rite, I would like to provide an extremely interesting observation and assertion made by Anscar Chupungco. He claims that Pope Pius XII's 1939 encyclical letter *Summi Pontificatus* "re-echoed" the Propaganda Fide's Instruction to the three new Vicars Apostolic in 1659 to preserve China's cultural expressions and to use them "as cultural vehicles of the Christian message" and, significantly, that it was because of the encyclical letter that this idea of using different cultural expressions for Christian purposes found its way into the documents of Vatican II (1982:39). Based on this information, it is possible to speculate that because of all of the thinking that went on during the Chinese Rites Controversy in regard to the cultural traditions of the Chinese, that this controversy was at least a contributing factor in the changed approach of the Catholic Church as expressed in this Second Council.

In the Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church, *Ad Gentes*, advice is given to Catholics to give Christian expression to "the social and cultural framework of their homeland, according to their own national traditions" (Abbott 611). It also recommends that individuals from different societies "heal" and "preserve" their
cultural traditions by permeating these traditions with the Christian message (Abbott 611). Chupungco indicates that the way in which a non-Christian cultural tradition is transformed into a Christian one is simply by interpreting and transforming a non-Christian rite, for instance, "in light of the Christian faith" (1982:81). If the reader recalls, according to Chupungco, it is not necessary to first declare a tradition as being secular before giving it a Christian interpretation although he does not deny that the Church has a history of Christianizing secular cultural traditions as well (1982:16, 20). Earlier I explained Chupungco's position in regard to the Church’s 1939 declaration that the Confucian and ancestral rites were secular. Here I quote him directly: "It is quite unrealistic to secularize pagan rituals before elevating them to the dignity of Christian worship. The method of secularization in order to sacralize later has no precedent in the history of adaptation" (1982:40). The section from the Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church quoted above supports Chupungco's view that secularization is not a prerequisite to Christianizing a social and/or cultural national tradition although the official position of the Church as declared in Plane compertum est in regard to the ancestral rites is that they are secular (even though they may indeed have been secular for a number of Chinese all throughout Chinese history as I have previously demonstrated). We can conclude from this information that the Church was not consciously aware - or that the individuals making the decisions at the time of the 1939 Instruction had temporarily forgotten - that Catholicism had had a tradition of Christianizing pagan traditions
without at first secularizing them; on the other hand, perhaps it would be more appropriate to state that at the time of the 1939 Instruction the Church had no intention of incorporating the ancestral memorial ritual into the Catholic liturgy since - to recall Rahner for a moment - the Church again had become so European in orientation by this time that it did not even consider the possibility or recognize the desirability of doing so (and thus the need for Vatican II): for them to proclaim the Chinese rites as being secular was appropriately enough.

We simply need to recognize how the Church Christianized many Greco-Roman traditions as it began to move away from the strictly Jewish forms of Christianity and to become a Roman Church in order to understand that the Church had largely forgotten some of its own methods of spreading the Christian word throughout the world. At the beginning of Chapter 4, I relate some of the instances in which this occurs as offered by George Dunne. Chupungco also provides us with numerous examples of how the Church historically Christianized various cultural traditions - both pagan and secular - in his chapter on "A History of Liturgical Adaptation" in his Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy, two of which I shall offer here. The first example demonstrates how early Catholics Christianized secular traditions. Chupungco reports that pontifical ceremonials were adapted from the imperial court of the fourth century, and that the liturgical vestments of this period were also originally based on the style of those of the Roman government (1982:20). In regard to the adaptation of a pagan tradition, the author describes a ritual taken
from the **Apostolic Tradition** of Hippolytus of Rome whereby milk and honey are offered to a neophyte along with the Eucharist at his First Holy Communion. Hippolytus explains that this rite signifies "'the fulfillment of the promise of God to the patriarchs, that he would give them a land flowing with milk and honey'" (Chupungco 1982:16). Chupungco indicates that the drink of milk and honey was frequently given to newborn children by Romans "as a sign of welcome into the family and as a protection from evil spirits" (1982:16). He concludes that the Christians of this time imbued this pagan cultural tradition with Christian meaning, and asserts that it is very unlikely that the use of milk and honey in this Christian ritual was "pure coincidence" (1982:16).

Although this tradition of Christianizing pagan and/or secular cultural traditions had not been emphasized for centuries (with the exception of the Jesuit attempt in China, of course: recall my descriptions - also in Chapter 4 - of Ricci's successes, in particular, in "christianizing Confucianism" or "confucianizing Christianity" especially in his writings), it became - once again - not only possible but desirable for inculturation to occur in cultures throughout the world. In the case with which we are especially concerned here, it became possible for the first time for Chinese Catholics not only to actively participate in but to fully incorporate the traditional Chinese ancestral veneration ritual into the Catholic liturgy after Vatican II. As Chupungco states, "Adaptation of the liturgy to various native genius and traditions is not a novelty but fidelity to tradition. Liturgical adaptation is as old as the Church, but it has been
brought to the limelight in modern times because of Vatican II's renewed sense of pluralism within the Church and respect for people's cultures" (1982:3). Adaptation and incorporation of a plurality of cultural traditions such as that of the Chinese ancestral memorial ritual could and should be done by the Catholic Church, according to the words of Luzbetak, not as a "concession," but as a "right" and a "need" (68). In fact, Father Flanigan, who eventually came to perform ancestral rituals in the Catholic Church in Taiwan after Vatican II reports on his 1994 tape that now its performance is "not only encouraged but almost demanded by the Church as a sign of inculturation into the society...."

This right and need enables one of China's most significant cultural treasures and traditions (the very foundation of its civilization according to some scholars) to be imbued with the Christian message and at the same time enrich the universal Church with the Confucian values of filial piety which were in existence for thousands of years before Christ (Chupungco 1982:14; Addison 27; Yang 29; Thompson 36-37; Eliade 1982:5; Ling 39-46). In this way, the Catholics of Chinese ancestry all over the world could be both the "senders" and the "receivers" - again to use the words of Luzbetak - that each local Church was designated to be during Vatican II: that is, a local Chinese Church could send the message of Confucius to other local Churches as it receives the message of Christ and as the integration of the Christian message becomes expressed through the ancestral rite (72).
What acts, in particular, did the ancestral memorial service as performed by Cardinal Yu Pin in 1971 in Taipei, Taiwan involve and what significance did they have for Chinese Catholics and perhaps for others who may have watched the performance on television? And why, we might ask, was the service performed in Taiwan as opposed to Hong Kong or mainland China in the early 1970s?

According to the theologian Luis Gutheinz, S.J., also of Fujen Catholic University in Taipei, Taiwan, there were several important reasons why the ancestral memorial service was performed by the only Chinese Catholic Cardinal in Taipei during the early 1970s. Of course, one of the main reasons given was that the developments of Vatican II allowed such an occurrence to happen at this time; however, he also adds that, according to Bishop Paul Chen Shihkuang, the integration of the ancestral memorial service into the Catholic liturgy could only help to spread the Catholic faith amongst Chinese because now those Chinese who were hesitant to become Catholics would no longer have the fear of not being visited at their gravesites by the young (1971:158-159). Gutheinz also puts forth other ideas as to why it was important to have such a ritual at that particular point in history. That is, he maintains that such a publicized event, performed by the Catholic Church, was a needed reaction against the strong influence that the West was having on traditional Chinese society in Taiwan. He states that, "In spite of their adaptation of modern western scientific rigor, the Chinese, deep down, would like to maintain their own special character, and thus the revival of old cultural forms" (154). My assumption is that Gutheinz refers to the
ancestral service as an "old cultural form" even though ancestor veneration always has been and largely continues to be a central foundation of Chinese civilization (as I hope I have fully demonstrated by now), because of his concern that Chinese youth are not as concerned with Chinese traditional culture as he feels they should be. In his article "Chinese Ancestor Veneration in China," he bemoans the fact that more youth were not present at Cardinal Yu Pin's service and often implies throughout the article that Chinese youth are overly concerned with the Western idea of progress: "The youth thinks about the future, about progress. The ceremony on January 27 was also intended as a signal against these developments which endanger the traditional thinking of China. It is remarkable that hardly any young persons participated in the ceremony" (155). In addition to the belief that the Catholic ancestral memorial service would do only good for the youth of Taiwan who are becoming too Western oriented is the Austrian theologian's assertion that the service was performed in Taiwan in reaction against the Communist tendency on the mainland to sweep "away many cultural values of China" especially at this time which was right after the height of the ten year Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), the worst of which occurred during the years 1966 to 1969 (155). As is commonly known, many of the traditional ways of the Chinese people were actively discouraged by the Communist party after they took over the government in 1949 and many non-Communists fled to Taiwan and elsewhere. However, it was especially during the Cultural Revolution that the government endeavored to rid the nation of what
it considered to be any feudalist, capitalist, imperialist or Western influences in an endeavor by Mao Tse-tung, the then Communist leader, to assure that the Communist government would not become a Soviet-style bureaucratic ruling class (Bush 36; Coye and Livingston 355; Fairbank and Reischauer 504-514). During this period of the Cultural Revolution, innumerable lives were lost as the ideals of the party, and their attempts to have them actualized, were intensified and carried to an extreme. Of course, in line with the thinking of Marx and Engels, religion was and is not approved of by the Chinese Communists because of the belief that it is the "opiate of the people" (Thompson 140). They maintained and maintain that religion is used by those in power such as the upper class, feudal lords and the capitalists to keep the workers under control in order to be able to exploit them (Bush 24). They also put forth that religion will naturally die out "when all of the conditions of socialism and communism are met" for there will no longer be a need for such a crutch (Barry 6). Therefore, although the policy of the Communist government does not, for the most part, overtly outlaw religion, they have had a long term policy of attempting to eliminate theistic beliefs by providing atheistic education in the schools, by not publishing mythological or religious books, by imposing a tax on "'superstitious commodities' such as incense sticks, candles, and paper articles to be burned to the dead with the obvious purpose of using financial pressure to reduce religious rites" (Yang 389). (Here it should be obvious to the reader that the Communists were trying to discourage the "feudal" practice of ancestor veneration since these
are the artifacts that are traditionally used during these rites.) C. K. Yang also reports that Communists have typically held "'anti-superstition' exhibitions,""anti-religious demonstrations and similar actions which have often damaged religious property and affected the personal well being of the believers" (389, 391). It is also crucial that I mention the Communist attitude toward religious organizations - in particular its stance toward the Catholic Church. Again, as Yang points out, on the whole, the Communists have had a degree of tolerance in regard to religious organizations as well as toward looser theistic beliefs, but because the Vatican is openly anti-Communist the Chinese Communist government has forced the Catholic Church in China to sever all ties with Rome ( Yang 395). This has created a situation in which there are two Catholic Churches within China: one is above ground, denies allegiance to the Vatican, and has a relationship with the Chinese government; the other is the underground Church whose allegiance to Rome is unwavering, and which, of course, the Communist government does not sanction. (There have been many underground Chinese Catholic political prisoners and deaths since the Communists came to power (Barry 5-8).) During the Cultural Revolution, however, the issue of the overt practice of religion - of any sort - was not circumscribed. All religious institutions disappeared as of 1966: churches and temples were converted to buildings for secular use, for instance, and the above ground Church went underground. Persons were especially coerced into giving up the practice of their faith at this time (Tong 16; Bush 22). Bush claims that "Had anyone dared to object to the
suppression of religious freedom at that time, Communist officialdom could have replied that the constitutional provision guaranteed only freedom to believe, not the freedom to worship, preach or to perform religious acts of any kind" (22).

It is beyond the scope of this paper to write a full exposition of the Chinese Communist government's position toward religion in general and to the Catholic Church in particular in China. However, hopefully I have provided enough information for the reader to understand Gutheinz's assertion that the Chinese in Taiwan in the early 1970s wholeheartedly welcomed the performance of the ancestral memorial service by the Cardinal because this ritual can also be viewed as a reaction against the Communist government's propensity to obliterate many traditional Chinese traditions - such as that of ancestor veneration - as well as to attempt to kill the true Catholic Church particularly during this time period. Gutheinz states in regard to these Communist activities: "In Taiwan the answer was the 'Movement to revive Chinese Culture.' The ceremony of January 27, 1971 reflects essential features of this tension" (156). It is not surprising that the Government officials of Taiwan praised the Catholic Church for "its initiative in reviving Chinese Culture" (156). It is also interesting to note that such a traditional ritual performed by the Church could have such political ramifications. Although Gutheinz does not suggest that this performance may have helped Catholicism to have become a more viable alternative for Taiwan Chinese than it had been prior to its broadcast because of the

27 See Leung for more information on Sino-Vatican relations.
approval of the Taiwan government, it is my guess that such was likely to have been the case.

In Chapter 6, I describe the variety of beliefs associated with a traditional Chinese ancestor veneration ritual whether that ritual occurs in the home, at the gravesite or at the clan temple. I will not reiterate that variety of beliefs pertaining to the rite as a whole at this point. However, in order to demonstrate the degree to which the outward manifestations of the ancestral memorial service as performed by Cardinal Yu Pin were the same and to what extent they differed from that of a traditional rite, I here include a brief summary of a typical traditional rite as provided by James Addison (though, of course, we must recognize that variations even in the way a ritual appears may occur from family to family, from occasion to occasion, from time to time, and from place to place). The "modern" rites, which Addison claims, "remain essentially the same as in Confucian times," characteristically involve the following artifacts and behaviors:

The forms of Chinese ancestor worship are simple, for the rites constitute a family meal...Food and drink are placed on the table before the tablets of the deceased, and at a later hour, or on the following day...all the members of the family (or clan) eat and drink what remains. The presentation of the offerings is accompanied by an invitation...and by the prostrations...Candles and incense are usually burned...When the sacrifice is made on some special occasion, announcement is made...the ancestors are greeted with praise and requested
to receive the offerings and to bestow their blessing... (29;37-38)\textsuperscript{28}

Here we can see from the italicized words what the fundamental ingredients of a typical traditional ancestral memorial service includes: food and drink, an ancestral tablet, prostrations, words spoken (invitation, announcement, greeting and request), candles, incense and a table. Thompson also includes mention of flowers in his description of a typical ancestral rite while Minamiki does not (Thompson 56; Minamiki 1985:6). (Often paper money is also burned during the rite as explained elsewhere (Yang 39-40; Minamiki 1985:6).)

It should become obvious how the process of inculturation takes place in regard to the ancestral memorial ritual when we recognize how similar the rite as performed by Cardinal Yu Pin is to the traditional ritual described above. It is important that we keep in mind the words of Chupungco in reference to this process when he states the following: "The original structure of the rite together with its ritual and celebratory elements is not subjected to radical change, but its meaning is altered by the Church to express the Christian mystery" (1982:84). Reverend Mark Fang indicates that the ritual as performed by the Cardinal was "planned" by two Confucian scholars who "tried to integrate Confucianism into Christianity"; their names are Archbishop Lokuang and Bishop Paul Chen Shihkuang, the latter whom I mentioned previously (n.d.). Their goal was to express filial piety as well as a "concern for last and ultimate things" through the

\textsuperscript{28}I have omitted any words of interpretation on Addison's part in an effort to simply report what the ritual simply looks like.
ancestor ritual (Fang n.d.). Below I quote Gutheinz's description of the ritual:

The ceremony begins with Chinese fireworks and music. The chairman (Cardinal Yu Pin) and the 'co-celebrants' take their seats. The master of ceremonies lights the fire as a sign that the higher ancestors are close to the people celebrating. The entire assembly bows three times before the higher ancestors. The chairman steps up to the altar table, bows, and makes a sacrifice of incense three times - a generally understood sign of reverence and veneration - and returns to his seat.

**First sacrifice:** Wine and flowers. The chairman steps up to the altar; bows, makes an offering of wine and then flowers as a sign of life community. He bows and speaks the blessing: 'The ancestors created this ceremony for us as a lesson. If someone has no ancestors, how can he have parents? If he has no parents, where is his life supposed to come from? If he has no life norm, what is the difference between him and a wild animal? On the mainland they trample on our life norm, forget our ancestors, desecrate our graves. I make today a sacrifice to our ancestors, may heaven send their spirit, awaken new life, and make an end to this oppression. The sacrifice of fragrant flowers is supposed to be a sign that the ancestors bear the creative powers of heaven and earth. May it always be this way down through all generations.' After this, the chairman returns to his seat. The assembly bows three times.

**Second sacrifice:** Wine and fruit. The same ceremonies as with the first sacrifice. The chairman speaks the blessing: 'The Yellow River is the cradle of our nation. For twenty years already, we have been separated from our ancestors - those of the family and the nation. In remembrance of their virtue we make this sacrifice today. The Cardinal of God called us together for this ceremony. We bring our culture to a new life. May heaven always be at China's side. We make a sacrifice of fruit as a sign of our firm resolve to bring about the day on which we will again celebrate in our country.'

**Third sacrifice:** Wine, chopsticks, meal, soup, grain and tea leaves. The same ceremonies as in the first two sacrifices. Instead of the blessing, the chairman gives a homily on the
meaning of the celebration as expressed in both of the blessings and in the invitation to the celebration.

After the homily, the chairman returns to his seat. The assembly bows three times. Then, the chairman steps up again to the altar, bows, and blesses all of those present in the name of the ancestors. The latter receive the blessing and bow. The master of ceremonies brings the light. Those present gaze at the light and turn slowly backwards when passing by it — apparently a symbol that the ancestors are passing by and leaving the assembly. Then, all turn to face the front. Music and firecrackers end the celebration.

After this ceremony followed the mutual reverence. The participants over seventy were on the right, those younger than seventy on the left. They turned toward each other and bowed twice (156-157; italics mine).

The reader should easily note the elements which are present in the description of this ancestral ritual as well as in the traditional Chinese rite quoted above from Addison. Almost the same ingredients appear (although slightly different words are used): food and drink (specifically fruit, meal, soup, grain, tea leaves and wine), bows, words spoken (blessings and homily), fire/light (candles?), incense, flowers, and a table. Addison does not specify what kind of food and drink, exactly, is included in a typical ancestral ritual. Undoubtedly, this is because different foods can be offered depending on family means and food availability; in addition, his description of the traditional rite does not mention what kind of drink is used although the Catholic ritual specifies wine. (Thompson uses the word wine while Minamiki uses the word drink in regard to the traditional rite (Thompson 56; Minamiki 1985:6).) The description of the traditional rite includes the word prostration while the Catholic ritual description uses the word bow. It is quite
plausible that different words are used for a reason. That is, it is likely that although *prostration* is a kind of bow (one of the meanings given by *Webster's New World Dictionary* for *prostrate* is "thrown or fallen to the ground"), here it specifically means "kowtow." (Yang clearly states that the kowtow is performed at an ancestral rite (39).) Although I defined this gesture in an earlier chapter, I shall again provide a description of it here: "The ceremony in itself varied from time to time. But its basis remained three kneelings, each accompanied by touching the forehead to the floor three times. The performer fell to his knees and literally knocked his head on the floor" (Cameron 141). In addition, it is quite likely that the word *bow*, as translated from the description by Gutheinz, means *jugung*, which - according to Reverend Joseph Chiang, Director of the National Pastoral Center for the Chinese Apostolate in New York (and who was born and raised in Foozhou, Fujian, China) - is the "modern" version of the kowtow. As Reverend Chiang clarified in an interview with me on 18 December 1993 in New York's Chinatown, the *jugung* is merely a very deep bow from the waist and does not involve kneeling on the floor or touching the forehead to the ground. In other words, one does not become prostrate in this form of the bow. Father Chiang clearly indicates that the kowtow is rarely seen in China or Taiwan anymore (although I did see it performed at the funeral in Hsin Chu, Taiwan in 1983). Therefore, it is likely that the kowtow was used in the ancestral rite as described by Addison, and that the *jugung* was used in the performance in Taipei by the

---

29 See Appendix IV for description.
Cardinal. However, it is important to note that the bow, no matter what form it takes exactly, is important in both rites. In regard to the use of lights of some sort, in the traditional ancestral ritual, the word *candles* is specifically used while Gutheinz uses the words - according to the translation available to me - *fire and light*. We can regard candles, fire and light in the same category, however, since all of these objects provide light and smoke of some sort. In addition, both ritual descriptions use the word *incense* - there is no ambiguity in this regard. Also, the traditional rite includes the spirit tablet - simply referred to by Addison as *tablet* while the Catholic service makes no mention of the ancestral tablet even though we know from the 1939 Instruction that it would not have been prohibited just as long as nothing other than the names of deceased ancestors were inscribed on them (Noll 89). There is no mention of flowers in Addison's description of the ancestral ritual while flowers are an important part of the Catholic rite. (As stated previously, Thompson mentions that flowers are included in a traditional ancestral ritual (56); Minamiki does not indicate that flowers are typically a part of a traditional rite (1985:6).) Thus, I have concluded drawing parallels between the objects and the gestures which are typically present during a traditional ancestral rite and the first performance of a Chinese ancestral memorial service by a member of the Catholic clergy. Nevertheless, I still need to call attention to the words spoken during the traditional ancestral rite as opposed to the words spoken in the Catholic rite. Addison states that some kind of invitation, announcement, greeting, and requests are made to the ancestors in
the rite he describes while in Gutheinz's service the words spoken are referred to as blessings or a homily. I explore the implications of these differences shortly.

At this point, I must turn our attention to attempting to discern what the symbolic meanings are of the objects and gestures used during the non-Catholic as opposed to the Catholic rite. In other words, we must attempt to understand how the process of inculturation occurs. We must try to decipher how the word of the gospel (the text) inserts itself in this traditional ritual (the context) (Luzbetak 69).

Before I begin to lead the way, perhaps it would be useful to provide a quotation from Minamiki in reference to his conclusions about the significance of the components of the non-Catholic ritual. In regard to the traditional ancestral service he states, "While the meaning undergoes a process of change and development, the symbols themselves tend to perdure. The objects and gestures that constitute the rite continue under a law of inertia. They belong to the world of sense data and can continue even without their accompanying symbolic meaning. And people, through some sort of reflex action, can continue to use these objects and go through the acts without adverting to their symbolic meaning. Thus, the rites manifest a certain resistance to change, whereas the meaning is fluid and changeable" (Minamiki 1985:210; my bold). Minamiki also explains that one of the reasons the Rites Controversy continued for so long was because the symbolic meaning that each of the objects and gestures had for different individuals varied and this
was why it was so easy for the missionary in the field as well as the officials in Rome to make a decision (as I have pointed out previously on several occasions). Although it is necessary that we keep in mind that the symbolic significance of the objects and even of the gestures and words in the traditional rite might have different meanings for various people at different times and locations - and therefore, as Minamiki so accurately states, "the meaning is fluid and changeable," it is still possible and desirable at this point to offer a few interpretations given to these components of the ritual as revealed by the work of Chinese religion scholars before we examine what they might come to mean in the Catholic performance of the ritual.

In regard to the food and the drink that are presented during a non-Catholic ancestral service, C. K. Yang states that these offerings are always "central" because they signify that an effort is being made to share "the supreme factor in the sustenance of life... between the living and the dead, thus maintaining contact between the two" (40). Addison uses almost the same exact words: he states that the "main motive" for the offering is "to maintain respectful contact with the venerable deceased" (49-50). This latter author attributes this need to maintain contact with the dead to the persistent feeling of duty instilled in Chinese by the traditional value of filial piety regardless of whether or not there are any supernatural beliefs associated with the presentation of the offerings. He maintains that whether the dead are "regarded as hungry and needing food, as present and requiring respectful attention, as figures of the past living in the memory alone" it is filial piety which inspires the continual offerings.
of food (and drink) at an ancestral rite in order to maintain some kind of relationship with the deceased (50; my parentheses). In regard to the ancestral tablet, I have had opportunity to consider this artifact on several occasions throughout this project, but for the sake of thoroughness and clarity I shall briefly restate the traditional beliefs associated with the tablet here: the plaque has been believed by many Chinese to house at least one of the three or four souls which are often believed to exist after the death of an individual (I cannot and do not maintain that all Chinese believe or believed this this, but there is enough evidence to indicate that many do and did) (Addison 17; Yang 41; Thompson 52; Freedman 86). In reference to the gesture of the prostration, or the kowtow, Addison states that "for the Chinese, [it] constitutes the natural method of expressing reverence for parents and superiors" (37; my brackets); Yang also refers to this form of bowing as "reverential" (39). Of course, there are also traditional interpretations of those two other perduring artifacts involved in the rite. Addison asserts that both candles and incense are traditionally "burned as symbolical of invitation and to attract the attention of the spirits" (37). Yang generally states that candles are used as "a means of communicating with and providing sustenance for the spirits" (39). (However, I do not fully understand what he means by "providing sustenance for the spirits." Does this mean that the light and/or smoke from the candles reassures the spirits because they are still in contact with their descendants?) This latter Chinese religion scholar more eloquently describes a traditional belief about incense: "The fragrant smoke spiraling from the burning
incense was a means of contacting the invisible spirits of the ancestors, and for some people, constituted the daily ration for their sustenance" (39). (Again, I have the same question, however: does this imply that the ancestors are made happy by the smoke because this physical entity, which can blow up to the sky - and therefore to the spirit world - reassures them that they are still in contact with their descendants? Most likely this is the implication in regard to both the candle light/smoke and to the incense smoke.) Concerning the words spoken at the traditional ancestral rite, the Chinese have a long history of making announcements to the deceased especially on important occasions at this rite: the birth of a son, a marriage, the departure from and return to the royal court would be announced to the deceased king. Undoubtedly Addison is correct when he describes this process as "a continuance of the relations of respect and obedience customary between living parents and children" (25, 21). This convention of announcing continues into modern times as well for the family head is expected to "announce the particulars" of the day to the deceased (Thompson 56; Addison 37, 39-40). In regard to the invitation, Addison states that it is made "to the departed to partake" of the offerings (37). Elsewhere he discusses that for some this is merely a formality while for others, they may indeed believe that the deceased hear them and come to share the food with the living (48-49). Also, the words "ancestors are greeted with praise," "requested to receive the offerings," and to "bestow their blessing" are interpreted by Addison (and other scholars) as having a variety of meanings depending on the individuals involved.
Some would believe the ancestors hear the praise; some would not. Some would believe the ancestors hear the request to receive; others would not. Some might believe that the ancestors were capable of "blessing" their living descendents which to traditional Chinese would mean simply to bring prosperity as opposed to misfortune (Addison 48-49; Freedman 92-93; Otake 21-28). Before concluding our examination of the various interpretations which may be given to the artifacts, gesture and words of the traditional ancestral rite, I would just like to point out that all of the artifacts are placed on a table (this is not a description of a graveside ceremony).

Here I have provided a mere sampling of the kinds of beliefs that have characteristically been associated with the objects, gestures and words which compose the traditional Chinese ancestral ritual. Doubtless there are many more. Nevertheless, now let us turn our attention to the Catholic interpretation of some of these elements of the ancestral rite as performed by Cardinal Yu Pin and as described by Luis Gutheinz, S.J..

In regard to the food and drink of the Catholic rite, drink is mentioned first. Wine is offered along with flowers on the altar in the auditorium of the school. The translation states that the "chairman," or Cardinal Yu Pin, "makes an offering of wine and then flowers as a sign of life community" (156). An interpretation of the "blessing" which follows may help us to understand what "life community" means exactly. Again I will repeat the blessing here: "The ancestors created this ceremony for us as a lesson. If someone has no ancestors, how can he have parents? If he has no parents,
where is his life supposed to come from? If he has no life norm, what is the difference between him and a wild animal? On the mainland they trample on our life norm, forget our ancestors, desecrate our graves. I make today a sacrifice to the ancestors, may heaven send its spirit, awaken new life, and make an end to this oppression. The sacrifice of fragrant flowers is supposed to be a sign that the ancestors bear the creative powers of heaven and earth. May it always be this way down through all generations" (156-157). This blessing raises several issues, and it is important that we look at the words closely in order to attempt to understand the symbolic meaning of the wine - which, in this instance, cannot be fully separated from that of the flowers. Based on the words of the Cardinal in this part of the rite, I interpret the phrase life community to refer to all of the Chinese - both the living and the dead, as well as both the mainland or Communist Chinese and the Taiwan Chinese (at least). He addresses the Chinese community who is present in 1971 in Taipei and admonishes them to remember the reason for their life: it is due to that of the ancestors. He also suggests that the performance of the ritual is based on the values of the ancestors who taught them how to live in proper relation with each other in accordance with the concept of hsiao, or filiality. Here I maintain that the Cardinal is making direct reference to the teachings of Confucius in relation to this concept of hsiao and which encompasses the important value of good conduct or li. Although I provide a quotation of Addison's paraphrasing of the following ideas in Chapter 6, I again offer them here: In the Analects, Confucius, or Master
K'ungh, responds to a question about hsiao: "'The Master said, 'While [the parents] are living, serve them with li; when they die, bury them with li; sacrifice to them with li'" (Thompson 42). When the Cardinal states, "'The ancestors created this ceremony for us as a lesson,'" I ascertain that these words are in direct reference to the words quoted above by Confucius. There is another passage in this blessing which also directly echoes these Chinese Classics which, according to Thompson (and to the Cardinal) represent, on the one hand, the "understanding of the ways of the ancients, and on the other have served as the living law for all subsequent generations" (Thompson 39). In giving advice about how and why to observe the rules of li, the Li Ki: Book of Rites states the following:

To cultivate one's person and fulfill one's words is called good conduct. When the conduct is (thus) ordered, and the words are accordant with the (right) course, we have the substance of the rules of propriety...

The parrot can speak, and yet is nothing more than a bird; the ape can speak and yet is nothing more than a beast. Here now is a man who observes no rules of propriety; is not his heart that of a beast? Therefore, when the sages arose, they framed the rules of propriety in order to teach men, and cause them, by their possession of them, to make a distinction between themselves and brutes (Thompson 40).

It becomes quite clear that Confucianists were responsible for planning the set of rituals Cardinal Yu Pin followed that day when we consider these two passages. Once again, in the above blessing, his words are, "'If he has no life norm, what is the difference between him and a wild animal?'" Cardinal Yu Pin's words, like the ideas of the Chinese Classics his words reflect, advise the Chinese to behave in
accordance with the Chinese "life norm" - that is, with the rules of *li* - and suggests that to ignore this advice would be less than human.30 (To behave in a less than human manner would be to ignore the specific rules of *li* which - as also indicated in Chapter 6, and elaborated upon even more fully in a later chapter - involve behaving ethically in all of the five relationships of ruler-subject, husband-wife, elder and younger brother, and friend and friend, father-son, and which means performing ancestral rites for the deceased, as stated by Master K'ung (Legge 1966:406-407).) Thus, I conclude that the phrase *life community* refers to the living as well as to the dead. The ancestors, although they are no longer alive are still a part of the community because without them there would be no living community: they are responsible for the life which exists today. It is for this reason that the Cardinal asserts that "the ancestors bear the creative powers of heaven and earth." They were given the power of heaven - the source of all life - to reproduce life on earth when they were alive, but their "power of heaven" continues after their death because the model of their behavior, or "life norm," (*li*) and values continues "through all generations." Thus, the Cardinal offers flowers to signify the continuing "creative powers

---

30 Although the Chinese Classics are sometimes understood to be strictly the writings of Confucius (551-479), this perception is not accurate. According to Laurence Thompson, three of the books of the Canon of the Literati, as these Classics have come to be called by scholars, were already in existence before the time of Confucius. Confucius added to these earlier writings and wrote his own books. In addition to this work, however, is the generations of scholarship which were added to the Literati Canon until as late as the twelfth century. Thompson states that the final version of the Canon appeared at this time under the following overall title: Thirteen Scriptures, with Notes and Commentary. See Thompson's Appendix for a description of these texts (146-150).
of the ancestors" and wine and flowers as "a sign of life community." Therefore, we may conclude in regard to the symbolic significance of these objects within this rite that the flowers have signification simply for the deceased; whereas the flowers and the wine together symbolize both the living and the dead who continue to form a community and sustain a relationship as evidenced by the performance of the ancestral ritual.

In regard to the section of the blessing where the Cardinal refers to the Chinese mainlanders who "trample on our life norm, forget our ancestors, desecrate our graves," he of course refers to the disrespect which the Communists have for any of the customs which may be associated with ancestor veneration as well as to the disregard they have for the "life norm" or teachings of Confucius who was denounced - finally during this period of the Cultural Revolution - for being the "'number one criminal of feudal thinking'" (Bush 377). (This is not to suggest that the practice of ancestor veneration and the teachings of Confucius are inseparable.) Thus, it is interesting to note that Cardinal Yu Pin uses the ancestral rite to voice his political views. Reading this section of the blessing clarifies Gutheinz's assertion that the ancestral rite, as a part of Taiwan's "Movement to revive Chinese Culture," was partly inspired in reaction against the ideology and actions of the Communist party (156). However, obviously it is also important to examine the Christian words he expresses following this comment about the mainlanders' activities. He states, "I make today a sacrifice to the ancestors, may heaven send its spirit, awaken new life, and make an end to this oppression"
(157). This prayerful statement can be interpreted in the following way: the Cardinal is speaking to God; he is telling him that although he is making a "sacrifice" to the ancestors on this day, he also requests that God free the mainland Chinese from "oppression" which prevents such honored traditions from being performed. Through the "spirit" of God - or the equivalent of "heaven" - life can be renewed on the mainland and the love and respect of the ancestors can be freely expressed. This prayerful statement can also be interpreted in a slightly different way: With the Catholic tradition of the Communion of Saints in mind - in which it is possible for the living to pray to the deceased for help (and not only to pray to God on behalf of the deceased) - it is plausible that the Cardinal is praying to the deceased ancestors in "heaven" to intercede on the behalf of the Chinese people in order to prevent the successful "oppression" of the Chinese Communists (Lamirande 144-146). (Mark Fang points out that Catholics are more open to ancestor veneration than Protestants precisely because "The Catholic Church aside from worshipping God also practices the veneration of saints and angels." (n.d.).) Therefore, I do not suggest that the Cardinal offers the "sacrifice" in exchange for the benefits he and/or the Chinese of Taiwan would like to receive from the ancestors. This interpretation would be in line with the traditional non-Catholic folk beliefs of many Chinese (Addison 50-51; Otake 21; Freedman 92-93). (Mark Fang overtly states, "Catholics...do not consider ancestors as idols. We venerate them and remember them as we do the angels and saints (n.d.). Rather, I suggest that he appropriately prays to the
ancestors, as a Catholic, in request of help in regard to the Communists, and at the same time he offers "sacrifices" to the ancestors as a part of the Confucian tradition which can be characterized as being a this worldly humanism (Ching 9). (I should at least briefly mention that the Confucianists "declined to elaborate on the supernatural problem of the soul," and that the Confucian Li Ki specifically states that ancestral sacrifices are offered to "serve and commemorate the departed...without seeking for anything to be gained by them" (Yang 44; Addison 23-24).) Therefore, I offer the idea that the Cardinal, in this blessing, prays to either the Christian God or to the deceased ancestors in request of help and at the same time shows filial respect to the ancestors by sacrificing to the latter. That is, he does not perform the ancestral rite and pray to God and/or to the ancestors for help as some kind of exchange the way that many traditional Chinese may have and still may as stated above. He performs the rite in order to express the "life norm" or correct behavior of respect and reverence toward the ancestors as taught by the Confucian "rules of propriety" as he also prays for what he believes are the desires and needs of his people (Thompson 40).

Before we turn to a consideration of another aspect of the Cardinal Yu Pin ancestral ritual, it is necessary that we give some attention to the word sacrifice which is used throughout the ritual as well as in the segment we have just examined. Mark Fang, one of the leading liturgists in Taiwan, as previously mentioned, clearly states that the term sacrifice has different meanings in different contexts for Chinese Catholics. He offers two examples of the way in which the
word is especially used: "As Catholics and as Chinese we offer to the heavenly Father in the Eucharist the body and blood of Jesus Christ - once the victim of the cross and now under the species of bread and wine. In a symbolic ceremony incense, flowers, wine and fruit are offered to the ancestors to express our sentiments and our gratitude towards them and our communion with them in the Lord" (n.d.). (We should again note that here Fang alludes to the Christian relationship with the deceased as being a part of the tradition of the "Communion" of Saints.) The liturgist also clarifies the Chinese Catholic understanding of the different ways in which the term can be understood: "As far as sacrifice is concerned, its meaning and the items being offered differ when the intention of sacrifice is God or the ancestors. The Catholic faithful are wholly aware of this difference and distinction although they employ the same Chinese term 'sacrifice' in both cases" (n.d.; italics mine). Undoubtedly it is largely due to the questions which arose during the Chinese Rites Controversy in regard to the symbolic meaning of the ancestral rites which provokes Fang to make such a clarification. He is also likely to be aware that many individuals need to be educated as to what the significance of the rite is for Catholic Chinese, in particular.

Thus, it is already apparent how the Confucian bishops attempted to "christianize Confucianism," or to "confucianize Christianity" in our analysis of this first part of Cardinal Yu Pin's ritual. By integrating prayers to God and/or within the Catholic tradition of the Communion of Saints, Archbishop Lokuang and Bishop Paul Chen Shihkuang demonstrate their ability to incorporate
the Christian message into the context of an extremely important aspect of traditional Chinese society: the tradition of ancestor veneration. Here, these Confucian clergymen succeed in seeing and using "Christianity as giving to the Confucian tradition the religious perspective which it does not possess," in the words of Yves Raquin, S.J. of the Ricci Institute for Chinese Studies of Taipei, Taiwan (per. com. 1993). Gutheinz's description of the first Catholic ancestral ritual demonstrates one of Catholicism's attempts to inculturate. We can also view this ritual - which largely includes concern with the political situation on the mainland - as an attempt at insertion of the Christian message into the context of the political situation in regard to mainland China and Taiwan. The Christian Cardinal in Taiwan prays to the Christian God for a less oppressive political government on the mainland within the context of the Catholic ancestral rite.

The second sacrifice offered by the Cardinal also involves wine but this time an offering is made on the altar in conjunction with fruit. Again, I repeat the blessing Cardinal Yu Pin makes here: "The Yellow River is the cradle of our nation. For twenty years already, we have been separated from our ancestors - those of the family and the nation. In remembrance of their virtue, we make this sacrifice today. The Cardinal of God called us together for this ceremony. We bring our culture to a new life. May heaven always be at China's side. We make a sacrifice of fruit as a sign of our firm resolve to bring about the day on which we will again celebrate in our country" (157). It is indeed quite fascinating to recognize that this entire "blessing" is concerned with being united with the ancestors of
mainland China and with the hope and faith that the Christian God will make this possible. I maintain that the Cardinal begins the blessing with the words "The Yellow River is the cradle of our nation" because, if we think of the word cradle as being defined in terms of "the place of a thing's beginning or early development" - as Webster's New World Dictionary defines it, we can speculate that the Cardinal is drawing a parallel between the beginning of Chinese civilization as having originated with the Yellow River (in the Yellow River basin, to be exact) and Chinese ancestors, the originators of the family line which is continually able to be renewed amongst the Chinese people only as a result of the life of the ancestors in the very beginning (Yang 115-116). According to the Confucian text the Li Chi, the fundamental reasons given for the performance of ancestral and mortuary rites are "to express gratitude toward the originators and recall the beginnings" (Yang 44). A journalist in Kiangsu Province in 1933 paraphrased this Confucian value by stating that periodic ancestral and graveside rites are "based on the principle of the fountain of the water and the root of the tree" (Yang 44). That is, according to the Confucian way of thinking, one must remember ("In remembrance of their virtue") the source of all life: in the case of Chinese civilization, the Yellow River ("the fountain of water"); in regard to the tree, the root; as concerns human life for the Chinese, the ancestors. Belief in these Confucian ideas by the Chinese is why it is so important for Taiwan and the mainland to be reunited as a country, and this is why Cardinal Yu Pin offers fruit in sacrifice "as a sign of our firm resolve to bring about the day on which we will
again celebrate in our country": in order that the Chinese in Taiwan will have free access to the graves of their ancestors. We must recall that many mainland Chinese fled to the island of Taiwan with the defeat of the Kuomintang army in 1949 (Latourette 1964: 395-396). For these non-Communist Chinese, especially, it was particularly heartbreaking to not have access to the gravesites of their family ancestors, in particular, for ancestral rites performed at the graveside is a very old and important aspect of the ancestor veneration tradition. In fact, one day each year - the third day of the third month - has traditionally been a holiday in China and Taiwan and is known as the Ch'ing Ming (which literally means "clear" and "bright") or Grave Sweeping Festival, a special day upon which the living sweep and repair the graves of their ancestors as well as offer sacrifices in the cemetery (Yang 95; Addison 41; Thompson 57, 132). (Thompson points out that although most Chinese focus their attention on the most immediate ancestors who have died or the ones whom are still within the realm of memory, attention is also typically paid to "the most important figures of the past - notably the founding ancestor of the lineage" (132).) Thus, fruit is offered as a symbol of intention and of hope that there will once again be freedom for the Chinese in Taiwan to be able to return to the mainland to offer the sacrifice to the ancestors. In regard to the wine, there is no clear indication of its meaning in this second sacrifice as there appears to be in the first (recall that in the first sacrifice offered by the Cardinal he states that wine and flowers symbolize life community).
In this second sacrifice we can also clearly see how the process of inculturation has taken place for there is evidence of "the integration of culture with Christ," which is the primary emphasis of inculturation according to Luzbetak (72). The words of the Cardinal in the blessing expressed here demonstrate the belief that the Christian message can "bring our culture to a new life," and this concept has become an extremely important one in the development of the history of the Catholic Church - especially since Vatican II. In fact, Dulles points out that Pope Paul VI called for the "process of evangelization" of cultures to "regenerate and renew" these cultures and not just accept them as they are (Dulles 41). Dulles also reports that the same ideas were encouraged at the important Bishops' Synod of 1977. There it was proclaimed, to use Dulles' words, that "Christianity must not only find roots in human cultures but must transform them" (41). Cardinal Yu Pin expresses these ideas clearly in the words quoted above. He (and the Confucian clergy who wrote the script) undoubtedly understand that Christianity was to "regenerate and renew," as well as "transform" Chinese culture from within and to make it something "new." The Cardinal's words demonstrate that he has faith that Christianity can perfect such an ancient civilization which began in the Yellow River basin and which had such an edifying "ceremony" as formally remembering the ancestors of the "family and the nation." It is feasible to interpret the words of this blessing to mean that the Christian message has such power that it is possible that the full insertion of its teachings and spirit throughout all of China will make it possible for all Chinese to
once again be united and no longer have to suffer the political divisions that Communism has brought about, and that this is how Christianity will bring Chinese "culture to new life." (Incidentally, the political situation between Taiwan and the mainland government has improved since the early 1970s, and many Taiwan Chinese are now free to travel to the gravesites of their ancestors.)

Before proceeding to a consideration of the third sacrifice offered in the 1971 Taiwan ancestral rite, I would just like to point out some parallel uses of the word root both in Confucianist thought and in the Church's thinking about how the process of inculturation should proceed as it endeavors to integrate the Christian message with cultures all over the world. Above I quote the words of Dulles who reports that the 1977 Bishops' Synod indicates that the goal of Christianity is to transform the "roots" of human cultures (41). Similarly, Chupungco explains that some of the Documents of Vatican II, and even another Church document which was written before that momentous occasion (he does not state which one), indicate that new liturgical forms can be added to the traditional Catholic Roman rite just as long as they "harmonize" with the true and authentic spirit of the Church (1982:46). Dulles expresses similar ideas when he states that new cultural forms can always be incorporated into the universal Church, but that it is important to keep track of the history of the Church's origins in order to achieve unity as Catholics throughout the world (50). Dulles seems to agree with B. Lonergan's understanding of what this unity is: "the real root and ground of unity is being in love with God - the fact that God's love has flooded
our inmost hearts through the Holy Spirit he has given us (Rom 5:5)" (42). Thus, the parallel I am endeavoring to make should hopefully be becoming apparent: I pointed out earlier that Confucianists value the "root" of their civilization and of their lives; therefore, they venerate their ancestors and follow their teachings. (The Confucian Analects in Legge's The Four Books asks the following question: "Filial piety and fraternal submission! - are they not the root of all benevolent actions?" (139; my italics) Similarly, Catholicism values the history of its culture (Dulles claims that "Christianity has certain features of a culture. It is a system of meanings, historically transmitted, embodied in symbols, and instilled into new members of the group..." (40).) As a result, the Church wants to maintain an awareness of the "root" of Catholicism which, according to Dulles and Lonergan, is found in the Bible to be the love of God as explained in Romans 5:5, as indicated above. However, Catholics also want to keep track of the history of the development of the Church in the world in order not to allow the Christian message to become diluted in a world where Catholics have been making a wholehearted effort to inculturate the variety of cultures of humankind. Dulles asserts that, "New cultural elements can always enter into the Christian synthesis, but the church's continuity with its origins must always be preserved" (50). Hence, at this point it should be obvious to the reader that the culture of Catholicism is just as concerned with remaining consciously aware not only with its origins or root (of course) but with the development of its history in the world just as the Chinese who follow the teachings of Confucius are with theirs.
(The Confucian Analects state that "Yu...was famed among other disciples of Confucius for his strong memory and love for the doctrines of antiquity" (Legge 1966:138). Interestingly enough, it is the root of Christianity - the love of God - which aspires (through human channels) to locate, penetrate and ameliorate the quality of the root of human cultures such as that of the tradition of ancestor veneration in China in order to perfect it and "make the beautiful more beautiful" (Luzbetak 67). Chupungco describes possibilities of the coming together of the roots and history of Christianity and the roots and history of non-Christian cultures (such as that of China) in terms of what will occur with the creation of new liturgical rites (such as that of the ancestor veneration ritual). He states, "The process can perhaps be described as a tree that branches out, as a rite that develops into other rites to form a Roman liturgical family" (1982:46). Thus, once again we can see that Catholics, just like Confucianist Chinese who want to remember, are concerned with "the root of the tree" (Yang 44).

To return to our consideration of the Catholic ritual, in the third sacrifice, in which the foods wine, meal, soup, grain and tea leaves are offered (and where chopsticks are mentioned as being included) no explanation of the symbolic meaning of these foods are provided by Gutheinz. He simply summarizes what occurs at this moment in the ritual by stating that "the chairman gives a homily on the meaning of the celebration as expressed in both of the blessings and in the invitation to the celebration" which plausibly involves an elaboration on the meaning of the life community of the Chinese and
their ancestors both in Taiwan and the mainland and the hope that all will be reunited; the remembrance of the originators of their lives - the ancestors; advice to follow the "life norm" of Confucian teachings; and the importance of praying to God, as well as the possibility of praying to and for the ancestors.

The last part of the ceremony ends in a manner similar to the way in which the entire service begins: both begin and end with fireworks and music. At the beginning of the ceremony, after the chairman and the co-celebrants have taken their seats, Gutheinz reports that the "master of ceremonies lights the fire as a sign that the higher ancestors are close to the people celebrating" (156). Although it is not clear from the translation what type of "fire" this is, my guess is that it is a candle because these have traditionally been used in traditional ancestral ceremonies and because the photograph of Cardinal Yu Pin provided in Gutheinz's German article shows very large candles on the altar. Whatever may be the case, a fire is lit and this signifies for these Catholic Chinese, according to Gutheinz, that the ancestors are present amongst this life community (156). In the last section of the ceremony, after the third sacrifice, and after the chairman blesses those present "in the name of the ancestors" (which I have no idea how to interpret), Gutheinz indicates that "the master of ceremonies brings the light. Those present gaze at the light and turn slowly backwards when passing by it - apparently a symbol that the ancestors are passing by and leaving the assembly" (157). Thus, the light consistently represents the symbolic presence of the ancestors both at the beginning and the
termination of the ceremony. In this first section of the ceremony, Cardinal Yu Pin bows - as he does all throughout the service. In this first case, everyone present bows three times after the light is lit, and then the chairman steps up to the altar and bows - apparently only once - before offering incense. In the last section of the ceremony, the assembly bows three times before the Cardinal goes to the altar and bows - apparently only once - and before he blesses all those present. The assembly bows in response to his blessing. In addition, during the three offerings of sacrifices already considered here, the chairman consistently walks up to the altar and bows before making his sacrifice (whatever it is) and then again before he "speaks" his blessings. Thus we can discern that throughout the entire ritual everyone present bows on some occasions only once and on others three times. However, no interpretation of the significance of bows is given until Gutheinz describes the "mutual reverence" ritual which takes place immediately after the music and firecrackers signify the "end of the celebration" (157). It is significant to note, perhaps, that during this last ritual in which those who are over seventy years of age and those who are younger than that age bow to each other twice - not once, and not three times - as is the case during the ancestral ritual. Although Gutheinz does not inform the reader what the bowing means during the ancestor liturgy, we can extrapolate from his use of the words "mutual reverence" in regard to the latter rite that the bows during the ancestral ceremony also symbolize reverence or respect for those of the life community - both the living and the dead. Based on a close examination of the
entire ritual, it appears that the chairman and the entire assembly bow three times before the ancestors, and that the chairman only bows once before he offers a sacrifice, and in the final section of the ritual, he bows only once before blessing the entire assembly. At this point, the assembly only bows once in response to the Cardinal's blessing. Therefore, it appears that everyone consistently bows three times to the ancestors, but only once before a sacrifice is offered on the altar, and once to each other (the living) during the ancestral rite, but twice to each other (the living) after the rite. Whatever the specifics may be, I speculate that all of the bows signify reverence both for the living and the dead. It is possible that more bows are enacted in reverence to the ancestors because this ceremony is conducted in honor and respect for them; therefore, they are deserving of three bows. Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate any literature on the significance of bowing during an ancestral rite as performed in the Catholic Church beyond the Gutheinz article. However, we need to recall the words of Reverend Joseph Chiang who indicates that the kind of bowing which typically occurs nowadays by the Chinese - whether the gesture occurs in the Catholic Church or not - is that of the jugung, a deep bow from the waist. Again I suggest that the likelihood is strong that the kind of bowing which was enacted at the 1971 ancestral ceremony in Taipei was that of the jugung based on Father Chiang's statement made during our December 1993 interview.

In regard to the offering of incense during the rite, interestingly, it is only offered once during the ritual - in the very
first part of the rite after the lighting of the fire and the bowing three times to the ancestors takes place. At this point, the chairman proceeds "to the altar table, bows, and makes a sacrifice of incense three times" (156). From the wording it is unclear whether the Cardinal bows and lights one stick of incense and repeats these actions three times (it is clear from the photographs that the incense are in the form of joss sticks) or whether he bows once and then proceeds to light three sticks of incense (156). Whatever may be the case, the offering of the incense, according to Gutheinz, is "generally understood" to be "a sign of reverence and veneration" (156). Thus, both the incense and the bowing are interpreted by Catholics to signify reverence, according to Gutheinz.

I would also like to briefly point out that the piece of furniture upon which all of the sacrifices take place during this ritual is at times referred to as an "altar table" and at other times as a "table" by Gutheinz (or the translator - or, hopefully, both). This could be of some significance since the word altar has religious associations while the word table has more secular connotations as I pointed out in our close examination of the documents that were submitted to Rome by different missionaries during the Chinese Rites Controversy in Chapter 6. Perhaps the use of the phrase altar table is the most appropriate because it is possible to interpret the entire ancestral ritual, from the Church's point of view as described in the 1939 Instruction at least (and in some cases this is likely to have been true), as being a Christian religious ceremony which transformed the secular ancestral rite (Noll 88-89).
Although I drew parallels between the artifacts, gesture, and words spoken between the non-Catholic traditional ancestral ritual as reported by Addison and the Catholic ritual as described by Gutheinz, I was not in a position, at that point, to consider the similarities and differences between the sampling of traditional folk interpretations of these artifacts and behaviors and the Catholic interpretations of these artifacts and behaviors. Let me proceed to do so now. If the reader recalls, based on the information provided by Yang and Addison, food and drink are offered to the ancestors as symbols that an effort is being made by the living to continue contact with the deceased in the traditional non-Catholic rite. Addison adds that these periodical ceremonies are performed in order to maintain contact with the deceased as a continued demonstration of filial behavior - regardless of whether or not there are any supernatural beliefs associated with the rituals; that is, whether the living believe that the deceased are actually present at the rite and somehow partake of the food and drink or not, this offering still illustrates filial piety (Yang 40; Addison 49-50). The symbolism of food and drink is not a very clear cut matter in the very first performance of the Catholic ancestral ritual according to the interpretations provided by Gutheinz. In the third sacrifice offered by the Cardinal, the most food is mentioned - that of meal, soup, grain and tea leaves (157). Wine is also offered in this third rite; however, absolutely no interpretation of the symbolic meaning of this food and drink is offered here. In the second sacrifice, although wine and fruit are specifically named as being offered at this time, only the symbolic importance of the
fruit is explained: Gutheinz reports that the Cardinal claims that the fruit symbolizes the "firm resolve" that those Chinese present at the ceremony will make to once again be able to celebrate the ancestral rite on mainland China (157). The first sacrifice outlined by Gutheinz involves wine and flowers. Here the Cardinal indicates that the wine and flowers together signify the "life community" of Chinese Catholics. My interpretation of this phrase is that life community represents all Chinese, both the living and the dead, on mainland China and in Taiwan (and elsewhere) and that the offering of the wine and the flowers is evidence of the Confucian behavior of filiality or hsi ao of the living who are outwardly making an effort to maintain their relationship with the deceased ancestors. However, in Catholic terms, this offering is symbolic of the tradition of the Communion of Saints which teaches that relationships between the dead and the living do indeed exist after individuals in the life community die (Lamirande 144-146). Therefore, the meaning of the offering of wine and flowers in this sacrifice overlaps with the meanings of the offering of food and drink as provided by Addison and Yang. Both non-Catholics and Catholics offer the food and drink/wine and flowers as symbols that the relationship between the dead and the living continues and as a way to express their filial piety. However, the quality of the relationship which is believed to exist between the dead and the living varies more amongst the non-Catholics than amongst the Catholics. As pointed out previously, while some non-Catholics do in a sense deify their ancestors and believe they have the ability to help or hurt the living, others have
no such supernatural beliefs associated with the deceased (Otake 21; Freedman 92, 93; Addison 52). The Catholics, on the other hand, offer the wine and flowers in this first part of the rite as an outward expression that the relationship with the deceased continues both as a means of demonstrating filial piety in the Confucian tradition and as a symbol that the dead and the living can help each other in accordance with the Catholic tradition of the Communion of Saints (Carroll per. com. 1994; Lamirande 144-46; Lawler and Wuerl 240-241; Fang n.d.). Thus, although we are referring to food and drink in regard to the non-Catholic Chinese, and to drink - in this case wine - and flowers in the case of the Catholic Chinese, we can ascertain that these overlapping, but not identical symbols, have similar symbolic meanings.

It has already been indicated that the traditional rite sometimes includes flowers although Addison's version does not make mention of them. Although Yang and Minamiki do not indicate that flowers are a necessary part of the ancestral rite, Thompson does; however, he does not provide any interpretation of them for the traditional folk. In the Catholic ceremony, Gutheinz reports that the Cardinal offers flowers to signify the "creative powers of the ancestors" which I interpret as meaning that the ancestors are revered here because they are responsible for the life which exists for Chinese today and because they are responsible for having lived and passed on the "life norm" or li - that is, the model of behavior and values which the Chinese continue to hold in their hearts and to act out.
I considered the difference between the use of the term *prostration* in Addison's description of the rite as compared to the use of the term *bow* in Gutheinz's description earlier. I concluded at that time that Addison means kowtow when he uses the word *prostration*, and that Gutheinz (and/or the translator) means *jugung* when he uses the word *bow*. However, we should be aware that many non-Catholic ancestral rites are likely being performed in this "modern" era, to use Reverend Chiang's word, with the *jugung*, and not the more traditional kowtow. (In fact, in the ancestral ritual which is advised by Bishop Paul Ch'eng Shihkuang to be carried out by Catholic families, Gutheinz clearly indicates that either three "bows" [*jugung*] or three "genuflections" [traditional Catholic knee bending reverential gestures] or "touching the floor nine times with the head" [kowtow] can be performed in the context of the home during the rite. Gutheinz does not indicate whether all three of these possibilities are also possible within the context of the Church (159; my brackets). The question with which we are here most concerned however, is the following: is there a difference in significance between the bow in the traditional performance as opposed to that of the Catholic rite? The bowing for non-Catholics expresses reverence for parents, superiors and the dead according to Addison and Yang while the bowing to superiors and the dead for Catholics, I have surmised from Gutheinz, is also a symbol of reverence (Addison 37; Yang 39; Gutheinz 157). Therefore we can answer this question with a simple no: the meaning of the bowing, whether it is the kowtow or the *jugung* is the same in the non-Catholic and the Catholic ancestral
rites. In both ceremonies, the bowing gesture demonstrates *reverence*, which, according to *Webster's New World Dictionary* means an outward expression of "a feeling or attitude of deep respect, love, and awe, as for something sacred; veneration."

In regard to a difference in meanings pertaining to the use of candles and incense in the two rites, Addison and Yang put forth that both of these artifacts are a means of communicating with the deceased and, according to Yang, a source of "sustenance" for them as well (39). I speculate that this implies that the light and/or smoke from the candles and incense are considered to be a way of communicating with the deceased, and therefore of comforting them in the spirit world. (We must keep in mind that I only offer a sampling of folk beliefs about these artifacts and behaviors here; we must recognize that there are undoubtedly many more and/or none at all held in regard to them!) The Catholic interpretation of the meaning of the fire/light (candles?), according to Gutheinz, is that they simply represent the symbolic presence of the ancestors during the ceremony (157). In addition, the significance of incense for Catholics as used during the rite is clearly explained by Gutheinz: the lighting of incense signifies "reverence and veneration," as does the bowing gesture (156).

For both Catholics and non-Catholics, the individual meanings of the items and behaviors in the ancestral rite generally express a desire on the part of the living to maintain and demonstrate a continued relationship with the deceased (As reported by Gutheinz, Bishop Ch'eng states, "We must express our connection in visual rites
(158)). This is accomplished in both kinds of rites by the offerings which are made, the words that are spoken, and the bowing which occurs as a means of expressing deep reverence for the ancestors. Therefore, one major motive of both rites is essentially these overt expressions of filial piety. In reference to the non-Catholic ancestral rites, Addison states, "the fact remains that its distinctive characteristic is the element of filial piety" (55). In reference to the Catholic rite, Mark Fang claims that part of the reason the Archbishop and the Bishop "planned" the "set of rituals" to be conducted within the Church was "in order to express filial piety," as mentioned briefly earlier (n.d.). As also briefly previously indicated in this regard, these Confucianist clergymen also wanted the ritual to express concern for "last and ultimate things" which refers to the Christian meaning that imbibes the ritual when performed in the context of the Catholic Church. The words of Gutheinz best express the goal of inculturation of the Catholic Church in relation to the ancient Chinese rite and the values it traditionally demonstrates: "The important thing is that the celebration of ancestor veneration proclaims and deepens the appropriation of the truth of the immortality, the resurrection of the body, and the community of all in Christ - whether they are living or dead" (Gutheinz 159). Here the scholar and priest suggests that the ritual of ancestor veneration as performed in the Catholic Church enhances an understanding of the Christian message. The words of Chupungco echo these ideas as being the goal of inculturation: "The center of every liturgical celebration is the person of Christ and his pervading paschal
mystery. This principle is the determining element in the definition of the Christian liturgy. Whether the Church celebrates baptism or the Eucharist or prays the liturgy of the hours [or performs the Chinese ancestral service], she continually proclaims Christ and the paschal mystery...[in some societies] the liturgy will be colored by corresponding values and attitudes toward life. But the heart of the celebration will always be the Christian mystery...The expression, 'The liturgy is the celebration of life,' means that the paschal mystery is celebrated in the context of the people's concrete experience" (1982:66; brackets mine). Thus, we can see how the paschal mystery is "celebrated in the context" of the Chinese people's "concrete experience" of the ancestral memorial service. Hopefully it has become clear to the reader how the Catholic rite - at least as it was performed by Cardinal Yu Pin in 1971 - is similar to yet different from the traditional ancestral rite. In addition, hopefully it has become apparent that once the Christian message (the text), is inserted into a cultural manifestation of a people (the context), how, ironically - the context helps to illuminate the text for the people and that the latter does not only serve to make the beauty of the culture more beautiful (as I earlier indicated was Luzbetak's claim), at least according to the observations of Gutheinz and Chupungco (Luzbetak 67; Gutheinz 159; Chupungco 1982:66).

Apparently the plan of set rituals put together by Archbishop Lokuang and Bishop Paul Ch'eng Shihkuang for the first performance of the ancestral rite by Cardinal Yu Pin on January 27, 1971 at the Pedagogical University in Taipei was not a standardized liturgical
text. Rather, Sister Janet Carroll (per. com. 1994) and I speculate that the standardized liturgical text which was later developed was probably largely based on the set of rituals in that first performance of the rite. Based on the information I have available to me at this time, it appears that the first Chinese ancestral memorial service liturgical text which was created and made available by the Chinese Bishops' Conference in Taipei, Taiwan on December 29, 1974, was a result of both Cardinal Yu Pin's nationally televised performance of the rite and a subsequent Bishop's Conference which took place in Hong Kong in March of 1971. At this Bishops' Conference were the representatives of the Bishops' Conferences of the Japanese, Vietnamese, Korean and Chinese Catholics. During this two day affair, where, "the synthesis between Christian revelation and Asian thought was the theme, the Archbishop of Saigon...suggested a study about liturgical adaptation, especially in terms of ancestor veneration" (Gutheinz 159). Although Gutheinz does not overtly state that this is where and when the idea to standardize an ancestral liturgical text was decided upon, undoubtedly this gathering had a strong influence on its eventual development of the liturgy by the Bishops' Conference in Taipei four years later. According to a statement made by Mark Fang (per. com. 1993), "there is no other guidelines whatsoever except this one" which is four pages long. To my knowledge there is no English translation of the text with the exception of the one I had translated for this project by Reverend Edward J. Flanigan, Director of the Language School in Taichung, Taiwan.
The "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy (for Church and Family use)" as it is called, is divided into six parts: a statement of Objectives; a statement of General Principles; the Style of the ancestral tablet; the Ceremonies for Church and Family use; a statement which clarifies that the liturgy may be revised at a later point; and date of approval of this liturgical text. Before I proceed to provide a large portion of the Chinese Bishops' liturgical text of 1974, it is necessary that I define the meaning of the word *liturgy* in the Catholic Church. According to *The Teaching of Christ: A Catholic Catechism for Adults*, *liturgy* is public prayer which takes place within the Church of Christ, and which is considered to be sacred. The liturgy is said to be extremely important by the Catholic Church because private prayer, though it prepares one for public prayer, is not enough. That is, the Catholic Church maintains that "It is God's plan that Christians relate to Him not merely as individuals, but as a family united in Christ" (Lawler and Wuerl 403). Thus, because liturgical prayer is public, it is subject to certain regulations which private prayer is not. Therefore, let us turn our attention to the regulations "proposed" by the Chinese Bishops' Conference in regard to the ancestral memorial service. The liturgical text - with the exception of the ceremonial outline for family use (and an image of the family ancestral tablet) - as translated by Father Flanigan, follows below. First we shall look at the statement of Objectives:

**Part I  Objective**
These liturgical rules are determined for the following purposes:
1) To emphasize God's commandment "Honor they Father and Mother" as the basic spirit, to encourage filial piety among Catholics, and to increase filial love toward God.
2) To correct a popular misconception about the Church that "to believe in God is to neglect the ancestors"; and to give non-Catholics a correct impression in this matter.
3) To show forth the virtues in Chinese culture concerning filial love, and the "careful observance of obsequities [sic] and memorial remembrances"; and to foster the relationship between the Gospel and our national traditional culture.
4) To bring about a proper development among Catholics in reverence of their forebearers and to break down any semblance of superstition in this regard (1).

It is possible to restate #1, "to emphasize God's commandment 'Honor thy Father and Mother' as to the basic spirit, to encourage filial piety among Catholics, and to increase filial love towards God," in the following way: God, who defines himself in terms of human relationships, "God the Father," encourages the human family to honor one's parents through the acts of filial piety, which, as the virtue which governs "the relationship between aged parents and their offspring," extends "ultimately to his general conduct in society" (Minamiki 1985:4). Since God is the Father in Heaven, this objective also encourages the human family to behave with the proper reverence (and in this case worship) in relationship to him. This objective clearly parallels the most significant traditional value of Chinese culture with one of the most significant traditional values of Catholic culture as expressed in the Ten Commandments. (Under the heading of 'Filial Prayer,' in The Teaching of Christ it states, "In the New Testament, the basis for prayer is the new relationship by which Christians come to the Father through Jesus Christ. This is the
relationship of adopted sonship. The Christian, joyfully aware of his sonship, can pray with childlike confidence and tender intimacy to the loving father, to 'Abba' (Rom. 8.15; Gal. 4.6)" (Lawler and Wuerl 389-90).

In regard to #2, "To correct a popular misconception about the Church that 'to believe in God is to neglect the ancestors'; and to give to non-Catholics a correct impression in this matter" is quite straightforward. Gutheinz seems to indicate that many older Chinese were hesitant to become Catholics because, from their view, not enough emphasis was placed on veneration of the ancestors within this Christian religion (158). There is no ambiguity as to why "Old people," especially, would have this "popular misconception" since for centuries many of the traditional forms of ancestor veneration were not permitted by the Church or, after 1939, by well intentioned but uninformed missionaries (Gutheinz 158; Carroll per. com 1993; Flanigan per. com. 1994).

The first part of the third objective, "To show forth the virtues in Chinese culture concerning filial love, and the 'careful observance of obsequities [sic] and memorial remembrances';" indicates that the Church is proud to participate in the demonstration of one of the most admirable attributes of Chinese society, that of 'filial love,' through the performance of the ancestral rite - whether it may be simply a periodic ceremony in their honor (as performed during Chinese New Year, for instance) or for the purpose of obsequies. The second section of the third objective, "to foster the relationship between the Gospel and our national traditional culture,"
undoubtedly refers to the renewed efforts being made by the Catholic Church to inculcate, especially since Vatican II.

Number 4 indicates a desire on the part of the Chinese Catholic Church to do away with any beliefs or actions associated with the rites which may give the appearance of being non-Christian when it states the objective "to bring about a proper development among Catholics in reverence of their forebearers and to break down any semblance of superstition in this regard" It also emphasizes the strictly Catholic expression of the Chinese ancestral rites.

A presentation of the second part of the liturgy follows:

Part II: General Principles
1) In honor of the ancestors, to give return for their blessings towards us, we must always pray and offer Mass for their entry into Heaven and to fulfill our duty of filial reverence.
2) The ancestors are not looked on as deities, so we do not burn paper money. The memorial ceremony is according to our national traditional customs, to which we add fitting Church customs.
3) According to the above principles, in every parish area (Whether church, institution or organization) the Church and family homes may set up ancestor shrines with incense burners in any suitable place (although separate from the tabernacles, crucifix and statues), as a symbol of thanksgiving and filial reverence (1).

The first principle indicates that the ancestral rite is performed within the context of the Catholic Church "In honor of the ancestors, to give return for their blessings towards us, we must always pray and offer Mass for their entry into Heaven and to fulfil our duty of filial reverence." From my view, the first part of this principle can be
interpreted in two different ways or both ways at once. On one hand, the principle could be stating that the rite - as well as prayers and Mass - express gratitude for the "blessings," or what the deceased did for the living while they were alive (or for even bringing the living into the world); on the other hand, it could be asserting that the rite, prayers and Masses are a way of demonstrating thanks for the "blessings," or intercession of the dead after their death for the living in accordance with the tradition of the Communion of Saints. The second half of the sentence is most certainly an articulation of the Communion of Saints tradition expressed in Chinese terminology. That is, a principle of the Catholic Church, as stated, is that the rites are performed as part of one's responsibility to others in society, and especially but not only in regard to one's parents. The ancestral rites are a means by which the church militant (the living) can "fulfill" this "filial reverence" by having them performed after Mass in order to assure that the deceased loved ones enter the Kingdom of Heaven for eternity. This means of interceding for the deceased can also be achieved through prayer, either during, before or after an ancestral rite. The Catholic catechism states, "The living can bring comfort and alleviation to those in purgatory by their intercessions, by 'Masses, prayers, almsgiving and other pious works which, in the manner of the Church, the faithful are accustomed to do for others of the faithful'" (Lawler and Wuerl 527). "Other pious works" can here be considered to be the performance of the ancestral ritual.

The first section of this second General Principle, "The ancestors
are not looked on as deities, so we do not burn paper money," is likely to be in direct reference to the fourth Objective of Part I where the liturgy indicates the goal of breaking "down any semblance of superstition." Although mention of paper money is not included in my quotation of Addison's description of a traditional rite, I indicated earlier that in some instances, paper money is used in a traditional ancestral rite. Some Chinese especially incorporate the use of paper money into funerary ancestral rites. For example, C.K. Yang indicates that paper money may be scattered before a funeral procession in an effort to scare away any evil spirits which may be present. In addition, paper money as well as many other paper objects such as houses, boats, gardens and clothes may be burned with the hope that these objects accompany and therefore comfort the deceased in the spirit world as well as provide a means for a "safe and speedy journey of the spirit to Heaven" (Yang 31-32). This principle of the liturgical text endeavors to clarify that this kind of heaven does not exist in which the deceased have the ability to enjoy these burned goods and money as if they were little gods or "deities."

Indeed, this traditional practice of burning paper money (and other objects) could be what the 1939 Instruction refers to when, after it declares the rites as being secular, goes on to advise Catholics to remain "passive" if there is "the appearance of superstition" (Noll 88). If this is the case, then my comment in Chapter 7 that *Plane compertum est* contradicts itself by declaring the rites secular on the one hand, but advising passivity on the other with "the appearance of superstition," would be inappropriate with the knowledge in mind
that many Chinese traditionally burn money and other goods for supernatural purposes at some ancestral rites (Noll 88). Apparently, the Catholic Church can find no way to secularize or to Christianize this practice at all - as demonstrated by this second principle.

The third general principle of Part II is quite straightforward: "According to the above principles, in every parish area (whether church, institution or organization) the Church and family homes may set up ancestor shrines with incense burners in any suitable place (although separate from the tabernacle, crucifix and statues), as a symbol of thanksgiving and filial reverence." This principle simply endeavors to give permission to Catholics to maintain a shrine without giving any particulars as to what that should include with the exception of the incense burners. It also clarifies that any religious objects should be kept separate from the shrine which is not religious in connotation, but is simply a symbol of gratitude.

Part III: Style
The style of the ancestor tablet, for church use, can be made along the style suggested on Page 4. For use in family homes, any style can be freely patterned from this one (1).
1) Size: 30" by 25"
2) Cross on Top is Red
3) Carved Dragons on Side
   In Gold
4) Anything Else Left to
   Proper Church to Decide...(4)

Part IV: The Ceremony

   The memorial rite is divided into one for Church use and
   one for use in family setting.
I. Church Rite
   (The rite for church use follows the national ceremonial
   directive #38.)

   On the national occasions of the Spring Festival (Chinese NY),
   Ching-Ming festival (Sweeping of the Tombs) and the religious
   observances of All Saints and All Souls Day, the priest
   announces to the people that Mass will be offered and
   following the Mass the memorial service for the ancestors will
   be solemnly offered. After the Mass, the celebrant changes
   vestments, to the long Chinese ceremonial cassock, and then
   with 2 servers, goes before the ancestor tablet to offer the rite
   as follows:
   1) The rite begins (conducted by the celebrant and another
      adult Catholic acting as Master of Ceremonies (MC)
   2) All rise
   3) Celebrant takes his designated position (either priest or a
      Catholic representing the priest celebrant)
   4) Funeral music (or hymns can be used)
   5) Firecrackers set off
   6) Scripture Reading: (Book of Sirach 44:1-15, or another
      suitable reading chosen by the priest and read aloud by the
      server or one of the Catholics, with the congregation standing.
   7) Homily (the celebrant speaks of the meaning of the reading
      and its relationship to the day's ceremony)
   8) Offering of Incense (Catholics stand)
   The Master of Ceremonies lights 3 joss sticks of incense, and
   with both hands, passes them to the celebrant, who after
   receiving them, raises them with both hands to his forehead
   and then bows profoundly (Formal Chinese ceremonial bow)
   and then places the incense sticks, one by one, in the incense
   holder pot which is in the middle of the shrine table right in
front of the ancestor tablet. Powder (loose) incense can also be used.

9) The Offerings
a) Flowers: The MC gives a bouquet of flowers to the celebrant, who receives them with both hands and offers the prescribed ceremonial offering (object raised to the forehead followed by a profound bow) and then puts the flowers in a vase which is placed on either side of the ancestor tablet, along with the already lighted red candles that are there.

b) Wine: The MC gives a wine flask to the celebrant who again receives it with both hands and offers it with the usual ceremonial offering and bow, and then pours the wine into 3 small cups which are placed immediately in front of the ancestor tablet.

c) Fruit: The MC gives a bowl of fruit to the celebrant, who again after receiving it with both hands, makes the usual offering and bow and places the fruit bowl on either side of the wine cups.

10) Rite of formal Obeisance
Three formal profound bows are made toward the ancestor tablet at the spoken command of the MC, who calls out 'first bow' 'second bow' 'third bow' and the Celebrant and all the congregation deeply bowing at his commands.

11) Prayer of the Faithful
Celebrant: My dear people, God's command is that we honor our parents and revere our ancestors. Today we recall our forebearers with grateful hearts, specially pray for them before our Heavenly Father.

i- Let us pray for our ancestors and all our deceased relatives, beseeching the Lord to unite them together in Heaven to enjoy eternal happiness. (resp) Lord hear our prayer

ii- Let us pray for the deceased whom no one remembers, asking the Lord to pour out His mercy and bring them to His Heavenly home, to join the ranks of God's children there. (resp)

iii- Let us pray for all children, asking the Lord to keep them ever mindful of the blessing of their parental upbringing and their filial reverence for them. (resp)

iv- Let us pray for all families in our parish, asking the Lord now to grant us peace and harmony, united in spirit, and in the life to come, to be reunited with our forebearers and relatives. (Other intentions may be added)
Celebrant: Most merciful Heavenly Father, You are the God of Abraham and Jacob, and the God of our ancestors. We beseech you to hear the prayers of us your family and grant to our ancestors eternal rest in Your bosom, forever sharing in Your love.
Thru Christ Our Lord
12) Music (Funeral music can be played or hymns sung, or omitted)
13) Rite is concluded
14) The celebrant departs (the Celebrant along with the servers bow towards the ancestor tablet and then leave. The congregation, after a reverence towards the Blessed Sacrament, also leave) ....

Part V: If anything is lacking in this ceremony, it will be corrected or added by the Bishops' Conference at an appropriate time.
Part VI: The Proposed ceremony has been approved for use by the Bishops' Conference on December 29, 1974... " (2-4).

Parts V and VI are self explanatory. Part V, however, is worthy of note because it suggests that the "proposed" liturgy of 1974 is not a final one. The introduction to the Church rite, directly under the #1, Part IV heading, indicates the times during the year when it is appropriate for the ancestral memorial service to be performed within the Catholic Church. One of those occasions is that of the Spring Festival, more commonly known in the West as Chinese New Year, which occurs "not earlier than January 21 or later than February 19" according to the lunar calendar (it varies slightly from year to year) (Latourette 1964:593). Chinese New Year is traditionally the most significant holiday for the Chinese when all return to their families to have a feast, relax, pay calls on one's seniors and superiors, and for some, to traditionally offer incense and food before family altars (Thompson 130-132; Yang 96). The
celebration of Chinese New Year lasts for several weeks, at least, and all businesses are at a standstill for about a week while in previous times it was for almost a month (Thompson 132). (When I lived in Taiwan in the early 1980s, businesses closed for four days.) Thus, although the liturgy as quoted above only states that the rite can be performed "on the occasions of Spring Festival...," it is likely that the ancestral performance can occur any time during the Chinese New Year celebration, but as close as possible to the actual date of the lunar New Year. (I am certain that this is the case with the time of performance of the rites in the Catholic Church here in the United States, but am speculating in regard to Taiwan).

The date Cardinal Yu Pin performed the first Catholic ancestral rite was in late January of 1971, incidentally, which was during Chinese New Year (Gutheinz 152). Mention of this fact leads me to point out that that ceremony began with the use of fireworks just as the ritual described here in the liturgical text does. Fireworks have traditionally been used by Chinese to scare away any evil spirits at Chinese New Year celebrations and according to Nancy Zeng Berliner, "at any other festive or grave ceremony" (77; Williams 181). Berliner claims, however, that they are "now set off in celebration" (77). I surmise, therefore, that Berliner's latter evaluation of the purpose of using fireworks is the position of the Church in regard to their use during the ancestral rite. Here too, the Church has decided to view a traditional custom of the Chinese which may or may not have supernatural associations as being secular just as the rites were proclaimed to be secular in the 1939 Instruction in an analogous
situation. (When living in Taiwan, I was told that the firecrackers did indeed scare aware evil spirits on more than one occasion.)

Given this fact that the Chinese New Year is traditionally the most important holiday of the year and that ancestral offerings have traditionally been made at this time, it is understandable why the liturgical text of the Chinese Bishops' Conference would indicate that this is an important occasion upon which to have the rite performed. It is also not surprising that the rite is performed on the occasion of the Ching-Ming Festival since this is especially the time when the Chinese remember their deceased ancestors with the offering of sacrifices at the gravesite, as mentioned previously (Thompson 132). Therefore, it is understandable as to why the Church would name both of these holidays as being a time during which the ancestral rites would be performed within the context of the Church.

Just as it is easy for us to appreciate why the Church has designated these two important Chinese festivals which traditionally involve veneration of the ancestors (to different degrees) as days upon which the Church will perform the rite according to the Bishops' Conference liturgical text quoted above, it is also easy to comprehend why the bishops decided to have the ceremony enacted on All Saints Day and All Souls Day, two traditionally important festivals which developed in the West in the Catholic Church. The Feast of All Saints is celebrated on November 1 in the Church (and has been since some time after 610 when Pope Boniface IV turned the Pantheon, a Roman temple, into a Christian Church) in commemoration of all the martyrs and confessors (that is, saints who were not martyrs): "It is the feast
of all those whom Christ sanctified, of all those members of the holy people who have reached their heavenly home" (Douillet 122). In essence, it is a feast which remembers the deceased who are considered holy and who are considered to be in heaven by the Catholic Church. Traditionally, a special Mass is said in their honor. In reference to All Souls Day, this Catholic (and Anglican) festival day, celebrated on November 2, has been a tradition in the Church since 998 when it was instituted by the Abbot Odilo of Cluny, France. On this day, the Church remembers in a special Mass all "the faithful departed," and not only those who have gone to heaven as is true of the festival which precedes this day (McDannald 34). Thus, it is quite obvious that the Church has made an effort to integrate traditional and significant festivals which originated in the West as a part of the culture of Catholicism with traditional and significant festivals which originated in the East into the culture of Catholicism. All four festivals named here in the liturgical rite are concerned with the commemoration of the deceased, and therefore it is completely logical that these are the festivals which were chosen by the bishops at which to have the ancestral memorial service performed after Mass. We should note that the Masses have traditionally been said for the Saints and the faithfully departed in the culture of Catholicism in the West while ancestor veneration rituals have traditionally been said in the culture of the East for deceased ancestors. Here the two traditions - the saying of the Mass for the deceased and the performance of the ancestor ritual for the deceased - have been combined. The liturgy states the the memorial service
for the ancestors will be offered after the Mass is said. This addition of the ancestor liturgy to the Mass is a clear example of Chupungco's illustration of how the integration of new cultural traditions, and eventually, new Catholic liturgies which express those particular cultural values, become new branches of that historically Roman liturgical tree - which begins with the Catholic Mass (1982:46).

Because the ancestral service performed by Cardinal Yu Pin is not based on any standardized liturgy, I will refrain from doing a close comparison of that ceremony as described by Gutheinz with the ritual published by the Chinese Bishops' Conference. However, some parallels are worthy of comment especially since Sister Janet Carroll and I speculate in our January 1994 interview that Cardinal Yu Pin's ceremony had an influence on the development of the 1974 approved liturgy. In this ancestral memorial liturgical text, no food is offered other than fruit while in the Cardinal's service, meat, soup, grain and tea leaves are also offered (Gutheinz 157). Wine is an important offering made in both services. Incense is offered in both ceremonies, only here the text specifies that joss sticks are used although powered incense can also be offered. Gutheinz does not indicate that joss sticks are used, although I maintain that they are, because their use is traditional in China and because the photo included with the article shows the sticks to be in the hands of the Cardinal (153). The liturgical text also mentions the use of an incense holder pot in which the joss sticks are traditionally stuck after being lit whereas, although there is no mention of this pot by Gutheinz, the photo also shows the Cardinal putting the joss sticks
into the incense pot (153). Flowers are offered in both ceremonies. Red candles are indicated as being already lit and on the shrine table when the flowers are offered in the bishops' liturgy; while no candles are specifically mentioned by Gutheinz, light and fire are named which can possibly be put in the same category as candles, as elaborated upon previously. The order in which the offerings are made in the two rituals are similar: in this liturgical text, the order is incense, flowers, wine and fruit while during the 1971 service, the order is incense, wine/flowers, wine/fruit, wine/chopsticks meal/soup/grain/tea leaves. The most outstanding difference between the description of the offerings by Gutheinz and the offerings as described in this text, however, is that there is absolutely no elaboration upon whether or not the incense, flowers, wine and fruit (and candles) have any specific symbolic meanings in the context of the ancestral rite. I suggest that the symbolic meanings attached to the incense, flowers, wine and fruit (and candles) are just as "fluid and changeable," to again use Minamiki's words, within the Catholic Church as they are in non-Catholic traditional ancestor veneration ceremonies and this is why the Chinese bishops do not provide any interpretations of these offerings (Minamiki 1985:209). As Sister Janet Carroll (per. com. 1994) states, "Liturgy is very fluid in pastoral situations - extremely fluid in very different parts of the world...depending on the pastoral ministers." In the context of Taiwan in 1971, the symbolic meanings of the offerings largely had to do with the social and political climate of that time especially in regard to the Communists. The offering of the fruit
during that rite, if the reader recalls, was said by the Cardinal to be
"a sign of our firm resolve to bring about the day on which we will
again celebrate in our country" which is a direct reference to the
mainland situation during the Cultural Revolution (Gutheinz 157). In
a later chapter, we shall see how one Chinese American pastoral
situation has attributed a completely different set of symbolic
meanings to food, incense, flowers and drink which are offered
during the ancestral rite at Chinese New Year in that parish.

Although the Chinese Bishops' Conference text does not offer
interpretations of the offerings, it does indicate the significance of
the bowing gesture which is referred to as the "Formal Chinese
ceremonial bow" (that is, the jugung), and as the "Rite of formal
Obeisance." This latter title overtly indicates that the symbolic
significance of the bow is that of reverence and respect, which, I
surmise, is also the meaning attributed to the gesture during the
Cardinal's service (Gutheinz 157). Based on all of the available
evidence, the gesture of the bow has the same meaning to all people
in China whether Catholic or not: according to all the literature I
have read and from what I have personally experienced in Taiwan, it
is simply a sign of deep respect and reverence (Addison 37; Yang 39;
Cameron 141; Gutheinz 157).

Another extremely striking difference between the
performance of Cardinal Yu Pin's rite and the ancestral memorial
liturgy established by the Chinese bishops is the inclusion of the
style of the ancestor tablet for Church use. Cardinal Yu Pin's ancestral
service does not include an ancestral tablet even though permission
was given in the 1939 *Plane compertum est* that one could be used by Catholics just as long as nothing other than the deceased's name is inscribed on it (Noll 99). The above quoted diagram and directions from the Chinese Bishops' Conference "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" is very specific as to what can be included on the tablet and indeed it goes beyond a simple inscription of a deceased person's name. One of the major reasons for this fact is that the tablet provided above is for Church use, so instead of naming a particular individual, the liturgical text specifies that a name for a plurality of deceased should be inscribed; specifically, to reiterate, the text states that the following words should be placed across the very bottom of the tablet: "Memorial Tablet of All Ancestors of (Name of) Church." The liturgy also states that Chinese characters should be carved down and along the left hand side of the tablet and state the following: "Offered by All Catholics of ________ Church" while indicating that the date should be inscribed down and along the right hand side of the tablet. As also indicated above, the tablet is to be 30 inches long and 25 inches wide; the cross at the top of the tablet should be red; the carved dragons on the side should be gold (neither the text nor the diagram are clear as to whether "dragons" refers to the fact that there should be more than one dragon on one side of the tablet or that there should be one dragon - or more - on either side of the tablet). Finally, the liturgical text states, "anything else left to Proper Church to decide." This statement gives each pastor and/or parish quite a large margin in which to express its particular values, hopes, wishes, and/or prayers. The freedom of expression which is
allowed by this statement as well as by the inclusion of the date, gold
dragons and red cross goes far beyond the Instruction given in
regard to the tablet in 1939. Apparently the power given during
Vatican II to bishops and to Bishops' Conferences such as the one in
Taipei, Taiwan which developed this liturgical text is capable of
overriding the specifics of such Instructions as that of Plane
Compertum est. Chupungco provides evidence for this conjecture
when he summarizes the statements made in the Vatican II
Documents on the Constitution of the Sacred Liturgy (Sacrosanctum
Concilium). He reports that bishops' conferences are largely
responsible for making appropriate liturgical adaptations according
to the particular needs of the community. The liturgist specifies that
"Even little details like the rubric 'he addresses them in these or
similar words' are significant, for they offer possibilities for a more
cordial and personalized atmosphere" (Chupungco 1982:50-51). This
last quotation echoes the words in #4 of the liturgical text provided
by the Chinese Bishops' Conference in regard to the ancestral tablet
where it states, "anything else left to Proper Church to decide." Thus,
the bishops do have the power to make adaptations or to modify the
specifics of what can be written on the ancestral tablet just as long as
these adaptations are in harmony with the "true and authentic spirit"
of the Church, according to a section entitled "Norms for Adapting the
Liturgy to the Genius and Traditions of Peoples" in Sacrosanctum
Concilium (Abbott 151).

The words spoken during Cardinal Yu Pin's service in
comparison to those spoken in the text published by the Chinese
Bishops' Conference are quite different. Gutheinz indicates that there are an invitation (though he does not elaborate on its content), blessings and a homily said throughout the Cardinal's ceremony. I have previously discussed what are the content of the blessings in that ceremony: they mostly elaborate upon the symbolic significance of the offerings. The offering of the wine and the flowers are explained to signify the life community, for example (Gutheinz 156). A description of the content of the homily said by the Cardinal is not specifically provided but Gutheinz indicates that it considers "the meaning of the celebration as expressed in both of the blessings and in the invitation to the celebration" (157). In the liturgical text, the first words spoken are a reading from the Bible. The text specifies that the Book of Sirach 44, 1-15 or "another suitable reading chosen by the priest" should be said (2). As should be obvious at this point, nothing was read from Scripture during Cardinal Yu Pin's ceremony although he made frequent Christian references. For example, he states, "The Cardinal of God called us together for this ceremony...May heaven always be at China's side" (157). According to the liturgical text, a homily is also supposed to be given, but instead of its being an elaboration of the blessings (and invitation) as in the Cardinal's homily, it is designated as being an explanation of the reading from Scripture and "its relationship to the day's ceremony" (2). (I will discuss the Book of Sirach 44, 1-15 at a later point when comparing the Chinese Bishops' Conference liturgical text with the variations of it which are used in Chinese American parishes.) The words which are called out before the bows ("first bow," for
example) which are made in the Rite of formal Obeisance in the liturgical text are not paralleled in the Cardinal's service most likely because there is no formal Rite of Obeisance before the ancestor tablet because no tablet is used. However, when the celebrants in the Cardinals service do bow before the ancestors (tabletless though they be), there is no indication made by Gutheinz that such an announcement is made before the bows occur (156). In addition, no Prayer of the Faithful is said in the Cardinal's ceremony. Although some kind of blessings are given in the Cardinal's service and the main theme of his words are to revere, venerate and remember the ancestors - as well as to improve the political situation on mainland China through Christian prayer - the Cardinal does not implore those present specifically to pray for the deceased or specifically call attention to the commandment to "honor our parents" as is the case in the bishops' liturgy (Gutheinz 156-157). (I will consider the Prayer of the Faithful in relation to the Chinese Bishops' Conference "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" more fully when Chinese American parishes are the focus of our attention.) Thus, I have concluded a limited consideration of the food and drink offered during both services, as well as that of incense, flowers, candles/light/fire - and the order in which they were so offered. I have also briefly pointed out similarities and differences between the bowing gesture, ancestral tablet and words spoken or not spoken in each ceremony. I would also like to add that while both services include music, Gutheinz does not specify what kind of music is played while the bishops' liturgy indicates that funeral music should
be played or hymns can be sung. (This is a memorial service!)

The first ancestral memorial service performed by a member of the Catholic clergy took place in Taipei, Taiwan on January 27, 1971. Almost four years later, the "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" was approved for use by the Bishops' Conference in Taipei, Taiwan on December 29, 1974. What has happened since that time in regard to the performance of the Chinese ancestral memorial service within the context of the Catholic Church? Although Father Edward J. Flanigan is a Maryknoll priest who resides at the Taichung Society House, is the Director of the Language School in that city and has been a missionary in Taiwan for approximately thirty years, he (per. com. 1994) informed me that the missionaries in Taichung are not in close communication with the Chinese Bishops' Conference and seems perplexed by this lack of communication. Father Flanigan gave me the impression during this brief long distance telephone conversation that he was not aware there was a "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" which had been published by the Bishops' Conference in December 29, 1974. On the other hand, on the tape the Reverend had been kind enough to record for me on 12 February of this year, he summarizes the contents of a booklet which provides the outline for an ancestral memorial service which he uses in Taichung. This text, like that of the Bishops' Conference, is divided into two parts: one involves a description of how the ritual should be conducted for family use, or in the home; the other part describes how the rite should be performed in the Church. Before explaining the content of the
booklet, Father Flanigan states, "The book I sent along with this is imprinted. Some people use it; some don't. There are many other things. There's no set ceremony...But this book has been printed and is available and most of us use it." In other words, it appears that Father (with all due respect) was not only not aware that the ancestral memorial liturgy had been published in 1974 due to the lack of communication, but it also seems that Father is not certain where the information in the booklet, which is significantly similar to the proposed ritual published by the bishops, originated. However, it is important that we take note of Father's full meaning of his remarks quoted above. That is, I interpret his words to mean the following: although this Taichung booklet of 1988 is available for reference and use if a particular parish would like to use it, there are also other ways to pay respects to the ancestors within the context of the Catholic Church. I especially gather that this is what he means by his words, "There are many other things." I also have knowledge that very abbreviated forms of venerating ancestors within the Catholic Church are expressed, and this also contributes to my understanding of Father Flanigan's words. (I will provide this evidence at a later point.)

Whatever the case may be, the cover of the little pink booklet provided by Father Flanigan is decorated with drawings in red of Chinese lanterns, musical instruments, and children dressed in traditional Chinese clothing setting off firecrackers, Chinese characters, and includes the date of 1988. Inside the back cover of the booklet are children performing a dragon dance. It is obvious
from the cover and from Father Flanigan's statements that the contents are typically used especially at Chinese New Year, but Father indicates that it is also followed on Ching-Ming and All Souls' Day. However, Reverend Flanigan makes no mention of the use of these guidelines on All Saints Day as is described in the bishops' liturgy.

In brief, Father Flanigan indicates in his February recording that according to the guidelines he follows for the Church ritual, flowers, fruit and candles are placed on a table before pictures - "holy pictures" - and an ancestor tablet. The candles are lit. (He makes no mention of wine here although in the family ritual guidelines he states, "maybe wine" is offered.) A hymn is sung and the priest makes the offerings in the same way that is described in the bishops' liturgy. (That is, in regard to incense - which he doesn't mention initially, but which is offered during the rite - and fruit, he states, "The incense sticks are raised to the forehead and placed in the incense burner and the fruits are raised and put back down in the very stylized Chinese worship.") Next, bowing before the pictures and the tablet occur. The priest reads Ecclesiasticus 44:1-15. (This is the same Scripture reading as Sirach recommended in the bishops' liturgy.) Father then specifies that the text recommends that "Everybody at this point can recall the good points of the ancestors - recall their virtues and how they can emulate them." (He also comments: "That's a very nice thing to do.") Father next states that the Prayers of the Faithful are said: The priest prays for the coming of the Spring Festival and prays that the Lord "bless everybody."
Then, Father reports, "they" pray for the Chinese Church. Such words as the following are said: "The Lord gave the Chinese their culture"; "Bless Chinese people"; "Bless Taiwan in a special way." After these prayers have concluded, a hymn may be sung and Psalm 96 is read in which the Lord is praised and "families of nations" are encouraged to "Ascribe to the Lord." The blessing of the Church with incense occurs next, and the service concludes with the children thanking their parents and with the parents giving their children little red envelopes filled with money which is a Chinese New Year tradition. Finally, the congregation bows to the priest and thank him. The Reverend states that "the priest does the same." Then the people turn to each other and bow. This Church service does not vary significantly from the "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" approved by the Chinese Bishops' Conference. Mainly, however, this is the first time there has been mention of "pictures" of any kind as being included in the service - "holy" or otherwise. In fact, the General Principles of the bishops' liturgy states that religious objects such as a crucifix, statues, or a tabernacle should be kept separate from the ancestor shrine (1). Therefore, I am surprised to hear Father use the word "holy" before pictures. Another minor difference is that Father here suggests that wine is not always used while in the bishops' liturgy it is a major offering (3). Although Psalm 96 here is specified, the bishops' liturgy does state that "another suitable reading" may be read instead of Sirach 44: 1-15 (2). Here the Taichung text adds "another suitable reading" to the reading of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus. The prayers about the Chinese Church,
culture, people and especially the request to "Bless Taiwan in a special way" are reminiscent of the blessings given by Cardinal Yu Pin in his first public performance of the rite especially when offering the fruit while saying, "We bring our culture to a new life, May heaven always be at China's side. We make a sacrifice of fruit as a sign of our firm resolve to bring about the day on which we will again celebrate in our country" (Gutheinz 157). It is possible that the booklet published in 1988 also alludes to the fact that the Communists are still in control of the mainland and that Taiwan is still, as a result, separated from the mother country. Therefore, this special prayer for Taiwan is included as one of the Prayers for the Faithful. A major way in which this Taichung ancestral ceremony as outlined by Father Flanigan is different from the ceremony of the Cardinal but the same as the bishops' liturgy is that no interpretations of the offerings are provided. This omission is significant. Here the guidelines for the performance of the ritual do not need to state that the fruit symbolizes the "firm resolve" of the people to again be in some way reunited with the mainland, but this service finds another way to express the same ideas in the Prayers of the Faithful. I would also like to point out in regard to this Taichung text, that this is the first time a blessing of the church with incense, the thanking of the children by the parents, or the giving of the red packages to the children have been mentioned in any of the services we have examined so far. However, the concluding bow is reminiscent of the "mutual reverence" bow which occurs after Cardinal's ancestral service (Gutheinz 157). The only difference is
that here bows - as well as thanks - are directed to and from the priest as well as to the other members of the congregation, and no mention is made of age being a factor as indicated by Gutheinz (157). I would also like to comment on my observation that although Father does not mention the word *homily*, which is said to be given in the Cardinal's performance as well as in the bishops' liturgy, it is possible that the words of the priest which encourage everyone to recall the virtues of the ancestors as well to emulate them are a part of a homily. The exact moment in which these words are said is not clear since Father provides only a summary of the service in his recording, though a quite detailed one. We should also recall that remembrance of the ancestors' virtues and emulation of their "life norm" or virtuous norms of behavior are also encouraged during the Cardinal's ritual, but in the context of what are called "blessings" (Gutheinz 157).

Upon reflection of these guidelines for an ancestral liturgy as reported by Reverend Edward Flanigan in Taichung, it is my educated guess, based on a comparison with the bishops' liturgy, that this is a liturgical adaptation of the Chinese Bishops' Conference's formalized and approved text which was made by some member of the clergy in Taiwan and that just eventually was passed around to other missionaries and perhaps to other indigenous Chinese priests. Unfortunately, knowledge of the source of that liturgy and who did the adapting appears to have been lost - at least as far as the testimony of Father Flanigan is concerned. In regard to Vatican II's influence on the creation of the new liturgical text as manifested in
the Bishop's Conference's Ancestor Memorial Liturgy, and the adaptations of this text which can occur in local or regional parishes depending on the thinking, needs, and resources of the individuals involved, there are two guidelines offered: as Chupungco points out, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (Sacrosanctum Concilium) indicates that the creation of new rites "will correspond more faithfully to the genius and culture of various peoples and races," as the "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" does (Chupungco 1982:48). In addition, however, The Vatican II Document Sacrosanctum Concilium clearly indicates that "As far as possible, notable differences between the rites used in adjacent regions are to be carefully avoided" (Abbott 147). Therefore, on the one hand, the bishops' liturgy can be considered to be the creation of a new rite which reflects the "genius and culture" of the Chinese people; on the other, I conjecture that the Taichung text is an adaptation of the Chinese Bishops' Conference approved liturgy which does not have any serious "notable differences" from the original, and therefore is a perfectly legitimate variation of the bishops' liturgy as used in the Taichung area of the island of Taiwan.

Father Larry Barnett, S.S.C., a Columban priest who was a missionary in the Hsin Chu area for several years, before he went to Seton Hall University in New Jersey, and before becoming a graduate student at Cornell University where he is presently studying, also indicates that he (per. com 1993) performed the ancestral memorial service in Taiwan although he did not provide any details as to the liturgy he followed. During our conversation, he stated that the
service is most importantly performed during Chinese New Year and on Ching-Ming in Taiwan. In addition, he reported that during every Sunday at Mass a perfunctory offering of incense would be offered to the ancestors which usually occurred after the creed and before the prayers: a representative would come up to the altar and offer one stick. This is one example of a simplified pastoral adaptation of a liturgical rite which I alluded to previously when I mentioned that I was aware that there were many forms in which veneration of the ancestors can take place in the Church aside from the elaborate ritual approved by the Bishops' Conference or even as performed by Cardinal Yu Pin before the standardized rite came into being. (This is also true of traditional non-Catholic practices. Addison states the following in that regard: the ancestral offerings "vary not only with the locality but also with the piety and the means of the family. In pious families incense and candles are burned before the tablets every morning and evening and on the first and fifteenth of every month (i.e., on the new and full moons). These daily and fortnightly rites do not include a family meal and may be performed even by a servant or the keeper of an ancestral temple" (38).) Father Flanigan (per. com. 1994) also provides evidence for continual encouragement on the part of the priests to remember the ancestors sometimes only in words: "We constantly remind the people that every Mass - every Sunday - or every day, every time Mass is said, there is remembrance of those who have gone before us marked with a sign of faith especially those for whom we now pray that the Lord will give them light and peace and lead them into his heavenly home.
This is said at every liturgy - every Mass." This is another example of how the Communion of Saints tradition of the culture of Catholicism overlaps with the tradition of ancestor veneration in the culture of China and how the two traditions have come to be in deep harmony with each other within the context of the Catholic Church in the twentieth century.

Before I proceed to give other examples of pastoral adaptations of the ancestral ritual in Taiwan and in the United States, I would just like to mention the information I have available to me in regard to where the ancestral memorial rites are or are not performed by Chinese Catholics, simplified or otherwise, other than in the United States. Reverend Christopher Wong (pers. com. 1993), who was recommended to me by Cardinal John B. Wu, Bishop of Hong Kong (pers. com. 1993), as being "well qualified to advise...on this subject," informed me that he performed the first and "elaborate ancestral ceremony in Manila in 1985" for about one hundred Chinese. (Reverend Wong is presently pastor of St. Therese Catholic Chinese Church, located in Chicago's Chinatown.) Unfortunately, I am not aware of the form it took or of the liturgy he followed. When I requested this information from him in a survey I sent out to Chinese Catholic parishes - as I shall explain fully at a later point - Father Wong did not respond to this question. However, he did inform me that after the ceremony, his friends asked him, "What are you doing? Performing a Chinese opera?" Indeed it must have been an "elaborate" rite! Reverend Wong also indicated that he had gotten in trouble with his superiors for performing the rite in Manila
because he had not received permission from them to perform the ancestral service; I neglected to request that he elaborate on this point in our telephone interview. The Reverend also informed me that although the ancestral rites are beginning to be performed in the Catholic Church in Hong Kong, the incorporation of this ritual into the Catholic Church, he reports, is rather slow there because the influence of the Italian priests is very strong and because these priests have a tendency "to push Chinese one step back." Apparently Father Wong implies here that the Italian priests are reluctant to enhance the process of inculturation in Hong Kong. There is other evidence which indicates that the incorporation of the ancestral liturgy into the Church is slow in Hong Kong. Reverend Raymond Nobeletti (per. com. 1994), a Maryknoll priest who was a missionary in Hong Kong, and who presently is the pastor at the Church of the Transfiguration in New York City's Chinatown, reports, "In my 15 years in Hong Kong, I never heard of anyone mentioning the dead during Chinese New Year. We put emphasis on honoring the elderly. This ceremony comes from Taiwan..." In addition, Pauline Li (per. com. 1993), a thirty-five year old parishioner at Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church in Philadelphia's Chinatown, who received her master's degree from the University of Pennsylvania (Penn) and who is presently in a graduate program at St. Joseph's University here in Philadelphia, claims that she never saw the ancestral ritual performed in the Catholic Church at all in Hong Kong. She was born a Catholic, grew up in Hong Kong, and only left there about five years ago, so she would have had a lot of opportunity to learn about the
rite if it were being performed in Hong Kong on any scale worthy of note. In regard to mainland China, neither Sister Janet Carroll (per. com. 1994), Director of the United States Catholic China Bureau, or Reverend Joseph Chiang (per. com. 1993), Director of the National Pastoral Center for the Chinese Apostolate, are aware of the performance of the ancestral rite on mainland China, but as Sister states, "You don't know, you know?" However, there are some grounds for belief that some form of ancestor veneration does take place by Catholics in that Communist country. An article entitled, "Rites still a puzzler in China," which was published in Hong Kong's Sunday Examiner of May 6, 1994, reports that Chinese Catholics venerated their ancestors on the festival of Ching-Ming. Although there is no statement made that a celebration took place in the Church, the article specifically claims that the "Chinese Catholics who observe church regulations offer flowers to the deceased and make a deep bow in front of the graves on the festival day" (3). Based on this meager evidence, it appears that those who must be above ground Catholics in China have begun to integrate the cultural tradition of ancestor veneration into their Catholic religion in accordance with the directives of Vatican II even though the Chinese government forbids allegiance to Rome. The limited information available to me at this time prevents me from commenting further.

To return to additional examples of pastoral adaptation in Taiwan, another description is provided by Ching Shyong Liu, who was a fourth year graduate student in Mechanical Engineering in December of 1988 when I interviewed him in regard to the topic of
ancestor veneration in the Catholic Church. He is from Taiwan (where he has returned since receiving his Ph.D. degree). Ching Shyong was born into a Catholic family in Pindong, in southern Taiwan. He went to a Dominican Catholic High School in Gaoshung, a large city in the south. During this period of his life, he seriously considered becoming a priest. However, he decided he could reach more Chinese people in regard to Christianity if he did not enter the ministry. He has since married, but remains very active in the Catholic Church.

During our interview five and one half years ago, Ching Shyong recalled growing up as a Catholic in Taiwan and not having had the freedom to pay respects to his ancestors within the context of the Catholic church. He said that the change in Church policy occurred in his adolescence: "We can never...never be allowed to respect the ancestor people when I was a child...They argued for a long time, okay? I can not exactly remember when they changed the rules, but I can remember when I was a child, there was no such ceremony after Chinese New Year Mass. Probably after I graduated from junior high school some time we have this kind of ceremony. That means the Pope, they understand. Actually, I think this is a very important step, a very important step." I am not exactly certain how old Ching Shyong is; however, I assume, based on this statement, that this change in Church tradition occurred about twenty years ago. This would mean that his Church in southern Taiwan began to perform the ancestral memorial service some time during the early seventies - that is, around the time that Cardinal Yu Pin made his televised
performance of the ceremony as well as near the time of the
publication of the Chinese Bishops' Conference "Proposed Catholic
Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" in 1974. Ching Shyong briefly described
the ritual as it was (and perhaps still is?) performed in his parish in
Taiwan as compared to the traditional non-Catholic ancestor rituals
that he knows. He stated, "But in every Chinese Catholic Church, we
also have a table, but there is no food on it. That's the first
difference, okay? There is no food. No food. First we just keep some
flowers. We use the flowers. There is no food, no wine, no liquor, no
snacks, just flowers....Okay, we use flowers and we pray for them -
for all those ancestor people. We pray for them, okay?" After
conversing about non-Catholic traditional Chinese beliefs for a period
of time, we returned to the topic of the ritual itself. Ching Shyong
also stated that in addition to flowers, there are candles, and incense
and "maybe fruit" used in the ceremony. (Obviously, this contradicts
his earlier emphatic statement that "no food" is permitted.) When I
asked him if the kowtow was enacted during the ritual, he said no.
(If I had known about the jughung at that time, I would have used
this word instead; either way, Ching Shyong did not mention bowing
at all although it is possible that I did not explore that area deeply
enough with him.) Even though Ching Shyong did not become any
more specific about the ritual than what I have indicated here, we
can gather that the ritual includes many of the traditional items
outlined in the bishops' text, with the exception of wine, the ancestral
tablet and bowing. Ching Shyong even speaks as if he were aware of
this 1974 Ancestor Memorial Liturgy when he states the following:
"Already we have a process. Official one. Formal. Step by step...Now in Catholic Church this kind of thing become formal - official - just like Mass - step by step." Apparently the ritual conducted in Ching Shyong's Taiwan parish is a slight variation or adaptation of the bishops' standardized "proposed" liturgy.

Not only is Ching Shyong Liu able to provide us with a history of the performance of the ancestor memorial service in terms of his life in Taiwan, but his experience here in the United States as a Chinese Catholic also relate to issues which concern us here. When he was a graduate student at Penn, for example, Ching Shyong wrote articles for the Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church Bulletin each week. He also participated in the Chinese New Year ancestor veneration services. In fact, he was able to experience a very simplified version of an ancestral veneration ceremony - or what we may call a form of pastoral adaptation - at Holy Redeemer in the late 1980s before this parish had its first full ancestral memorial service based on the Taiwan Bishops' Conference "proposed liturgy." In December of 1988, Ching Shyong briefly describes this informal means of honoring the ancestors which was to take place during Chinese New Year of 1989: "In this coming Chinese New Year in Holy Redeemer we will do that ceremony. I will do that. The Father wants every sister and brother write down the ancestor people you want to respect. Write down their names on some papers and you put the names on the walls and people can pray for them, Okay?"

This same ritual, as above described by Ching Shyong, continued to be performed sporadically at Holy Redeemer each year
until 1992, according to Reverend Luke Chow (per. com. 1994), (who was pastor at Holy Redeemer at this time), and to On-Lei Tsang (per. com. 1992), a parishioner at Holy Redeemer and personal friend of mine. (I know that Reverend Paul Tsau, who was pastor at Holy Redeemer in the late 1980s conducted an ancestor memorial service on the scale of that of the Taiwan bishops' liturgy due to a survey response I received from Reverend Tom Betz, presently a Holy Redeemer pastor.) On-Lei also describes the ancestor name writing tradition for us as she experienced it at Holy Redeemer. Before I quote her description as recorded in a personal interview of 28 June 1992, I would just briefly like to mention that I first met On-Lei in 1990 at the Philadelphia Chinatown Development Corporation (PCDC), mentioned in the introduction. We were both part time employees at this organization, and presently On-Lei is on the Board of Directors even though she is a young (but serious) undergraduate at Drexel University. Therefore, by the time of our interview in regard to the ancestral memorial service we were quite good friends.

On-Lei Tsang was born in Hong Kong, but she and her family immigrated to Philadelphia's Chinatown in her early grammar school years. On-Lei, her twin and younger sisters went to Holy Redeemer School. On-Lei had converted to Catholicism by the time she was in the eighth grade; her sisters converted eventually as well while her parents remain Buddhist. On-Lei's parents have no problem with their children's decisions to have become Catholics.

On-Lei's description of her very first experience of an ancestral veneration service of any kind is parallel to the experience
of Ching Shyong Liu. While Ching Shyong was in junior high school when his parish in Taiwan began to conduct the service, On-Lei was in high school. (Pauline Li (per. com. 1993), also a parishioner at Holy Redeemer - as previously mentioned - was a parishioner at another Catholic parish in Philadelphia until she heard about the performance of the ancestral service at Holy Redeemer; therefore, her first experience of the service was here as well since she never witnessed any form of the rite in her native Hong Kong, as Ching Shyong did in Taiwan.) On-Lei's telling of her first experience of the ritual is quite a moving one:

The first time I saw the ritual in the Church was really amazing to me because I never saw incense in the Church before [here she refers to joss sticks]. That was actually the first time, you know. They did it like for two years. The first two years I was there I saw the actual happening. You know. What they did they had banners on two sides of the altar and they had incense lights. And they also had little strips of satin sheets - just like square, little short squares - little satin sheets. There was also ink for you to write. You could write it in Chinese or you could write it in English of a person - of ancestors - that you would like to pray for. It was, I guess it was, a very different Mass for me 'cause I had never seen anything like that done in our Church since I was there. And this kind of touches me to see that I can communicate, that I can pray for my ancestors also in this Church and not 'cause they were another religion. Or that, you know, my religion was different from the rest of my family. And that I can also pray for someone who I love who has passed away in the family [perhaps she was not completely clear on the tradition of the Communion of Saints in the Catholic Church or else she just did not see the clear connection between this method of remembering - and praying for and to the ancestors - and that one] (brackets mine).
In addition to learning what the exact process of this particular ancestral service involved, we also are privileged to have On-Lei share the meaning the simple rite had for her. She feels liberated that she can pray for her ancestors and use joss sticks just as her Buddhist parents do. (On Lei clarifies this point later in the interview.) At another stage of our conversation, On-Lei also adds that after writing the ancestor's name, and praying for the person, one would light a stick of incense "and just put it there." I believe by "there" she means that she would stick the joss stick into an incense burner pot which is typically filled with sand.

This writing of ancestors names on sheets of satin - red, On-Lei later informs me, praying for the deceased (and undoubtedly to the deceased as well) is a form of pastoral adaptation of the "full ceremony" for deceased ancestors which is very similar to a traditional Catholic custom which developed in the West and is performed on All Souls' Day as pointed out by Sister Janet Carroll (per. com. 1994). During our interview in January of this year, she reminded me of the tradition where many Catholics "put names...of relatives in an envelope for All Souls' Day and they put the basket of names on the altar." Sister also observes that this form of a Chinese New Year ancestral memorial service, as described by Ching Shyong and On-Lei, is most likely an adaptation of our Western tradition "over into a Chinese form"; she also suggests that the use of the red papers and putting them on the wall would be "more appealing to
the Chinese" perhaps for reasons of aesthetics.31

Thus we have traced the development of the Chinese ancestral memorial service from the first performance in 1971 by Cardinal Yu Pin in Taipei to the development of a "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" approved by the Chinese Bishops' Conference in Taiwan in 1974. I have also been able to provide some examples of adaptations of the bishops' liturgical text in Taiwan through the descriptions (or summaries) of these rituals offered by Reverend Edward J. Flanigan, Reverend Larry Barnett, and Ching Shyong Liu. Ching Shyong's experiences with different adaptations of the ancestral rite enables us to move our consideration of the history of the performance of the ancestral memorial rite in the Catholic Church across the ocean and into the context of Chinese Catholic parishes in the United States. Both Ching Shyong Liu's description of the form the ancestral memorial took in the late 1980s and On-Lei Tsang's description of a similar form of the service in the early 1990s preface the final and one of the most significant aspects of this project. That is, we are now at a stage where we are in a position to present various descriptions of adaptations of the ancestral memorial service as approved by the Bishops' Conference in Taiwan in 1974 as they are performed in the United States in the 1990s and in the process offer some meaningful insights into their significance for Catholic individuals of Chinese ancestry in this country.

31 The color red traditionally has great symbolic significance in China: it is associated with the concept of fu which means "blessings" or "luck." It also is the color of blood and therefore signifies life. In addition, it is traditionally believed to scare away evil spirits (Berliner 33).
Chapter 9
The Ancestor Memorial Service
Flourishes Throughout the United States

Over the last several years I have personally been able to collect ancestor memorial service liturgies from several parishes in the northeastern United States. On February 9, 1992, I was given the liturgical text which was generally followed at Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church in Philadelphia’s Chinatown on that day in celebration of Chinese New Year by Reverend Luke Chow after having the opportunity to personally observe the service. The following year, I also attended the ancestral rite conducted at Holy Redeemer by Thomas Sung, of Elmhurst, New York. He also provided me with a copy of the liturgy he used on that day of January 24, 1993. On February 28, 1993, Father Joseph Chiang, pastor of Our Lady of the Visitation Church in Paramus, New Jersey (as well as the Director of the National Pastoral Center for the Chinese Apostolate in New York’s Chinatown), supplied me with the liturgy he handed out to his parishioners prior to the ancestral rite which I also had the opportunity to attend. In addition, this past Chinese New Year, I was able to collect the liturgies used by two New York City Chinatown parishes on February 13: at St. Theresa’s Church on Henry Street, Reverend John B. Chiang provided me with the liturgy which his group followed while I received the liturgical text used at the Church of the Saint Joseph on Monroe Street in a service led by Reverend Andrew Brizzolara while in attendance there. In addition to my being able to personally acquire the ancestor memorial liturgies of various
parishes in the northeastern United States, I had three different versions of the Chinese Bishops' Conference liturgy sent to me by three different individuals from other parts of the United States (these were sent along with responses to my survey which I sent out to Chinese American parishes, as mentioned in the introduction). Reverend Clifford Martin of St. Anne's Church in San Francisco and Sister Maria Hsu of the Archdiocese of San Francisco both sent me the liturgy used by St. Mary's Cathedral in San Francisco in 1993, as conducted by Archbishop J. R. Quinn and about forty other priests (with approximately 2000 people in attendance) (per. com. 1994). May Wong, lay minister of the Archdiocese of Seattle, sent me the liturgical text used by the Seattle Diocese and which, incidentally, is entitled "New York Overseas Chinese Spring Festival Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" (per. com. 1994). (All of these liturgies were presented to me in Chinese. All were translated by Sister Janet Carroll's assistant at the United States Catholic China Bureau, Hu Wei.\textsuperscript{32}

Although not all of the individuals who provided me with the above named liturgies were certain that they were derived from the liturgy of the Chinese Bishops' Conference in Taiwan, based on my conversations with two individuals, I am certain that either they are directly based on the Taiwan liturgy or that they are based on versions of that liturgy which have circulated amongst Chinese American parishes here in the United States. Reverend Thomas Sung

\footnote{32 See Appendix III for the Chinese liturgies and the English translations.}
of Elmhurst, New York (per. com. 1992) was the first individual to indicate to me that the liturgy he used at Holy Redeemer in 1993 was based on the Chinese Bishops' Conference of Taiwan. In addition, Monsignor Alan Detscher (per. com. 1994), Associate Director of the Secretariate of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops Standing Committee on Liturgy in Washington, D.C., indicates that no new liturgy has been composed for the Chinese American service. He also adds that in such cases where a liturgy from a particular ethnic group - such as the Chinese ancestor memorial service - has not had a standard American form created, the liturgy from the native country is used in parishes in the United States. Therefore, I surmise, based on this information, that all of the versions used in Chinese American parishes have the "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" as their source.

Before we turn to a description and analysis of a live performance of one of these ancestral services as performed in a United States parish, let us examine only the most striking similarities and differences between the seven liturgical texts we have available to us in relation to the Taiwan bishops' liturgy. First, all seven of the liturgies share the offerings of incense, flowers, wine, and fruit; only Our Lady of the Visitation and St. Joseph's Church offer them in a slightly different order than that just named. Instead, these two parishes make their offerings in the following order: incense, fruit, flowers, and wine. Second, after the offerings, all of the rituals have a bowing ceremony which are enacted in slightly different ways. Third, four of the liturgies include Prayers of
the Faithful: Seattle Archdiocese, St. Joseph's Church and St. Mary's do not. Fourth, five of the liturgies specifically mention Ecclesiasticus 44, 1:15; however, although St. Mary's and Seattle Diocese do not, Seattle does indicate that some reading from Scripture does occur. It does not specify which one. Fifth, interestingly enough, although the Holy Redeemer liturgy of January 24, 1993 does mention that a homily should be given "on the significance of the liturgy" (as the Taiwan bishops' liturgy recommends), none of the other liturgies prescribe that a homily be given during the rite. (All of the services I have attended were held after a Mass in which the homily addressed the meaning of the rite at that time.) Sixth, although the Chinese Bishops' Conference liturgy specifically states that the rite can be performed during Chinese New Year, on the Ching-Ming festival as well as on All Souls' Day and All Saints' Day, the 1993 Holy Redeemer liturgy is the only one which specifies when it should be performed at all. This latter text states, "ancestors are specially remembered at New Year, Ching Ming, on All Souls' Day and other festivals" (1). Therefore, the only difference between this Holy Redeemer liturgy and the bishops' liturgy is that the former does not specify All Saints' Day in regard to the "other festivals" to which it refers. Seventh, both Holy Redeemer liturgies make statements which differ from each other as well as from the bishops' liturgy in reference to when the rite should be performed in relation to the Mass. The bishops' liturgy states that the rite is conducted "following the Mass" (1). The 1992 Holy Redeemer liturgy indicates that the liturgy is conducted before Mass although it was conducted after
Mass that year that I attended (3); the 1993 Holy Redeemer liturgy states that the rite can be conducted before, during or after the Mass although it was conducted after the Mass that year I was in attendance as well (1). The other liturgies do not specify when the ritual should be performed at all. Eighth, the only Chinese American versions of the text which preface the ritual with a statement which addresses the meaning of the ritual is that of St. Mary's and the 1993 Holy Redeemer liturgy. Actually, the "Comment" which prefaces the ritual in the St. Mary's Cathedral text is, with the exception of one paraphrased sentence, composed of direct quotations taken from sections of three different paragraphs of the liturgist Mark Fang's unpublished article entitled "A Short Comment on Ancestor Veneration," and to which I have referred previously. In that "Comment," the veneration of the ancestors in the Catholic Church is justified and described in terms of the Communion of Saints tradition in the Catholic Church. It also clarifies that the offerings are made during the rite only to "express our sentiments and our gratitude towards them and our communion with the Lord" and that Catholics of Chinese ancestry do not consider their ancestors to be "idols" (1). In contrast, the Holy Redeemer statement - in terms of the purpose and meaning of the ritual - is much more brief: it simply states that the "main purpose is to teach the young to show respect and appreciation to their deceased forefathers who as roots of the Chinese society have always been recognized and respected" (1). (I would also like to add, however, that although the other liturgies do not make such a statement as to the meaning of the rite on paper, on
occasion, I have witnessed, reasons are given orally prior to the rite in the Church. For example, in the 1993 performance of the ancestor memorial held at Our Lady of the Visitation, Reverend Chiang’s assistant explains the meaning of the rite to the parishioners even though it is not included in the text here. (I shall elaborate upon the content of her explanation at a later point.) Ninth, one of the most significant artifacts in the Taiwan bishops’ liturgy is the ancestor tablet. Although none of the Chinese American liturgies available to us here describe what it should look like to any extent whatsoever (as the bishops’ liturgy does), it is worthy of mention that with the exception of the 1992 Holy Redeemer liturgy and the St. Theresa’s Church text, all of these liturgies at least name the inclusion of the tablet in the ritual. In fact, however, even the two parishes which do not mention the tablet in the liturgical text include the artifact as being an important part of the ritual (which I personally observed). I should also point out that although the St. Mary’s Cathedral text only states ancestor’s shrine and does not specifically name a tablet or plaque, I would assume that the tablet is an important part of that liturgy just as it is in all of the other rituals I have personally experienced here in the northeastern United States as well as from the evidence we have from the four other liturgies we have before us.

In the last chapter, I reported the words of On-Lei Tsang who described for us a very simple version of an ancestor veneration ritual conducted in Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church in Philadelphia’s Chinatown before 1992. Although I personally
attended the more elaborate 1992 and 1993 ancestral memorial services held during Chinese New Year at Holy Redeemer - as well as the ancestral rituals which took place during that time at Our Lady of the Visitation Church in Paramus, New Jersey in 1993, at Saint Theresa's Church and at the Church of the Saint Joseph in New York of this year, 1994 - it is necessary that I restrict a thorough presentation of the material gathered from fieldwork to one service. Therefore, I have chosen the 1993 Our Lady of the Visitation, Paramus, New Jersey ancestor memorial service to broaden and deepen our understanding of many of the themes which have already been raised in this project.

Our Lady of the Visitation parish is not located in a Chinatown. Rather, it is situated in an upper middle class, predominantly white - but not highly populated - area in the town of Paramus, Bergen County, New Jersey. The church itself is a large white building made of wood and has a steeple. It is separated from the also white and lovely rectory to its left (where Father Joseph Chiang resides) by a large parking lot. Entering the church by the front door, one views quite a high ceilinged structure with large stained glass windows on both sides all of which are dominated by a large red cross in the middle. Although the special Chinese New Year Mass, followed by the ancestral service, was to begin at 3:00 p.m, I arrived early in order to situate myself and take pictures. Many of the approximately 100 Chinese Americans who eventually attended the Mass and service were already in the church, milling around and chatting, preparing Chinese New Year posters to be included with the ancestor memorial
liturgy and Church bulletin which was later handed out to parishioners. Several individuals were busily preparing the ancestor table which was temporarily set up on the left side of the altar under a statue of the Blessed Virgin Mary with the Christ Child in her arms.

The table arrangement was quite beautiful. The table itself was about eight feet long and three feet wide. It was covered with a red tablecloth. The ancestor tablet, which does not have all of the details of the tablet recommended by the bishops' liturgy, is made of wood, is rectangular in shape with a dome shaped top. In the red center are vertically inscribed the following Chinese characters:

中華民國列宗列祖牌位 (Chung Hua Min Tsu Lieh Tsung Lieh Tsu P'ai Wei), which mean "Tablet of Our Chinese Ancestors," as translated by Reverend Chiang (per. com. 1994). The tablet was placed toward the back of the table in the center. On either side of the tablet and equal in height to it - about two feet - were placed two tall red candles in golden candle holders. (This is just as the bishops' liturgy prescribes under "9a) Flowers" (3).) Directly in front of the ancestor tablet was the incense burner which is gold, on short legs with handles and is about five or six inches high. In this golden container is sand where the lighted joss sticks are placed during the ancestral ceremony. To the right of the incense burner, a rectangular golden tray - about a foot long - was situated, upon which were set four small round gold cups and a gold pitcher filled with wine. To the left of the incense burner was a round tray - approximately a foot in diameter - upon which fruit was placed: two golden, two red, and two greens apples, a large bunch of red
grapes and a small hand of bananas. They were all brilliantly colored and healthy looking. To the left of the fruit was placed a green pot filled with long green stemmed, dark pink flowers. To the right of the tray of wine utensils was placed a white pot filled with long green stemmed flowers which were of various shades of pink and white. To the right of this pot of flowers, a yellow scroll with black Chinese characters was lain - partially unrolled. On the floor to the left of the ancestor table was a rectangular basket - about two feet long and a foot wide and only about two inches deep - in which the joss sticks were placed. (They are not quite two feet in length.) As beautiful as this picture may appear in your mind's eye, more beauty was added: Father Chiang had provided a gorgeous, predominantly red embroidered four foot by four foot cloth draped down the front of the table where it met the floor. Across the top, in Chinese characters are stitched the four Chinese characters: 慎終追遠 (Shen Chung Chui Yuan) which, as translated by Reverend Chiang (per. com. 1994) mean the following: "We are Thinking of the Dead and Looking Forward to Eternity." Images of dragons and water and flowers are sown onto the fabric in brilliant shades of orange, blue, green, yellow and white. (It is a traditional Chinese ornament which I saw and bought in Taiwan, minus the characters and with a few additional adornments.) The entire arrangement of the table was extremely pleasing aesthetically. All of the artifacts are of the highest quality and were tended to with the utmost care by the parishioners. As we can see in comparison to the liturgy of the bishops' conference, all of the same ingredients
"proposed" in that liturgy are included here: the shrine table, the ancestor tablet, the joss sticks, the incense pot holder, the flowers (two pots full, not "a bouquet" as stated in the bishops' liturgy), wine (four cups not three as stated by the Taiwan bishops), and fruit (3).

Before the Mass began, the large pot of dark pink flowers and the trays of fruit and wine had been moved to a very small table in the center of the Church aisle where the wine and the bread for communion were also placed. They remained there through the Mass and until they were brought up to Reverend Joseph Chiang, at the start of the ancestral memorial service.

Another aesthetic and religious adornment was added to the church altar itself prior to the Mass. An additional embroidered cloth, similar in terms of colors and content to that which was on the shrine table, was draped across the front of the altar. This lovely piece of embroidery is about eight feet wide and two feet deep. In the center is a golden threaded cross; to the left and to the right of the cross are stitched two silver threaded Chinese characters, 敬天祭祖 (Chin Tien Chi Tsu) all four of which together mean, as translated by Reverend Chiang (per. com. 1994): "Worship God and Offer Sacrifices to Our Ancestors." On the bottom of this piece of embroidery hang tassels in colors of red, blue, green and gold.

The stage was set by 3:00 when all had arrived, settled in their pews, and Father Chiang and another priest, Reverend John Shih, both wearing purple vestments, said Mass. During the Mass, Father Chiang alternated between the use of English and Mandarin Chinese. However, the homily he gave, which directly addressed the issues of
celebrating the Chinese New Year Mass and conducting the ancestor’s memorial service in the United States, was said in English. I quote Father Chiang’s words directly below:

Number one, I welcome each one of you, especially those of you who came to this parish for the first time to this parish in our community to participate in Chinese New Year Mass and particularly to worship ancestors. I know not many of you see this kind of liturgy, but it is very meaningful. Because we are Chinese. No matter where you born. Even if you born in the United States, even you speak perfect English, you have to remember your friends ..[inaudible].. You say, 'I am American' but they identify you as a Chinese. To be Chinese, you should be very proud, not only of Chinese culture, but also in the Church of God because that is the only culture can combine culture and religious together to worship God and also to commemorate our ancestors. So I wish, you know, all our young generation would admit to that. I know. I go many places and they refuse to say, "I am Chinese." I told them, 'I am so proud to be a Chinese priest.' No matter where I go, I always say, 'I am Chinese.' They say, they told me, 'I am American.' Although we have U.S. citizenship, but we are Chinese. That's why we celebrate today's Mass. That's why we commemorate our ancestors. So remember that. Because when we lost this concept of roots, you lost your identity, and you lost your value of your tradition and your family. So being Chinese is nothing to be ashamed. Even if you don't speak Chinese, doesn't matter, but you remember you are Chinese. That's what we are doing here: this is one occasion in which you know the Chinese people are the greatest people on earth because they really love and pay respects.. [inaudible].. their ancestors which is lack of education in this society. Every year when we have this liturgy for those who are not Chinese people - especially the American people - they come here they are impressed. They always say to me, 'Father Joe, I wish the United States, all the schools, all the Churches have this kind of liturgy to teach our young generation. I don't want to be, you know, rude, but I have to tell you that is the truth. So that is why we are very proud to be Chinese people: we celebrate this
Chinese New Year Mass, and besides that we have worship our ancestors. That is the main...[inaudible]... and the main intention that we are gathering here today at this Mass and at this liturgy. So I gave my thanks to each one of you, and particularly those who came in to prepare for this event and also those who bring friends over here to share. We share the first spiritual meal on the altar: each one of you, 'This is my body; this is my blood.' Then after that, we share as a culture, Chinese family, we share the meal...[inaudible]... So anyone who contribute, who make this event, you know possible, I personally want to thank each one of you. I don't want to mention each one of your names. I know everyone contribute many things, and they do very well, you know. We try to do our best to make this feast day meaningful and also to teach all of us to share.

Here we have an opportunity to observe how inculturation occurs within a local church situation amongst a particular ethnic group within the context of the United States. I cannot refer to Our Lady of the Visitation parish as an ethnic church for the great majority of its parishioners are white. Only about thirty-five to forty regular parishioners at Our Lady of the Visitation are of Chinese ancestry, and this is why Reverend Chiang only conducts a special "Chinese Mass" one Sunday each month. (There are three permanent Caucasian priests and two priests in residence at Our Lady of the Visitation. Father Chiang is one of the latter as is another who is from the Philippines.) This was a special Mass and service held specifically for an ethnic group which is only a small part of that parish. According to Father Chiang (per. com. 1994), many of the other Catholics of Chinese ancestry who attended the Chinese New Year Mass and ancestral memorial service under examination here came from surrounding areas of Bergen County for the special event.
On this occasion, Father Chiang addresses an audience which is overwhelmingly composed of individuals who are of Chinese ancestry. Out of the one hundred or so people in attendance, I believe there were only two of us who were Caucasian and one person who was from the West Indies. The other Caucasian woman was a senior nun from a neighboring town. The West Indian woman, Naula Sorhainico, whom I interviewed that day, was the nun's personal attendant (per. com. 1993).

Based on what could be quoted from Reverend Chiang's words spoken - in this case, a homily - it is clear that he primarily addresses the individuals of Chinese ancestry in his audience. It is interesting to recognize, that just like many of the words spoken by Cardinal Yu Pin during his ceremony in 1971, Reverend Chiang's concerns are largely political ones. That is, here within the context of the United States, where those of Chinese ancestry are a minority (especially on the east coast and in Bergen County) Reverend Chiang's main message is to remind these Chinese who happen to be Americans (from his point of view), that Chinese culture and ancestry is something to be proud of. He even goes so far as to proclaim Chinese as being "the greatest people on earth" because of their tradition of paying respects to their ancestors - a tradition, which he points out, is lacking in American society. Here he suggests that the way Chinese "love and pay respects" to their ancestors is a custom which "Americans" admire. The Reverend reports that many individuals who are not of Chinese ancestry say to him, "Father Joe, I wish the United States, all the schools, all the churches have this kind
of liturgy to teach our young generation." (My understanding of the implication of this statement is a Confucian one: here Reverend Chiang suggests that by behaving with filial piety toward one's ancestors as is demonstrated by this liturgy, that this quality of conduct would have a beneficial effect on society since, in Minamiki's words, filial piety is the "cornerstone of all morality" (1985:4).) Therefore, Reverend Chiang encourages those in his audience - or those of the "young generation" who are not present but whom those in the audience may be able to influence - to not lose contact with their "roots," or the traditions of their family and culture in order to maintain their identity as Chinese and discourages them from becoming "American" and losing such great traditions which contemporary American society lacks.

I suggest above that Father Joseph's message, or my interpretation of his message, is interesting because, on the one hand, he tells his audience, "So being Chinese is nothing to be ashamed," which he would not feel compelled to state if minority groups such as Chinese Americans were not made to feel "ashamed" by the still predominant white mainstream society. On the other hand, he states, "the Chinese people are the greatest people on earth." It is quite feasible that Reverend Chiang makes this rather strong assertion for two reasons: the first one is because he is trying to counteract the way that some Chinese Americans may be made to feel as a minority group in the United States. To be blunt, because mainstream society frequently may cause individuals of Chinese ancestry to feel inferior (and therefore "ashamed"), he feels compelled to tell them that they
are superior (that is, "the greatest") in order to help them to regain their self esteem in the American context. The other reason that Reverend Chiang may make such a statement as "the Chinese people are the greatest people on earth" (which, of course, implies that those who are not of Chinese ancestry are inferior to this group) is because he sincerely believes this to be true. In Chapters 3 and 4 of this dissertation, I point out how many missionaries, particularly the non-Jesuit orders, had a tendency to be nationalistic especially in terms of their effort to convert the Chinese to Catholicism. These missionaries thought of their own cultures - whether it was Portuguese or Italian or Spanish - as being superior to that of the Chinese. At the same time, I also indicate that the Chinese traditionally thought of themselves as being the center of the earth as evidenced simply by the meaning of the name for China in Chinese: Chungkuo. During many periods of Chinese history, this country has had a tradition of considering their culture to be superior to that of others, and this is why for centuries there were laws prohibiting the entry of waikuojen or "outside people," otherwise referred to as barbarians (Kung and Ching 244; Creel 128). In the Chinese American liturgies of the Seattle Diocese and of St. Joseph's Church there is evidence for this attitude of the superiority of the Chinese culture as expressed in the "Memorial Oration" of both texts: "The Chinese nation rises in the east. With a history of more than five thousand years, it has a civilization of long standing and boasts many lofty ideals...All of the ancient civilizations pass away except the Chinese one which still stands in the east making its own
contributions to the world. This is the achievement made by our great ancestors..." With further thought, it is quite possible that Father Chiang publicly proclaims the superiority of the Chinese people from the pulpit for both of the reasons stated above. That is, Father could be telling these individuals of Chinese ancestry that they are the "greatest" because he believes it and in order to heal the sometimes misunderstood and underappreciated, and often misidentified minority: "You say, 'I am American,' but they identify you as Chinese."

Another noteworthy comment which Father Chiang makes during his homily is the following: "To be Chinese, you should be very proud, not only of Chinese culture, but also in the Church of God because that is the only culture can combine culture and religious together to worship God and also to commemorate ancestors." With all due respect to Reverend Chiang, we know that the statement is not true. The Catholic Church is slowly becoming successful in inculturating all over the world amongst many different societies and the Chinese are not the only peoples to have a tradition of venerating their ancestors. The Union of Catholic Asian News (UCAN) in Hong Kong, published an article in Asia Focus on January 24, 1994 on ancestor veneration in the Catholic Church in Korea. Africa is another example of a continent where many countries have a tradition of ancestor veneration and which is now in the process of being incorporated into the Catholic Church in many areas (McCarthy 29-47; Kraft 309). Actually, Naula Sorhainico from Dominica in the West

33 See Appendix III.
Indies provides a perfect example of a non-Chinese Catholic who comes from a culture with a Catholic tradition of venerating ancestors. In fact, to venerate her ancestors was the reason she came to the Chinese memorial service at Our Lady of the Visitation Church with the Catholic Sister she attends. Naula was born a Catholic, and in her native country, Catholics as well as non-Catholics have a memorial for "dead ancestors" every November whereupon all family members walk to the cemetery - in her Catholic case, after Mass - with candles or lamps where they spend the evening sitting, singing, crying and laughing, beside the grave of their beloved deceased. Naula (per. com. 1993) states, "It's like saying 'hi' to your dead ancestors. It's like once a year you go and spend time with them." However, aside from my objection to Father Chiang's statement that the culture of the Chinese is the only one which has the tradition of venerating ancestors and of being Catholic is my acknowledgement of his point that indeed the process of inculturation is what is taking place here on this day in February of 1993 when he can and does discuss the ancestor memorial service as being a part of Catholic tradition in the context of the local church in the United States (although he does not overtly use the word inculturation, this is, of course, the process to which he refers). Here the Reverend points out (without elaborating to the extent that I do here) that this local church in Paramus, New Jersey, which has a community of ethnic Chinese, has the ability to enrich the universal church and to teach them about their traditions and values such as that of ancestor veneration which is thousands of years old in
accordance with the changes hoped for in Vatican II (Dulles 49). While these ethnic Chinese in Paramus, New Jersey "receive" the message of Christ, they also have the ability to "send" the message of the value of filial piety as expressed through ancestor veneration, in Luzbetak's terms (72). In addition, Father Chiang recognizes that the ethnic Chinese of his parish have something to teach not only other parishes but also other Americans by whom they are surrounded in society - and who may or may not be Catholic - through such traditions as conducting the ancestor memorial service. As quoted twice above, many have expressed the desire to Father Joseph to have the liturgy conducted in schools and churches.

It is worthwhile to note that a predominant theme of Cardinal Yu Pin's first performance of the ancestral rite in Taiwan in 1971 was largely concerned with praying that the Christian message would somehow permeate Chinese culture in such a way that the Chinese tradition of ancestor veneration could be continued as it should be and only could be - that is, by having Taiwan be reunited with the mainland, and consequently with their ancestors. (The Cardinal stated, "May heaven always be at China's side. We make a sacrifice of fruit as a sign of our firm resolve to bring about the day on which we will again celebrate in our country" (157).) In contrast to this deep concern is Father Joseph Chiang's theme as expressed in his homily in 1993 in the United States amongst ethnic Chinese: here the Reverend uses the union of the Chinese tradition of ancestor veneration with the Catholic Church as a way of teaching his parishioners that status and esteem can be gained by recognizing
that Catholic individuals of Chinese ancestry - though a minority in this country - have something very valuable to offer to American society at large.

I would also like to clarify what I believe to be the meaning of another one of Father Chiang's statements where he utters, "We share the first spiritual meal on the altar: each one of you, 'This is my body; this is my blood.' Then after that, we share as a culture, Chinese family, we share the meal..." Although the very last part of his statement is inaudible on my tape, I maintain that Father does not refer here to the offering of food during the ancestral service which occurs after the receipt of communion during Mass; rather, here he refers to the feast which occurs after the Mass and the ancestor memorial service in the auditorium of Our Lady of the Visitation at which time many speeches are also given by the parishioners. Further justification of this interpretation is provided in the words which are stated at the beginning of the ancestor memorial service by the Master of Ceremonies, as shall be seen shortly. (The Master of Ceremonies at that time articulates what the symbolic meaning of the offerings are - on this day, for this parish - and she does not overtly state or imply that the food and wine offered during the rite is in any way being shared between the dead and the living.)

Reverend Chiang's use of the word *worship* also requires explanation before turning our attention to the ancestral rite which follows the Mass. As pointed out by Reverend Larry Barnett, S.S.C., (per. com. 1993), mentioned previously, the word *pai* in Mandarin
Chinese, which translates into the English word *worship*, has different meanings in different contexts. He states that when the word is used in relation to God it means "worship," with all of the supernatural connotations which are characteristically associated with the word by native speakers of the English language. However, when the word is used by Chinese in reference to ancestors, it means "respect." Therefore, I assume that the word *worship* for Father Chiang means "respect" for the ancestors in this context just like the word sacrifice "takes on different meanings" for Chinese in different contexts, as pointed out by Mark Fang and discussed earlier (Fang n.d.) (Addison also clarifies the ambiguity of the meaning of the word worship. He states that *pai* can mean "'worship' in the fullest sense, but also 'visit,' 'pay respect to,' 'reverence,' 'make obeisance to,'" - with the last three meanings being applicable to the "worship" of ancestors in the Catholic context (53).)

Immediately after Mass concludes with the singing of "Amazing Grace" and then organ music, parishioners begin to prepare for the ancestor memorial service. Mary Chen, Assistant to Reverend Chiang at the National Pastoral Center for the Chinese Apostolate, takes the podium and assumes the position of Master of Ceremonies all throughout the performance of the ancestor memorial service. She prefaces the ceremony with a brief explanation of the meaning of the ancestor memorial ritual (as mentioned above):

The liturgy will be conducted in Mandarin Chinese. I'm going to take a few minutes here to explain the liturgy for those who do not understand Mandarin Chinese.
The liturgy is usually performed by the Chinese people on the eve of Chinese New Year and of the Spring Festival. The main purpose, as you may recall, is for all of our children to understand the love of our ancestors and all of the benefits which we have received from our ancestors and to demonstrate our filial piety and gratitude. Under the Confucian influence, Chinese society emphasizes the strong and close relationship of the family. So the family education is basic of our Chinese culture and Chinese society. So here in the United States society, we need badly to reestablish this family education, so we can all enjoy a peaceful and modern society.

During the liturgy the main celebrant with the assistants will offer three gifts to our ancestors. First is incense which symbolizes our prayers to God, our Heavenly Father to ask him to bless our ancestors souls and give them everlasting rest and peace. Secondly, is the flowers which symbolizes our love and filial piety. It also means the multiplication of our generations by generations insuring our family prosperity. Thirdly, we offer fruits and wine to our ancestors which represent good harvest of crops which is very important to an agricultural country such as China.

During the ceremony, we will also bow three times to our ancestors. The bowing of the head means our most solemn, great respect and our piety and our love to our ancestors. This is a Chinese custom even today if we want to greet each other or to show respect. So now let us stand and observe this solemn liturgy for our ancestors.

Next Mary announces that Reverend Joseph Chiang and a co-celebrant should take their positions in front of the altar. She then narrates what is being placed on the ancestor table as three parishioners individually carry the trays of fruit and wine, and the flowers up to the front of the sanctuary where Father Chiang and the young co-celebrant stand. First, an older woman hands the tray of wine to Father Chiang, who in turn hands it to the co-celebrant, dressed in a long white tunic, who stands behind him on the sanctuary. The co-celebrant takes the tray of wine and places it on
the ancestor table which is still on the left side of the sanctuary. Next, an older man hands the tray of fruit to Father Chiang. When the young man returns to the center of the sanctuary, Father Chiang hands him the wine. Again, the young man places the wine on the ancestor table. The same actions are repeated with the flowers after two young women each hand a pot of flowers to the Reverend (I do not know when the second pot of flowers was removed from the ancestor table and placed in the center aisle). After this preparation is complete, two young parishioners and the co-celebrant move the table to the very center of the sanctuary directly in front of the altar. An older woman approaches the table and lights the two tall red candles on either side of the ancestor tablet as a young man, dressed in a suit, relocates the yellow scroll to the left side of the table. This young man holds the basket of joss sticks standing in front of and to the left of the ancestor table.

Although Mary Chen next announces that music will be played, there is silence. (Father Chiang (per. com. 1993) later clarified for me that someone had forgotten to take care of that part of the ceremony which was supposed to include classical Chinese music.)

The Master of Ceremonies proceeds by announcing that she will be reading a passage from Scripture and requests that everyone please be seated. Mary Chen reads Ecclesiasticus 4, 1:15:

Now let us call the roll of famous men that were our fathers, long ago. What high achievements the Lord has made known in them, ever since time began! Here were men that had power and bore rule, men that excelled in strength, or in the wisdom that dowered them; prophets that worthily upheld the name of
prophecy, issuing to the people the commands their times
needed, uttering through their foresight, a sacred charge to the
nations. Here were men that had skill to devise melodies to
make songs and to set them down in writing. Here were men
rich in ability, (noble of aim), that dwelt peacefully in their
times. These were the glories of their race, the ornament of
their times; and the sons they begot have left a memory that
adds to a recital of their praise. Not like those of others, who
are forgotten in death as if they had never been; nameless,
they and their children, as if they had never lived; no, these
were men of tender conscience; their deeds of charity will
never be forgotten. Blessings abide with their posterity; their
descendants are a race set apart for God, the pledged heirs of
his promises. For their sakes this line of theirs will endure for
all time; their stock, their name will never be allowed to die
out. Their bodies lie in peace; their name lasts on, age after
age. Their wisdom is yet a legend among the people; wherever
faithful men assemble, their story is told.

Congregation responds: Thanks be to the Lord.

Ambassador Martin Feng, from the People's Republic of China
(Taiwan), goes to the podium and, in sum, expresses his pleasure at
having the opportunity to participate in the ancestor memorial
service in the United States and then elaborates as to its significance.
He states that even though this country is modern and advanced
technologically, there are many social problems as is demonstrated
by the increase in violence. The Ambassador maintains that the
enactment of this ritual in the United States is important for
individuals of Chinese ancestry because it serves as a reminder of
traditional Chinese values and will lessen the possibility of the
Chinese being influenced by the decadent influences in American
society. However, he also indicates that the ancestor memorial
service can teach individuals of all ethnic backgrounds the values of high standards of moral behavior which are treasures which Chinese should share with all of humankind and not just with each other. Ambassador Feng then proceeds to wish all of the parishioners a happy and prosperous New Year. He concludes by giving a special wish of the same sort to Reverend Joseph Chiang, in particular.

The parishioners clap at the conclusion of his talk, and May Tsai, President of the Chinese Apostolate O.L.V. Church takes to the podium where she, in sum, thanks the Taiwan Ambassador for his words, praises him for his accomplishments, and awards him with a plaque. Ms. Tsai joins Ambassador Feng on the left side of the ancestor table on the sanctuary to pose for a picture of her handing him the plaque as the parishioners applause.

Reverend Chiang goes to the podium and announces that the Prayer of the Faithful is about to begin. He states, "God commanded us to honor our parents and ancestors. With that in mind, let us pray for our ancestors." The Reverend steps down. The Master of Ceremonies, Mary Chen, resumes her position at the podium.

Mary recites the following Prayer of the Faithful: "Let us pray for all our ancestors, families and friends. May God grant us peace. May we be worthy progenies. Let us pray." The congregation responds in unison: "God hear our prayer."

Mary Chen recites the following prayer: "Let us pray for all the Chinese. May God grant us the ability to endure hardships and make us love and unite with each other. May the grace of the Lord be with
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us. Let us pray." The congregation prays in unison: "God hear our prayer."

Mary Chen recites the following prayer: "Let us pray for our brothers and sisters who are here today. May God bless them, grant health to the body, peace to the mind and success in all that they do. Let us pray." The congregation prays in unison: "God hear our prayer."

The Prayer of the Faithful is complete and the Reverend concludes with the following words: "Merciful Father in Heaven, God of Abraham, Jacob and our forefathers, hear the prayer of your family here. Let those we remember today share your love and rest in you care."

After the Reverend finishes his prayer, the main celebrant of the offerings, who is dressed in a suit and tie, proceeds to the front of the altar and stands alone directly in front of the ancestor table. He looks at a sheet of paper he is holding with both hands in front of him. Shortly thereafter, this main celebrant is joined by two assistants who are dressed in long black cassocks. The young man with the joss sticks stands to the right and behind these gentlemen. The assistant who stands to the left of the main celebrant picks up the yellow scroll and unrolls it. The two assistants hold this rather large (approximately two foot wide and three foot long) piece of yellow cloth which has Chinese calligraphy painted on it while the main celebrant reads what is there written aloud. He reads what is called the Salutation:
God created our soul and our forefathers the physical being. These gifts of birth and nurturing are as high as the mountains and as deep as the ocean,
At this beginning of a new year, a time when the earth returns to spring,
We drink the water while remembering the source,
Our gratitude to you is everlasting.

The assistant on the right takes the scroll, rolls it up, and places it on the right side of the ancestor table. The three men stand facing the ancestor table and the main celebrant takes out the paper he had been holding prior to the reading of the Salutation. The Master of Ceremonies announces that the "Sacrificial Offerings" are about to begin. The young man with the joss sticks hands the main celebrant three lighted incense sticks which he receives with both hands. The main celebrant raises them to his forehead before making a deep ceremonial bow (jugung) in front of the ancestor tablet and places the incense into the center of the incense burner filled with sand.

The Master of Ceremonies announces the "Offering of Fruit": One of the assistants hands the main celebrant the tray of fruit who receives it with both hands, raises it to his forehead, makes a deep bow and places it back on the ancestor table.

The Master of Ceremonies announces the "Offering of Flowers": One of the co-servers hands the main server the smaller, multi-colored pot of flowers which had been placed on the right side of the table. The main server receives it with both hands, raises it to his forehead, bows deeply and replaces the flowers on the table.

The Master of Ceremonies announces the "Offering of Wine": One of the co-servers hands the main celebrant the tray of wine
which the main server receives with two hands, raises to his forehead, bows deeply, and then places the tray on the ancestor table.

The offerings are complete and the Master of Ceremonies announces that everyone will now bow three times to the ancestors (in English). The three servers remain in front of the ancestor table while Reverend Chiang and the accompanying priest stand in the sanctuary, behind and to the left of the ancestor table. They face both the ancestor table and the three servers from their position while Mary Chen is at the podium. Mary announces, "First bow," and everyone bows deeply from the waist. Mary announces, "Second bow," and again everyone bows. Mary announces the third bow and everyone responds accordingly. Next Mary Chen announces that everyone will bow once to each other which everyone does. Finally she announces that the congregation should bow to the servers to wish them a happy and successful New Year which everyone does.

Reverend Chiang speaks. He states that after families come up to offer their incense to the ancestors, everyone should retreat downstairs where there will be a New Year celebration with food. All of the family members present begin to line up in front of the ancestor table down the aisle of the church. (Recall that there are almost one hundred individuals in attendance.) Each person lights an incense stick in front of the ancestor tablet, bows, and places the incense in the incense burner. (I am assuming that people pray as they complete this act just as in the Western tradition of the Catholic Church, parishioners pray as they light candles.) Usually this is done
in pairs, but there are small groups of families who light the incense, bow and place the incense in the burner concurrently. There are also individuals, such as Naula Sorhainico, who complete these actions alone. The first to begin this very last part of the ritual are the two priests.

Let us examine the second section of Mary's words spoken first. They are of great interest to us because here we have concrete examples which demonstrate that the symbolic meanings associated with the artifacts that are characteristically used in the ancestor memorial service are "fluid," to use Minamiki's and Sister Janet's terms, as I mentioned earlier (Minamiki 1985:210; per. com. 1994). In other words, here we have proof that the symbolic meanings associated with incense, flowers, fruit and wine do not have the same associations as they did in Cardinal Yu Pin's performance in 1971. In this 1993 Paramus, New Jersey ritual incense is said to "symbolize our prayers to God, our Heavenly Father, to ask him to bless our ancestor's souls and give them everlasting rest and peace"; In the 1971 Taipei ritual, incense symbolizes "reverence and veneration" (Gutheinz 156). There is quite a difference between these two interpretations: the Our Lady of the Visitation one is strictly Catholic in orientation while the Taipei symbolism is more secular in nature. In the Paramus ritual, the flowers symbolize "our love and filial piety." Here it also means "the multiplication of our generations by generations insuring our family prosperity." In the Cardinal's ceremony, flowers represent "the creative powers of heaven and earth. May it always be this way down through all generations"
(Gutheinz 157). The American interpretation given here is multiple. The second part which indicates the hope of continuing the family line is analogous to the meaning given to flowers in the Taipei rite where they represent the ability of the ancestors to have procreated. On the other hand, there is no parallel between the "love and filial piety" aspect of the symbolism in the Paramus rite with that of the Taipei ritual. Reverend Chiang's service has the Master of Ceremonies state that fruits and wine are offered to the ancestors as symbols of "good harvest of crops which is very important to an agricultural country such as China." It is quite interesting that the symbolism here does not reflect the situation of individuals of Chinese ancestry in the context of the United States. Perhaps it is because Father Chiang identifies more strongly with China than he does with the United States - as is evident in his homily - that the symbolism does not reflect the American situation. Although wine is offered with flowers to symbolize "life community" in the first sacrifice of the Cardinal's service, wine and fruit are offered together in the second sacrifice of that ceremony as they are in separate offerings of the Our Lady of the Visitation ritual. The summary of the Cardinals' service by Gutheinz, however, only confines an interpretation of the symbolism to that of the fruit, which, as stated on several previous occasions, signifies for the Chinese in Taiwan during the period of the Cultural Revolution on the mainland "our firm resolve to bring about the day on which we will again celebrate in our country" (157). My educated guess as to the reason that the fruit and wine symbolize "a good harvest of crops" in the Paramus ritual is because this may
have been an interpretation of the offering of fruit and wine in a traditional non-Catholic ancestral rite which was held either in Taiwan or on mainland China (where Reverend Chiang was born and raised, if the reader recalls) at a time when such a political situation did not exist between the two Chinas or where it was not a predominant concern of the folk for whom this symbolism had meaning during their ancestral rites. It is quite apparent that there is no parallel between the symbolism of the fruit and wine in the 1993 Paramus rite as compared to that of the symbolic meaning associated with the offerings in the Cardinal's service.

The significance of the bowing in Reverend Chiang's service in comparison to the gesture's signification in Cardinal Yu Pin's is almost the same; that is, in the Paramus ritual Mary Chen states that the bowing means "great respect" which we can equate with the word "reverence" used by Gutheinz in reference to its symbolic meaning in the Cardinal's service (157). The only difference is that Mary Chen elaborates a bit on the gesture's meaning by also adding that it expresses "piety" and "love" for our ancestors. Essentially, however, we can equate the meaning of the bow in both services as being the same.

At the Our Lady of the Visitation service bowing occurs three times to the ancestors, once to each other, and once to the servers at the end of the ritual as the Master of Ceremonies announced they would at the beginning of the service. It is interesting to note that even when the same priest and Master of Ceremonies are in charge of the ancestor memorial service on different years, that there are
variations as to how many bows occur when and to whom. For example, during the Chinese New Year ancestral rite which took place at Holy Rosary Church in Jersey City, New Jersey on February 21, 1987, Mary Chen announced the same symbolic meanings for the incense, wine, flowers and bowing as she does at Our Lady of the Visitation in 1993. However, she also adds that the bowing occurs during the rite three times to God, three times to the ancestors, and then, at the conclusion of the ritual, once to each other. This is a clear example of just how, exactly, the ritual is conducted varies not only from parish to parish but from year to year. As Reverend Chiang (per. com 1994) has said to me repeatedly, "There is no set way; it changes each time." It is notable, however, that the symbolic meanings of the offerings and the bowing are the same in the Our Lady of Visitation and Holy Rosary rites, and that only three bows to God are added in the Jersey City parish ritual (Chiang 1987 Videorecording). (I must mention that the festivities which occurred within this Church as a part of this celebration of the New Year, but which were not a part of the rites, were spectacular. The Solemn Pontifical Mass, whose celebrants were Theodore McCarrick, Archbishop of Newark, and ten other bishops and priests - including Reverend Chiang who was responsible for the event - was followed by a lion dance down the center of the aisle of the Church and a procession of individuals of Chinese ancestry dressed in traditional Chinese costumes which were representative of the dress from different periods of Chinese history. The women, who were especially beautifully attired and made up, had the responsibility of
handing the offerings to the main celebrant during the ancestral ritual (Chiang 1987 Videorecording).

I am also obligated to mention that a Holy Redeemer Bulletin from the late 1980s explains the significance of the offerings during the liturgy as it was conducted by Reverend Paul Tsau, who, along with Ching Shyong Liu, was one of the very first people I interviewed for this project. Reverend Tsau provided me with the bulletin which specifies the symbolic meanings of the incense, flowers, fruits and wine, and bowing in December of 1988. All of the meanings attributed to the offerings in the bulletin are the same as those given orally by Mary Chen at the 1993 Our Lady of the Visitation service and at the 1987 Holy Rosary service with the exception of an addition to the symbolic significance of the incense which suggests that parishioners should "ask them [God and the ancestors] to protect each of us from every evil in this life" (n.d.:2; my brackets). On two previous occasions, I suggest that the symbolic meanings of the offerings made during an ancestor memorial ritual are just as fluid within the Catholic Church as within a traditional non-Catholic offering. I have provided evidence that they are extremely fluid when we compare the meanings associated with the offerings in Taiwan as compared to the meanings associated with them in the three parishes I mention here in the northeastern United States. On the other hand, there is not much variation at all between the significance attributed to the offerings between Our Lady of Visitation, Holy Rosary and Holy Redeemer (the Church of the Saint Joseph and Saint Theresa Church did not provide...
interpretations of the offerings in February of this year). This lack of radical difference in the symbolic association of the offerings would be in harmony with the recommendations made in Vatican II documents in regard to liturgies that are performed within close range of each other. As Chupungco points out, "SC 23 [Sacrosanctum Concilium] urges against notable differences in the rites used in adjacent regions" (1982:49; my brackets). However, I am not certain that this would apply to the symbolic meanings attributed to the offerings by individual parish priests. Either way, I still maintain that there are variations in the symbolic meanings given to the offerings on the level of the parish as strongly evidenced by the difference between the meanings of the offerings in the Cardinal's rite as compared to the meanings given in Our Lady of the Visitation, Holy Rosary, and Holy Redeemer parishes, and as evidenced in a minor way in the difference in meaning of the incense at the 1987 Our Lady of the Visitation ceremony as compared to the meaning attributed to the artifact in the Holy Redeemer bulletin from the late 1980s.

As pointed out earlier, the Bishops' Conference liturgy does not provide any interpretations of the symbolic meaning of the offerings. However, I can comment on the similarity of the order and the way in which the incense, fruit, flowers and wine are offered during the Our Lady of the Visitation ancestor memorial ritual of 1993 as described above when compared to the liturgy as "proposed" by the Chinese Bishops' Conference in 1974. The way in which an assistant hands the offerings to the main celebrant in Paramus is the same as
the way in which the bishops' liturgy describes that the Master of Ceremonies hands the offerings to the celebrant. That is, an individual hands the celebrant the object/s being offered, the celebrant raises it/them to his forehead, bows deeply, and places the object/s on the ancestor table. The only difference between this part of the ritual as described in the bishops' liturgy in comparison to that of the 1993 Paramus service is that the offering of the fruit, the flowers, and the wine are not indicated as being called out as they are being offered: during the Paramus ritual Mary Chen called out "Sacrificial Offerings," "Offerings of Fruit," et cetera. In addition, the order in which the offerings were made at Our Lady of the Visitation is slightly different than the order in which they are to be made according to the bishops' text, as mentioned previously. That is, the Taiwan liturgy offers incense, flowers, wine and then fruit while the Paramus ritual made the offerings in the following order: incense, fruit, flowers, and wine (2-3).

In regard to the bowing in the bishops' liturgy as compared to this part of the Our Lady of the Visitation ritual, some indication as to the meaning of the bowing is given in the bishops' text. As pointed out earlier, this gesture is therein referred to as the "Rite of formal Obeisance" which, of course, means a rite of respect or reverence (3). Similarly, as related above, the Master of Ceremonies explains that the bowing means "our solemn, great respect and our piety and our love to our ancestors." Therefore, the meaning of the gesture in both rites is the same, but Mary Chen's explanation of it is much more elaborate than that which is presented in the bishops'
liturgy. On the other hand, we can contrast the bowing ceremony which is described in the Taiwan liturgy to the bowing which took place in the Paramus rite. The first part of the Our Lady of the Visitation series of gestures is exactly as is described in the bishops' text: the Master of Ceremonies announces each of the three bows before everyone present performs the jugung in the direction of the ancestor tablet. However, the Paramus rite adds two more immediately after the three bows to the ancestors: the first jugung involves bowing to each other, and then a final one is added in honor of the servers. In addition, the bishops' liturgy adds that one bow to the ancestor tablet should be performed only by the celebrant and the servers after the Prayer of the Faithful has been said and after the entire rite has concluded for everyone else (4).

There is one more point I would like to add in regard to the difference in the way both of these ceremonies terminate. I state in the above paragraph that the bishops' liturgy has the celebrant and the servers bowing to the ancestor tablet after the service has concluded. In contrast, the Our Lady of the Visitation ceremony has the parishioners come up to the ancestor table and offer incense before the ancestor tablet after the conclusion of that ceremony. The Taiwan Bishops' Conference liturgical text does not include mention of these actions on the part of the parishioners at all. However, this omission in the text does not mean that parishioners may never offer incense in Taiwan such as they do at Our Lady of the Visitation at the end of the rite. I make this suggestion because even though the liturgical text provided by The Church of St. Joseph in New York does
not indicate that the parishioners light incense at the end of the ancestral memorial service, they did do just this after the service I attended there during Chinese New Year earlier this year.

Let us next examine the very first part of Mary Chen's introduction prior to the actual service. In the first paragraph of her explanation of the significance of the ceremony, she elucidates the themes we have already covered in regard to the meaning of the ancestor veneration ceremony for Chinese whether it may be conducted within or outside of the Catholic Church. Here she clarifies that the service is performed for the benefits received from the ancestors and as a way of demonstrating filial piety and gratitude toward them. Mary also elaborates upon Confucian ethics and its concern with the encouragement of filial piety and emphasis placed on the family. She suggests that the teachings of Confucius can have great relevance in the context of the United States where she implies that the family unit as an institution, and therefore as an instrument which teaches its young proper moral conduct is deficient. Mary also suggests that the lack of family education in the United States is why there is a need for such a ritual which reinforces family values in order for our contemporary society to be harmonious or "peaceful." Therefore, in the first part of her explanation, Mary proposes that the centuries old Chinese tradition of ancestor veneration can have a positive influence on the moral fabric of American society in the 1990s, and needs it "badly."

This first section of Mary's explanation of the meaning of the rites, incidentally, is very similar to the ideas expressed in a
November 1988 Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church Bulletin. The piece begins with the question, "WHY DO WE HAVE TO ADORE HEAVEN AND WORSHIP OUR ANCESTORS?" Then it states, "The above question was one of the many questions asked by the Chinese friends of our late and beloved Cardinal Yu Pin. The Cardinal's answer was: 'My reason is very simple, adore Heaven, which is equal to God, and worship our ancestors which is an ancient Chinese custom, especially in this twentieth century, the morality concept and life as well is so badly damaged and deteriorated, that the promotion of the adoration of God and the worship of our ancestors can be a strong influence on personal conduct and change the moral style of today's society..." (According to George Moy (per. com. 1992), long time parishioner of Holy Redeemer and PCDC board member, Cardinal Yu Pin was in Philadelphia about fifty five years ago and was extremely dismayed to find that so few Chinese Americans were Catholic, incidentally.) Mary's speech is similar to the Cardinal's words as reported in the Holy Redeemer bulletin in that she suggests that the ancestor memorial service can teach Confucian moral values in contemporary American society which has problems just as the Cardinal does - only his words in this respect are stronger. He is quoted as having overtly stated that "morality" is "badly damaged and deteriorated," "especially in the twentieth century." Thus, from the Cardinal's point of view, as well as from Mary's (or from that of the text she is following), both maintain that the veneration of ancestors can help to improve human relationships in a society that does not demonstrate high moral character. The main difference between their ideas
presented here is that Mary does not refer to God in her preface to the ritual. Her main emphasis in this first section we have examined is on the ability of Confucian teachings to improve life in this "modern" Western society. (I should not neglect to point out, however, that the embroidered banner that was draped across the altar at Our Lady of the Visitation that day includes words which echo the Cardinal's sentiments quoted above quite precisely. The essence of the advice given on the banner is the same as that of the Cardinal's. Once again, the banner states, "Worship God and Offer Sacrifice to Our Ancestors.") Although Mary does not mention God in this part of her talk, it is still fascinating for us to recognize the extent to which the ancestral rites, within the context of the Catholic Church, have come in fifty-five years (for it was only fifty-five years ago that that Catholics were even allowed to attend ancestral rites at all - since 1939). Here Mary's words spoken prior to the rite indicate that the Church recognizes that this tradition which caused so much controversy for so many years is rich in goodness and has much to teach non-Chinese all over the world - and on this day of our concern, in the United States.

Although I have used the phrase *filial piety* on many occasions throughout this project, and elaborated upon its meaning according to Confucian teachings to some extent, more elucidation is required at this point. In consideration of the Master of Ceremony's remarks on the function and meaning of the ancestor memorial liturgy within the context of the United States (as well as those of Cardinal Yu Pin), many of us in the United States would agree that the state of the
family in contemporary society is becoming less stable - with the increase in divorce rates and of single parents used as evidence for this observation. (Family members frequently residing thousands of miles apart, in different states, can also be used as evidence of this.) However, when Mary Chen states that "Under the Confucian influence, Chinese society emphasizes the strong and close relationship of the family," and she refers to the tradition of "family education" in Chinese culture, these words have more weight in regard to the traditional responsibility of the family unit in Chinese society to educate family members in regard to their moral behavior and conduct in society than they do for the traditional responsibility of families to educate their children in many Western countries, for instance. The extent of the traditional responsibility of the family to morally educate and control behavior overlapped with the responsibility of the state to dictate, control and punish behavior in many periods of Chinese history (and to varying degrees in different geographical locations) (Latourette 1964: 565-574). As the China scholar H.G. Creel states, "The family has been important in many cultures, but it is doubtful it has anywhere been more important, for a longer time, than in China" (125; Latourette 1964:565). Therefore, a reiteration of and elaboration upon the significance of filial piety in Chinese society will enhance our understanding of this rather bold assertion.

I have stated previously that filial piety, one of the Confucian "cardinal virtues," begins with the deep respect which children demonstrate to their parents within the context of their own nuclear
families (Latourette 1964:568). I have also put forth that demonstration of respect for one's parents does not end with the death of a mother or father, but rather the relationship continues after death as is symbolized by the continual performance of the ancestral rites by the children. Thus, one of the five significant relationships in life, as named by Confucius, is that between father and son (although filial behavior is also expected of the daughter this ritual responsibility falls on that of the son) (Latourette 1964:569). As also stated previously, the other four important relationships named by Confucius are ruler-subject, husband-wife, elder and younger brother, and friend and friend (Ching 96). If the subject, the wife and the younger brother treat those with whom they are in a corresponding relationship with respect and accept their inferior status in relation to them, this proper behavior, or moral conduct (Li) will help produce a harmonious society. In addition, behaving in an upright and moral manner in regard to an equal - that of a friend - also helps society to accomplish this goal. Of the five relationships named by Confucius, three of them have to do with the family: father-son, husband-wife, elder and younger brother. Because three of the most important relationships in society are within the realm of the family, if there is peace and harmony in the family, according to Confucian teaching, there is a greater chance that there will be peace and harmony in society. The Confucian text The Great Learning states the following: "From the loving example of one family a whole State becomes loving, and from its courtesies the whole state becomes courteous" (Legge 1966: 370). The peace and harmony which is
therefore striven for within the family and ultimately within society is not left to luck and/or to the inherent goodness of the individuals who compose these social units. Rather, throughout many periods of Chinese history, moral instruction of the family (largely based on Confucian teachings) was highly organized and even became institutionalized by the eighteenth century (Liu 71).

The traditional organization of the Chinese family unit - beyond the nuclear family - is very important for us to understand. First there is what is known as the fang, a "subdivision of the clan [which] was composed of the male descendents within five generations tracing down from a male ancestor" (Yang 47; my brackets). The further extension of the family is known as the clan, which is "the large and more loosely integrated group...with a distant ancestor of several scores of preceding generations as the mark of common origin and the symbol of social ties" (Yang 47). The more closely the individuals are in relationship to an ancestor, the more elaborate and frequent the ancestral rites are expected to be carried out by these individuals. The performance of rites for an extremely distant ancestor, for instance, would bring all of the members of the clan together with less frequency than the rites that would be performed within the context of a nuclear family and then a fang (Yang 47). We must recall that the performance of the ancestral rites is traditionally one of the most important ways that an individual demonstrates filial piety within the family. As stated above, the living continue to demonstrate their filiality to the deceased by conducting this service. The performance of the rites also helps solidify the relationships of
the living members of the nuclear family, the *fang* and the clan. However, the gathering of the clan would not traditionally only occur for ancestral rites, but also for meetings in which moral instruction would occur. (We must keep in mind that there was regional variance: clan organization was more strongly developed in the south of China in contrast to the north where families were more loosely organized (Latourette 1964:567).) During these meetings, clan rules would be provided in which guidelines for "ideal conduct" would be outlined (Liu 64). The state encouraged the moral education of the family or the clan by the clan members and would sometimes distribute moral guidelines for behavior to the clans in order to have them be instilled in and by the clan members. Interestingly enough, the emperor K'ang Hsi, who was such a significant figure during the time of the Jesuits in China (and who is responsible for having decreed the rites to be civil in nature in 1700 only to have it ignored by Rome) issued Sixteen Injunctions in 1670 which were to be incorporated into the clan rules and taught to family members. The Sixteen Injunctions follow:

1. Be steadfast in filial piety and brotherhood.
2. Be close to fellow clan members.
3. Be kind to community people.
4. Take care of farming productivity.
5. Be industrious and thrifty.
7. Abjure heretical religions
8. Learn the law and statutes.
9. Follow the rituals in showing deference to others.
10. Attend to your proper vocation.
11. Instruct sons and younger ones.
12. Forbid false accusation
13. Do not harbor outlaws.
15. Organize pao-chia neighborhood units to maintain local order.
16. Resolve enmities (Liu 73-74)

This list of Injunctions is more specific as to how to behave than the teachings of Confucius are in many areas and go beyond the significance of the ancestral rites with which we are here most concerned. However, it is important that we recognize that the clan members had the responsibility to teach these Injunctions (which names filial piety as number one, incidentally) to the individuals who composed it, and that carrying out these Injunctions in daily life largely depended upon the cultivation of moral character instilled in individual clan members by Confucian teachings. As Latourette states, "Confucian rearing" taught that "salvation of the state and society depended ultimately on the moral character of the individual" (1964: 368). Therefore, we can see how the state had an investment in the family being responsible for social control as demonstrated by the Injunctions from the Ch'ing dynasty (1644-1912) quoted above. The more responsibility the family assumed in regard to moral education and even reinforcement and punishment if the moral guidelines were not followed, the easier it would be to achieve and maintain a peaceful and harmonious society in China (Liu 70). The Great Learning clearly states that "the government of the State depends on the regulation of the family" (Legge 1966:371).

With the awareness of this additional information about the
extent to which the family has traditionally been responsible for teaching morality and therefore law and order, we can see more clearly the weight of the words of Mary Chen, Cardinal Yu Pin and even those of The Ambassador of Taiwan, who, though a secular addition to the ancestor memorial ceremony, echoed their words about the need for high moral standards in American society which the teachings of Chinese culture could supply.\textsuperscript{34} Actually, Ambassador Feng's words parallel a finding of the scholar Julia Ching, when the former states that the cultivation of traditional Chinese values in American society will help prevent the individuals of Chinese ancestry who live here from being influenced by its decadent influences. Ching states, "Familial relations provide a model for social behavior. Respect your own elders, as well as others' elders; be kind to your own children and juniors, as well as those of others...These are the instructions...and they have provided inspiration for generations of Confucians. They have been the reason for the strong sense of solidarity not only in the Chinese family, but also in Chinese social organizations, even among overseas Chinese communities today" (Kung and Ching 70). Even though the family is not as fully responsible for teaching the concerns of the state to its

\textsuperscript{34} The 1993 Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church ancestor memorial service was the only other ancestral rite in which a secular speaker took the podium. At the very end of this ritual, two college age Mandarin speaking parishioners spoke about the need for Holy Redeemer to find a priest of Chinese ancestry. My Shanghai friend, Jian-Ping Cheng, who accompanied me during the service found this speech to be inappropriate both because it was given during the context of the ancestral ritual and because these words were spoken in front of the two Caucasian priests who are presently at Holy Redeemer, and who could not understand what was being said. This speech given by the Ambassador during the Paramus service, however, directly relates to the event of the day.
members to the extent that it was during the time of K'ang Hsi, it is still an important institution where moral values and proper behavior are taught especially in Taiwan where the influence of the Communist party has not rearranged the shape and function of this social unit as it has to some extent on mainland China, and where the Communist government has a history of dictating some aspects of the behavior of individual family members - the particulars of which go beyond the scope of this paper (Kung and Ching 89; Davis and Harrell 3-5). (I mentioned previously that the Communists ultimately declared Confucius as an enemy. The model traditional family as idealized by Confucius was attacked by the Communists: the latter attempted to replace the importance of the five relationships defined by Confucius with the five loves of the Communist party: that of the fatherland, the people, labor, science, and public property (Latourette 1964:406).)

The traditional Chinese family also has been concerned with teaching the importance of remembering the family's origins and of keeping track of these origins through genealogical records, and of course, through the enactment of ancestral rites. The words of Chang Tsai from the Sung Dynasty (960-1279 A.D.) demonstrate the significance of clan origin and of the maintenance of clan genealogical records for traditional Chinese. He states, "'To control the heart of the people needs the gathering of clan members and the promotion of good customs so that the people will not forget their origins. To achieve this purpose requires genealogy, clan organization, and the ancient system of tsung-tzu [head of the leading lineage by
primogeniture as the clan head]...if there is no genealogy, the families do not know their origins and cannot be kept together very long."

(Liu 64). Hui-Chen Wang Liu provides another quotation from a Sung scholar which is relevant to our interest in regard to the clan, especially as concerns ancestral rites. Chu Hsi states, "'Furthermore, the system of tsung-tzu follows the principle of nature. For example, a tree has its trunk, coming up straight from its root, as well as its side branches. A waterway, however long, has its main stream among other divergent streams. This is natural. What is needed now is for a few families of leading officials to try to revive the tsung-tzu system, that is, the system of keeping families together. One way of achieving this objective is to follow the precedent of the T'ang period [618-906 A.D.] by establishing ancestral halls and clan estates, so that the ancestral inheritance remains intact and can be managed by one chosen person..." (Liu 65; my brackets). Both of these quotations are directly relevant to two of the passages which are read during the Our Lady of the Visitation 1993 ancestral memorial service which is under examination here.

First of all, this second quotation of the words of Chu Hsi, a Neo-Confucian scholar, should remind the reader of two motifs which I have already discussed in Chapter 8. Here I refer to the motifs of the root of the tree and of the water theme. Although the root of the tree theme is not included in the Our Lady of the Visitation Salutation, the water theme clearly is. Again I repeat the Salutation here:
God created our soul and our forefathers the physical being. These gifts of birth and nurturing are as high as the mountains and as deep as the ocean, At this beginning of a new year, a time when the earth returns to spring, We drink the water while remembering the source, Our gratitude to you is everlasting."

This Salutation, an address to the ancestors and to the Christian God, reflects, in regard to the former, the Confucian ideas indicated in both of the quotations above. These words recall in a traditional Confucian manner the origins of the individuals of Chinese ancestry who recite them. That is, those of Chinese ancestry in the United States for whom these words have meaning within the context of the ancestral service are keeping track of their genealogy with the appreciation that is required of them according to Confucian teachings. They are remembering the "source," ("the forefathers of our physical being") of their lives: their ancestors. They "drink the water" of life - or enjoy this "gift" of life - only while remembering how it was made possible. They do not forget to remember and to thank their "source" at this time of renewal, that of the Spring Festival - or Chinese New Year - while using images drawn from different Confucian teachings, as we have seen particularly in regard to the water image, as recalled above. Thus, within the context of the United States in the 1990s, the main objectives described by these above quoted Sung scholars are still being actualized: origins are being remembered and ancestral rites are being enacted by individuals of Chinese ancestry to "control the heart of the people" and "to promote good customs."
The only phrase in the entire Salutation which cannot be interpreted as being Confucian in orientation is the very first phrase, "God created our soul." The Salutation, therefore, expresses not only the traditional Chinese values of remembering their Chinese origins with gratitude, but it also expresses acknowledgement that all of these "gifts" from the ancestors are only possible because God is responsible for the creation of our souls as human beings. Thus, the Salutation can be interpreted to be an address to both God and the ancestors within the ancestral memorial service performed in the Catholic Church. In evaluation of the entire Salutation text under discussion here, Reverend Mark Fang, liturgist (per. com. 1994), asserts that the images - such as "water" and "mountains" - expressed in the Salutation are drawn from various Confucian texts which are stated repeatedly throughout them. Some apt examples of water images in the Chinese Classics come from the Confucian Doctrine of the Mean where they are numerous: "Are like river currents," "deep and active as a fountain," and "like overflowing water" are three such illustrations (Legge 1966: 428; 398,422). Imagery of mountains and water are also found there: "The earth...sustains mountains...and contains rivers and seas" (Legge 420-421). In addition, Reverend Fang surmises that the Salutation was written by a Catholic for the purpose of expressing both Christian and traditional Confucian values in the ancestor memorial service. Unfortunately, no one I asked during interviews for this project knows who wrote the Salutation nor when it was composed. (It is important to note once again, however, that the Salutation is included
in the liturgies of St. Joseph's Church, the Archdiocese of Seattle, St. Mary's Cathedral as well as Our Lady of the Visitation.)

In a way that is similar to - but not the same as - the significance of the inclusion of the Salutation in the ancestor memorial liturgy of Our Lady of the Visitation is that of the inclusion of a passage from Scripture: Ecclesiasticus 44, 1:15. As the words quoted above by the Chinese scholar Chang Tsai indicate, the keeping of genealogical records traditionally have been an important custom for Chinese. (Admittedly, however, the extent to which and seriousness with which they are presently maintained varies as the family structure and traditions have been affected by Communism on the mainland, as changes in economic ties occur for those who move from agricultural communities to the city, and due to the influence of "the acids of Western modernity" on the traditional Chinese family (Latourette 1964:405; 565-601; 367-406; Yang 380; Bush 377).) Not only the keeping of genealogical records but also the "frequent recalling of the names and deeds" of ancestors as recorded in these books is an important Confucian teaching and traditional Chinese custom (Thompson 58; Hsu 229-232). Although Ecclesiasticus does not recall the deeds of ancestors of Chinese people, obviously, this passage from The Book of Wisdom, also known as the "Eulogy of the Ancestors" praises the achievements of "the great figures of biblical history" in such a way that the Chinese would wholeheartedly approve - and obviously do or else they would not have included it in their liturgy (Eliade 1984: 261). In the section from Ecclesiasticus which is spoken by the Master of Ceremonies
during the Paramus ancestral ritual, praises for the ancestors of the Jewish people are sung by Ben Sirach, scribe and teacher (Eliade 1984: 261). Francis Hsu reports the kinds of information that typically would be kept by Chinese in regard to outstanding ancestors, and therefore on the quality of praises that would be sung in their memory. Hsu's findings, which are based on fieldwork conducted in the 1940s in Kunming, China reveal that the following qualities were valued: "1. Those who attained high examination honors 2. Those who achieved outstanding merit through excellencies of personality....3. Those who demonstrated outstanding loyalty and martyrdom...4. Those who performed kindly deeds...5. Those who have performed outstanding acts of filial piety and fraternity..." and eleven more are named (230-232). Maurice Freedman also summarizes the content of traditional Chinese genealogical records which, he claims, frequently "look back to an ultimate origin of glory...In chronicling many generations and enumerating vast numbers of men, the genealogy must of necessity document some success for the clan: somebody, somewhere, at some time has been a scholar, held office, or otherwise brought honour to his agnates" (Freedman 1971:28). Therefore, we can see the parallels between the achievements which are named in Ecclesiasticus where men of "strength" and "wisdom" and "skill" and "ability" are eulogized and those of the Chinese genealogical records, where men who are "outstanding" and successful are also recorded and praised and remembered. Both the genealogical record of the Scripture passage and the genealogical records of those traditionally kept by
the Chinese recall the "source" and by so doing praise themselves, who are the worthy descendents of these special ancestors. Therefore, it is completely understandable why Ecclesiasticus was chosen for inclusion in the ancestor liturgy by Our Lady of the Visitation parish (as well as by all of the other Chinese American liturgies in the Appendices with the exception of Saint Mary's.) Here we have an example of how the values of traditional Chinese Confucian society mesh with Christian Scripture. As Julia Ching states, "the guiding vision of the future" of Confucius "was that of an idealized antiquity based entirely in the family..." (108). In Ecclesiasticus, the idealized antiquity of the Jewish people also seems to be "the guiding vision of the future" for it states: "Blessings abide with their posterity."

A comparison of the similarities and differences of the Our Lady of the Visitation ancestor memorial liturgy and the "Proposed Catholic Ancestor Memorial Liturgy" published by the Chinese Bishops' Conference reveals that the latter does not include the Salutation which must be an American composition as both Reverend Mark Fang and I speculate (per. com. 1994). The bishops' liturgy does indicate, however, that Ecclesiasticus (or Sirach, as it is named in the Taiwan liturgy) be said (or "another suitable reading") (2). In reference to the Prayer of the Faithful, let us now turn our attention to the parallels between those offered in the Taiwan text in comparison to the Our Lady of the Visitation liturgy as said by Mary Chen, Master of Ceremonies, and opened and closed by Reverend Joseph Chiang.
According to the *Teaching of Christ: A Catholic Catechism for Adults*, edited by Ronald Lawler, Donald Wuerl and Thomas Lawler, Christians should pray for themselves as well as for their neighbor. They should pray that they accomplish God's will on earth and that they will reach eternal salvation (387). In regard to the public "Prayer of the Faithful," which is to be said in Church, the catechism states that the following kinds of prayers of petition should be recited: those that concern "(a) the needs of the church, (b) public authorities and the needs of the world, (c) those oppressed by any need, and (d) the local community" (387).

Under the "Prayer of the Faithful" section of the Taiwan Bishops' Conference liturgy, the Celebrant essentially states what Reverend Chiang does in his introduction to the Prayer of the Faithful during the Our Lady of Visitation ceremony. The Taiwan liturgy states, "My dear people, God's command is that we honor our parents and revere our ancestors. Today we recall our forebearers with grateful hearts, and specially pray for them before our Heavenly Father"(3). Reverend Chiang states, "God commanded us to honor our parents and ancestors. With that in mind, let us pray for our forefathers." The latter is an abbreviated and slightly less warm and grateful form of the Taiwan liturgy which combines the fifth commandment to honor they father and thy mother with the Chinese tradition of honoring the ancestors both of which are a part of the Catholic tradition of the Communion of Saints (Fang n.d.; Chinese Bishops' Conference 1). Under the rubric outlined by the catechism,
this introduction would go in the last category of praying for "the local community" (that is, the deceased members of that community).

The first Prayer of the Faithful in the Bishops' Conference liturgy is the following: "Let us pray for our ancestors and all our deceased relatives beseeching the Lord to unite them together in Heaven to enjoy eternal happiness" (3). This prayer for the deceased "local community" is more specific than that stated in the introduction for here eternal salvation is the focus of the petition. The first prayer in the Our Lady of the Visitation ceremony of 1993, "Let us pray for all our ancestors, families and friends. May God grant us peace. May we be worthy progenies," is diverse in its petitions but quite straightforward in implications. This prayer would also be included under the "local community" Prayer of the Faithful category in the catechism (387). However, it differs from that of the Taiwan liturgy because it does not specify eternal salvation for the deceased relatives and ancestors. In fact, it is a bit unclear whether this prayer refers to the living "families and friends" or those that are dead. The prayer does become specific when it requests peace from the Lord and that the living be worthy of their ancestors. This prayer is quite different from the first prayer in the bishops' liturgy as well as from all of the others included in the latter text.

The second Prayer of the Faithful in the Taiwan text reads as follows: "Let us pray for the deceased whom no one remembers, asking the Lord to pour out his mercy and bring them to his Heavenly home, to join the ranks of God's children there" (3). Neither
the first prayer in Mary Chen's Prayer of the Faithful nor any of the others recited on that day pray specifically for eternal salvation for "the deceased whom no one remembers" as in the bishops' liturgy. It is interesting to note, however, that in Taiwan, the Hungry Ghost Festival, an annual occasion celebrated with parades, sacrifices and firecracker burning is held - according to the Buddhist interpretation offered by David Overmeyer - to appease all of the souls of purgatory who have no family to pray for them. He states that "all the gates of purgatory open for a time and all the souls can fly back to earth to receive food and offerings and hear scripture read for their salvation" (66). (This festival is a very important occasion for many Chinese and which I had the opportunity to attend in 1983 in Hsin Chu, Taiwan.) Therefore, although I know from personal experience - having been raised a Catholic - that it is common in the Catholic Church to "pray for the deceased whom no one remembers," it may have special significance for Chinese who convert to Catholicism, for example, and who are accustomed to thinking about the deceased whom no one remembers because of the popularity of this festival. According to the categories of the Prayer of the Faithful as designated in the catechism, this prayer would be included under "those oppressed by any need" (387). The second prayer in the Paramount liturgy is quite the opposite from that of the Taiwan text for it especially prays for the Chinese and that they specifically be able to endure difficulties, in addition to requesting that God's grace make it possible for the Chinese people to be united and to love one another. None of the other Prayers of the Faithful in
the Taiwan text specify the Chinese people in particular. This second prayer as recited during the Our Lady of the Visitation ceremony could possibly be classified as being for the "local community," but it is likely that the prayer refers to individuals of Chinese ancestry everywhere. If it does pertain to the local community, this prayer could be petitioning the Lord for strength which may be needed by this minority ethnic group in the United States. The third prayer in the Taiwan liturgy explicitly prays for children: "Let us pray for all children, asking the Lord to keep them ever mindful of the blessing of their parental upbringing and their filial reverence for them." Of course, this prayer reflects a very Chinese value system in the way that it specifies that the children learn the value of filiality. It is also completely understandable that it should be included in this liturgy since one of the main purposes for conducting the ancestor memorial is, as stated in the General Principles of the Taiwan liturgy, "to fulfill our duty of filial reverence" (1). This prayer may be included in the category of the "local community" designated by the catechism. The Taiwan liturgy has four Prayers for the faithful while the Paramus liturgy only includes three on this day during Chinese New Year of 1993. There is no parallel for this third prayer of concern for the filiality of children in the Paramus liturgy; however, the fourth prayer included by the Chinese Bishops' Conference is directly paralleled by the third prayer in the Paramus liturgy. The bishops' liturgy states, "Let us pray [sic] for all families in our parish, asking the Lord now to grant us peace and harmony, united in spirit, and in the life to come, to be reunited with our forebearers and relatives.
(Other intentions may be added)" (3). The prayer petitions that the particular families of the parish which recites it have peace, harmony and unity on this earth and also petitions for union with the deceased in Heaven while the Paramus liturgy includes a prayer which specifies the members of the parish who are present on the day of its recital, only petitions for blessings on this earth (health, peace and success) and omits any specifics about being reunited with the ancestors "in the life to come" as the Taiwan liturgy does (3). The Paramus liturgy states the following: "Let us pray for our brothers and sisters who are here today. May God bless them, grant health to the body, peace to the mind and success in all that they do."

As indicated above, the fourth prayer concludes with the statement that "Other intentions may be added" (3). Of course, we know that the Prayers of the Faithful as said in the Catholic Church are quite fluid and depend on the specific concerns, needs and sufferings of the body of individuals who are involved in performing the liturgy. Therefore, a variety of prayers could be included under the category of the Prayer of the Faithful. However, it is interesting to note that out of the other six Chinese American liturgies available to us, St. Joseph's Church, Seattle Diocese and St. Mary's Cathedral do not include the Prayer of the Faithful at all while both Holy Redeemer liturgical texts and St. Theresa's parish follow the prayers of the Taiwan Bishops' Conference quite closely and in the same order with the exception of the 1993 Holy Redeemer liturgy which only includes an edited version of the first prayer in the Taiwan liturgy and the same second prayer as provided there.
The Prayer of the Faithful in both that of the Chinese Bishops' Conference and the Our Lady of the Visitation liturgy conclude with essentially the same words. The Celebrant in the bishops' liturgy terminates this part of the ritual by stating the following: "Most merciful Heavenly Father, You are the God of Abraham and Jacob, and the God of our ancestors. We beseech you to hear the prayers of us your family and grant to our ancestors eternal rest in Your bosom, forever sharing in Your love. Thru Christ Our Lord." Father Chiang in the Our Lady of the Visitation liturgy states, "Merciful Father in Heaven, God of Abraham, Jacob and our forefathers, hear the prayer of your family here. Let those we remember today share your love and rest in your care." The only real difference between the two prayers is that the Paramus liturgy does not specify that the ancestors find "eternal rest" with God in Heaven. Otherwise, both liturgies join the Biblical ancestors with Chinese ancestors in this prayer of petition to the Lord. In regard to the other Chinese American liturgies which include the Prayer of the Faithful, only the 1993 Holy Redeemer liturgical text does not include this concluding prayer.

Thus, we have concluded a close examination of the ancestor memorial service which took place at Our Lady of the Visitation Church after Mass on February 28, 1993 during Chinese New Year. However, I would just like to point out that the liturgy which is written in Chinese (and which I had translated into English for this project) and that was handed out prior to Mass is slightly different from what actually happened during the service that day. In brief,
the liturgical text which was passed out does not indicate that any introduction to the liturgy would be given by the Master of Ceremonies prior to the service. In addition, the Chinese liturgy does not make it at all clear that the individuals who "take their positions in front of the altar" in #2-3 are not the same as those who are the celebrants of the offerings. In fact, no mention is made of Father Chiang and his co-celebrant ritually placing the offerings on the ancestor table as different parishioners line up in front of him and hand him these offerings. This part of the ceremony is one that I did not see repeated at any of the other memorials I attended. Another omission from the Chinese liturgy are the words with which the congregation responds after Ecclesiasticus is said. In the Paramus ritual, they pray, "Thanks be to the Lord," after Mary Chen concludes the reading of Scripture. Also, the description in #9 of those whom offer incense in the translation of the Chinese liturgy does not coincide exactly with what happened, for at the Our Lady of the Visitation performance, the co-celebrants - or assistants, as I above refer to them in my description of the ritual - are not handed one lighted incense stick. These men are present simply to hand the offerings to the main celebrant and to help him hold the scroll from which the Salutation is read. Finally, the bowing ceremony as outlined in the Chinese liturgy differs from that which in fact occurred during the service. The Chinese liturgy omits the bow which the individuals who compose the congregation at the Paramus service perform in reverence to each other.
As I state above, Reverend Joseph Chiang has repeatedly said to me over the past two years that I have been in contact with him that there are many ways in which the ceremony can and is performed. It varies from parish to parish, from year to year, from priest to priest and from congregation to congregation. General guidelines are passed out to parishioners and then variations of those guidelines are manifested, as we have seen here. Father Chiang also asserts (per. com. 1994) that since there is no "strict liturgical text in the United States," that this liturgy is still in an experimental period.
CHAPTER 10
Conclusion: A Sacred and Universal Ceremony?

It is truly quite fascinating to recognize that attempts at inculcation which had historically been a part of the Catholic tradition from its beginnings (as particularly evidenced by the way in which the Church Christianized many Roman secular and pagan customs) were evident as early as the seventh century in China with the Nestorian attempt to convert the Han Chinese (and other minority ethnic groups) (Cary-Elwes 14-37; Dunne 4-5; Chupungco 1982:20-24). The Nestorian Monument, for example, has Buddhist and Taoist images inscribed upon it along with Chinese and Syriac characters (Aprem 68; Cary-Elwes 34-35; Moule 33). However, perhaps one of the reasons for the failure of Nestorianism to establish itself in China at that time is precisely because it went too far in attempting to integrate the existing traditions it found then, and thereby lost its defining power as a religion in its own right, as Latourette and Cary-Elwes suggest (Latourette 1929:59; Cary-Elwes 35). (This is one of the fears of Vatican II, if the reader recalls: Dulles states that if the historical origins and development of Catholicism are not kept in contemporary consciousness as the Church renews its attempts to inculcate throughout the world, that the risk of the religion of Catholicism becoming diluted and losing its power is a possibility (50).) The Jesuits in the sixteenth century epitomized by the brilliance, creativity, love, insight and appreciation of Matteo Ricci for the Chinese and their culture - seem to have
remembered the Catholic tradition of understanding that Christianity is not to be identified with one culture, as evidenced by their attempts (especially his) to "confucianize Christianity" or "christianize Confucianism" during this period as Chinese Catholic clergy did once again- only after having been reminded that they could and should recognize the "genius" of all cultures by Vatican II - in the 1970s in Taiwan when they deliberately developed a Confucian "set of rituals" to be performed by a Chinese Cardinal, and which later was formalized by the Taiwan Chinese Bishops Conference in the form of a liturgical text (Sebes 1988:45; Fang n.d.:1).

It seems ironic that the performance of the ancestor memorial service within the Catholic Church is the least likely to be occurring on mainland China at the present time due to the position of the Chinese government both in regard to its disallowance of allegiance to Rome (which, as we know, promulgates inculturation) and due to the position of the Communist party in regard to any Chinese traditions which are "feudal" in nature, such as ancestor veneration is considered to be. The issue of the Communist party's position in regard to any area of life - whether it is political, economic or religious - is a very complicated one and one that tends to change direction within a short time period which makes generalizing about the mainland at all very difficult. However, the evidence which I have at my command at this time is that there is no performance of the ancestor memorial within the Catholic Church on mainland China to the extent that is described in the Taiwan liturgy. My evidence for
this assertion is largely based on my interviews with Sister Janet Carroll, Director of the United States Catholic China Bureau and with Reverend Joseph Chiang, Director of the National Pastoral Center for the Chinese Apostolate and the lack of published material located in relation to the ancestor memorial service in English. The only evidence available within my purview in relation to mainland Catholic Chinese venerating their ancestors is in the one Hong Kong May 6, 1994 Sunday Examiner article mentioned earlier, "Rites still a puzzler in China," whereupon Catholic Chinese are reported to have observed the Ching-Ming Festival this year by sweeping their ancestors' tombs. (The fact that I am not fluent in Chinese is admittedly a problem. On the other hand, I do have contact with Catholic clergy who either are or have been missionaries in Hong Kong and/or Taiwan, who are fluent in Chinese and who have been keeping abreast of the situation of Chinese Catholics on the mainland. If there is more venerating of ancestors going on amongst the Catholic mainlanders, I am certain I would have learned about it by now - or soon will.) I assert above that it is ironic that the smallest amount of Catholic ancestor veneration is occurring on mainland China in light of the fact that it was the governments of China that declared the rites to be civil in 1700 by K'ang Hsi and in 1939 by the Japanese government which had taken over Manchuria at this time (Latourette 1929:140; Minamiki 1985:xii). In other words, during both of these historical periods the governments were responsible for allowing the Catholic Church to sanction the ancestral rites within the Church if it chose to. As we know, the Vatican chose not to listen
to a "pagan" government in 1700 which contributed to the development of the Chinese Rites Controversy, and although *Plane Compertum est* gave permission to Chinese Catholics to participate in ancestral rituals in 1939, the Communists took over the mainland in 1949 - which reversed the entire situation! As stated previously, not only did this party want to get rid of the Western imperialist Christian Church, but they also wanted to do away with the "feudal" practice of ancestor veneration!! (Noll 88; Latourette 1964:395-396; Bush 106-108, 399)

Although it is ironic that the ancestral memorial service is being performed the least by Catholics on the mainland, the fact that the memorial ceremony first developed in Taiwan is completely logical in light of the mainland's present political situation. It was largely in reaction to this political climate on the mainland that the mainland Chinese (who now inhabited Taiwan) and indigenous Chinese of Taiwan felt the need to revive Chinese culture - especially during the severity of the Cultural Revolution (1967-1977) - within the context of the Catholic Church (Gutheinz 155). It makes sense that those who were under the governance of the Republicans in Taiwan - which established itself as an institution after they, the Kuomintang party, lost to the Communists and established themselves on this island - would be the first Chinese to develop the ancestor memorial liturgy in the Catholic Church: they were separated from the mainland where the traditions of the motherland were now being exterminated and where the practice and freedom of worship was not encouraged. In other words, it is understandable
that the liturgy should develop in Taiwan instead of in Hong Kong since, although many mainland Chinese also fled to this island with the Communist takeover (as well as to other countries abroad), the government there was not a Chinese one, and especially was not the Kuomintang - which had been the enemy of the Communist party for decades prior to its 1949 defeat. As Gutheinz points out, the Chinese government of Taiwan applauded the Catholic Church for helping to revive Chinese culture in the early 1970s while it is doubtful whether the British government of Hong Kong would have done the same for many reasons which I will not describe here (157).

Similarly, it is understandable and fascinating to recognize that the ritual enactment of Chinese ancestor veneration is growing amongst Chinese American Catholics in the United States. The function of its performance in such a public way - that is, as held within the institution of the Catholic Church - has a political purpose here as well. It is quite likely that this ritual which maintains traditional Chinese culture - and which especially expresses Confucian values, as well as Christian ones - validates and reinforces the identity of ethnic Chinese who are a minority in this country - as considered to quite an extent in the last chapter especially in regard to Reverend Joseph Chiang's homily. (Of course, in folkloric terms, there is evidence of peripheral distribution here: According to a lecture given by Dr. Kenneth Goldstein in his American Folksong course at the University of Pennsylvania in the fall of 1989, this concept is defined as being the tendency of immigrants and their
descendants to strive to preserve their native and traditional customs in order to reinforce their own ethnic identity in their newly adopted country where the predominant culture does not share this ethnicity.) Thus, on one hand, although it may be understandable why the Catholic ancestor memorial service developed first in Taiwan - following the developments of Vatican II which encouraged inculturation and largely in reaction against the Cultural Revolution on the mainland - it is not surprising that Catholic individuals of Chinese ancestry would especially want and need to continue or to begin the performance of this tradition in the context of the United States. (Here I also suggest that it is not surprising that the youth of Taiwan had less of a need to attend such a ritual, as Gutheinz points out was the case at Cardinal Yu Pin’s 1971 performance, since the youth there know they are Chinese and would have less of a need to validate the pride of this fact when they are surrounded by other Chinese in their native land.)

The evidence I have for the increased popularity of the Catholic ancestor veneration ritual is based on the fieldwork I have done in the four Catholic parishes I have previously named here in the northeastern United States: Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church in Philadelphia’s Chinatown; Our Lady of the Visitation Church in Paramus, New Jersey; and the Church of the Saint Joseph and St. Theresa Church in New York City’s Chinatown. I have already considered the history of the performance to some extent in regard to Holy Redeemer and the performance of one memorial service to a great extent in relation to Our Lady of the Visitation Church. Below I
discuss, to a limited degree, the ceremonies which were performed in the New York Chinatown parishes named above. At this point, let me summarize the evidence for the increased popularity of the ancestral memorial service based on the results of the survey I sent out to thirty-one Catholic parishes with a significant community of ethnic Chinese all throughout the United States. Of the thirty-one surveys I sent, eighteen were completed and returned to me. Out of the eighteen, four parishes indicate that they do not conduct the ancestor memorial service at all. Those with the most individuals in attendance are Saint Therese Chinese Catholic Mission in Chicago's Chinatown, where the service is performed during Chinese New Year and on All Soul's Day, and where between 300-500 individuals of Chinese ancestry participate. (Some individuals of other ethnic groups also attend). The performance of the ancestral service of the Archdiocese of San Francisco held at St. Mary's Cathedral during Chinese New Year draws between 500-600 people, the majority of whom are of Chinese ancestry. The parish which has been performing the service for the longest period of time - since 1979 - is the Catholic Chinese Apostolate of the Diocese of Brooklyn in Elmhurst, New York, where Reverend Thomas Sung, the scholar and priest who is responsible for having been the first to inform me that the text for the ancestor memorial service is largely based on the Taiwan liturgy is in residence. The parish where the service has been conducted for the second longest period is St. Theresa Church, New York, where it has been conducted by Reverend John B. Chiang since 1980. Based on an evaluation of the information provided by
the rest of the parishes in response to the survey, there has been a steady increase in the number of parishes which have conducted the service since 1979. The number of people who participate in these services depends on the number of individuals of Chinese ancestry in the community, obviously, but a general average for those who attend the ancestor memorial service for the rest of the parishes is 100 people. (St. Theresa's Church in New York, however, is as small as 50 people while the Chinese Catholic Pastoral Center of Boston boasts 300 in attendance on Chinese New Year and All Souls' Day.) Out of the fourteen parishes which responded to the survey indicating that they have the service at least once a year during Chinese New Year, only two indicate that only those of Chinese ancestry attend: The Mission of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in Plano, Texas and St. Theresa's Church in New York, one of the parishes where I attended the service this year and the only ceremony I ever attended where I was the only person who was not of Chinese ancestry. (I must add that there is evidence that not all parishes with a significant population of parishioners of Chinese ancestry are interested in having the service performed at their church. Reverend Raymond Nobeletti (per. com 1994), of Transfiguration Church, on Mott Street in the heart of New York City's Chinatown, for instance, writes that many of his parishioners who are from Hong Kong - where he was a missionary for fifteen years - find the service "repulsive," and therefore they do not conduct the ceremony. This reaction to the service, in my view, has to do with the lack of exposure which many Catholic Chinese in Hong Kong have had to the
ritual, as described in Chapter 8, and as revealed by the personal experiences of Pauline Li and Father Nobeletti, neither of whom had even heard about the ritual being performed in the Church when living there. Although there is much more to explore in regard to this issue, I must reserve any further elaboration on this area for another time.)

Let us turn to a very brief consideration of the ancestor memorial service as it took place at St. Theresa's Church, New York. This ceremony, held on 13 February 1994, is quite interesting because it was held in a very small library on the second floor of a building which is attached to the Church. The Church building itself was not being used, but there was a Mass being performed by the Irish American priest, Father Dennis Sullivan, for a group of individuals who were predominantly of Italian and Hispanic origin. None of these individuals who were not of Chinese ancestry were in attendance at the Chinese liturgical service, as mentioned above. The entire ceremony was conducted with only about 50 people (as also stated above), and the center of the ceremony was the fireplace which took the place of the ancestor table. All of the other essentials of the ceremony I have previously described were included: the offerings of incense, fruit, wine and flowers by Reverend John B. Chiang in front of an ancestor tablet which was placed on top of the fireplace. There was also the ritual bowing, Prayers for the Faithful, hymns and a very brief homily in Cantonese, Mandarin and English (for my benefit, I believe) in which the co-celebrant addressed the
small children who were standing in the front of the small gathering. The co-celebrant spoke of the need for children to respect, obey and listen to his/her parents according to the teachings of Confucius.35

Mainly, however, my intention at this point is not to focus on an ancestor memorial service in which no ethnic Chinese - Americans or otherwise - were present; rather, it is just the opposite. I would like to indicate the significance that this ceremony can also have for individuals who attend and who do not come from a country where the acceptance of ancestor veneration has already taken place by Catholics - such as in the case of Naula Sorhainico, for example, and not only in theory - in reference to Reverend Joseph Chiang's 1993 Paramus homily. To accomplish this goal, I would like to consider the words spoken in the homily given by Reverend Andrew Brizzolara also on 13 February 1994 at the Church of Saint Joseph.

This Mass and ancestor memorial service is also extremely interesting for reasons which are quite contrary to those which make the service at St. Theresa's Church so engaging. While St. Theresa's Church was unused, and the largely Italian and Hispanic congregation was attending Mass in the basement of that building, and the small quantity of individuals of Chinese ancestry who belong to that parish were conducting their ancestral service isolated in the small upstairs library, the Church of Saint Joseph, which is just a few blocks away from Saint Theresa's in Chinatown, was holding Mass in the very large and beautiful Church, was filled with parishioners who were

35 See Appendix III for the Chinese and English translation of the liturgy which was passed out and generally followed that day.
largely of Italian, Hispanic and Chinese ancestry (and at least one African American boy who performed as one end of the dragon during the dragon dance to classical Chinese music prior to the memorial service), and which had a priest of Italian ancestry, Reverend Brizzolara, as the main-celebrant of the Mass give a homily on the significance of the Chinese liturgy as well as co-narrate the performance of the ancestral rite. (This Reverend alternates the narration of the ancestral rites with Reverend Peter Choi: Father Brizzolara speaks in English and Father Choi in Cantonese). This extremely festive production is quite a contrast to the intimate service of Chinese gathered around the fireplace in the library at Saint Theresa's Church. And the homily at the Church of Saint Joseph is in great contrast too. The homily given during the Mass in regard to the significance of the ancestor memorial service (which took place after Mass) goes beyond the narrower but, of course, also very significant and touching focus of the homily directed toward the children of Saint Theresa's. Rather, the words spoken out of the mouth of this Caucasian American priest largely express traditional Chinese values. Reverend Brizzolara relates these values to all the individuals of every ethnic background present to the words directed to the parishioners at the Church of Saint Joseph on this Chinese New Year from Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, and to the words of the Pope. To be specific, the theme of Reverend Brizzolara's homily is the theme of the family. He prefaces his homily by reading a letter from "his Eminence John Cardinal O'Connor" in which the latter reminds Father Brizzolara and his parishioners that the Pope
has declared 1994 to be the International Year of the Family. The Reverend indicates that the letter states, "The Holy Father's message to the world of peace is that family creates the peace of the human family." Reverend Brizzolara then proceeds to elaborate on this idea of the International Year of the Family as declared by the Catholic Church in relation to the ancestor memorial service. I quote portions from his homily here:

More than in any age, we need to reaffirm, strengthen and affirm the family. In the past decade or more the family in Western Civilization and culture has become the endangered species...the family is the source of education, mutual love and respect, identity, as well as religion and cultural values. What it truly means to be Chinese or Italian or Spanish or Irish is not discovered in the field of the ghetto... but in the mutual solidarity of the family...Whether it is the Full Moon Festival or the Feast of Guadeloupe or Columbus Day or July 4th, when the family gathers it grows strong and encourages the entire world...Our families must be filled with a tranquility and peace...even in the most difficult moment from the conviction that you will never be alone. We are here today to pledge ourselves to uphold all of our best values which our ancestors handed down to us.....May the experience and goodness of our parents and great grandparents be a link to the peace filled present that we must all work for. Let me conclude with the words of our Holy Father. May the family so live in peace that peace may spread to the whole human family" (my italics).

With the knowledge in mind that the congregation is not predominantly Chinese, (perhaps there were 75 parishioners of Chinese ancestry in the gathering of approximately 260 people) and that the elaboration upon the meaning of the ancestral rites are offered by an Italian American priest in celebration of Chinese New
Year in New York City in 1993 (despite the fact that Reverend Joseph Chiang was one of the co-celebrants) is evidence that the process of inculturation as renewed by the Catholic Church during Vatican II in the 1960s is largely successful on this day, in this parish, in the United States in this International Year of the Family as declared by the Pope. The goal of inculturation, once again, is to recognize the goodness that a particular culture has to offer, to implant the message of the Christian gospel there in order to perfect it, and to learn from the culture into which the word of the Gospel is being planted as well as to spread the word of this culture's goodness to the other parishes who compose the universal Catholic Church (Luzbetak xvii, 67; Dulles 45-49). This Scalibrini priest, Reverend Brizzolara, provides evidence that he has learned from the culture of the individuals of Chinese ancestry who partly compose his parish; this Reverend provides evidence that he spreads the word of the goodness of this Chinese culture to other members of his parish who are not of Chinese ancestry. In his homily, this priest indicates that he has knowledge of Confucian values and teachings which are so integral to the Chinese ancestral rites. Especially in the italicized words above they are indicated: here we can see that the Reverend understands that the Chinese are traditionally responsible for the "education" of the family (whether or not he is aware of the extent to which this has traditionally been the case for the Chinese especially in regard to the moral education of the family is not apparent); here we can see that his words of "respect" and "mutual solidarity" and the knowledge that "you will never be alone" demonstrate his
awareness that Chinese have not traditionally been encouraged to be individualistic as in the West, but to accept one's place as a part of the social unit of the family in order to create and find "tranquility and peace" there in order for the society as a whole to be able to achieve peace (and tranquility) (Gutheinz 156; Liu 77; Legge 1966:370-371). These are all Confucian ideas which we have explored previously in this project. Recall the Confucian ideal put forth earlier that if there is peace in the family there will peace in the state (Latourette 1964: 368; Liu 77). (The achievement of this ideal is one of the reasons why the state gave the responsibility of moral education to the clans especially in the south of China during many periods of Chinese history, if the reader recalls.) Finally, the Reverend appears to recognize that it is a good idea to recall as well as to emulate one's ancestors when he states that "We are here today to pledge ourselves to uphold all our best values which our ancestors handed down to us... May the experience and goodness of our parents and great grandparents be a link to the peace filled present that we must all work for..." That is, here the Reverend recognizes that in order to achieve peace in the family, and, therefore, peace in society and ultimately peace "in the whole human family," one must appreciate and follow the values lived and taught by the ancestors. As Creel points out, Confucius also considered all human beings to be connected as one human family and did not dismiss non-Chinese as being barbarians as other Chinese have often done throughout Chinese history. The sage's ideas in this regard - which are echoed in the words of Reverend Brizzolara, the Cardinal and the Pope - are
succinctly expressed by one of his pupils, Tzu-hsia, when he states, "within the four seas, all men are brothers" (Creel 128).

As stated in the last chapter, the family traditionally has been valued throughout the world; however, the traditional role of the family in the life of the Chinese has largely been found by scholars to be a more dominating influence than in it has been in most other cultures (Creel 125; Latourette 1964: 565). Although many of the Confucian ideas expressed in regard to the family in the Reverend's homily overlap with many of the values as concerns the family of other cultural traditions, here Reverend Brizzolara succeeds in expressing traditional family values in Chinese terms. His ability to illuminate the traditional themes of this sacred liturgy, or public prayer, before a congregation of individuals who are predominantly of Italian, Hispanic and, even more amazingly, of Chinese ancestry in a United States parish illustrates that the Church here succeeds in sharing the genius of Chinese culture by having transformed a traditional folk custom with a history of thousands of years and with a variety of beliefs attached to it (supernatural or otherwise) into a Catholic one. In light of the century and a half long Chinese Rites Controversy which only fully terminated in 1939, and in consideration of the fact that Catholic missionaries were still discarding ancestral memorial tablets in Taiwan in the 1950s, it is evident that the Church has come quite far in its incorporation of the service into the Catholic liturgy not only by Chinese for Chinese (as evidenced especially by the performance in Saint Theresa's Church and to a great extent at Our Lady of the Visitation Church and Holy
Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church) but by individuals of other ethnic backgrounds for Chinese and other ethnic groups as well. The ancestor memorial service in the 1990s teaches traditional Chinese values to the universal Church (by a universal clergy?) and concurrently celebrates the paschal mystery of Christ which is the goal of all liturgical rites as stated in Documents of Vatican II (Abbott 137).
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January 15, 1994

Beverly J. Butcher
2028 Delancey Place
Phila., PA 19103
(215) 985-0352

Father Chiang and/or Father Sullivan
St. Theresa Church
141 Henry Street
New York, N.Y. 10002

Dear Father Chiang and Father Sullivan:

Greetings from Philadelphia. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Pennsylvania, and I am writing my dissertation on "The Chinese and Chinese American Catholic Ancestor Memorial Service." I have successfully traced the history of the Chinese Rites Controversy in the Catholic Church through 1939. I have also learned that Cardinal Yu Pin was the first Catholic priest to perform the ceremony in Taiwan on January 27, 1971 in Taipei, Taiwan. Now I am trying to trace the history of the performance of the ancestral ceremony in Chinese Catholic parishes throughout the United States.

I have sent out the enclosed survey to all of the Chinese American parishes I could locate the names and addresses of and wonder if it would be possible for either or both of you to complete the questionnaire for me as well. I realize that this request may be an inconvenience for you; however, I sincerely hope that you believe my dissertation topic is important enough to help me document this fascinating and important ritual in the history of the Catholic Church. Thank-you!

Sincerely,

Beverly J. Butcher
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THE CHINESE/CHINESE AMERICAN ANCESTRAL MEMORIAL SERVICE IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

1. Does your parish perform the Chinese/Chinese American ancestral memorial service only once during Chinese New Year each year or is it also performed at other times throughout the year?

2. Does your parish perform the same exact ritual during every ancestral memorial service or does the ritual change from time to time?

3. Do you have a copy of the guidelines of the ancestral memorial service which your parish follows and which you can possibly send me? (I would like to know if all Chinese American parishes follow the liturgy that was determined by the Chinese Bishops' Conference in Taiwan on January 15, 1975.)

4. Does your ancestral memorial service characteristically include fruit, wine, incense, the ancestral tablet, flowers, prayers (which ones?) and bowing three times before the ancestral table?

5. For approximately how many years has your parish been performing the Chinese/Chinese American ancestral memorial service?

6. Do you know who was the first priest to conduct the service at your church?

7. Approximately how many parishioners attend these ancestral memorial services?

8. Do Catholics who are not of Chinese ancestry attend these ancestral memorial services? If so, how would you describe these individuals?

9. Is the ancestral memorial service always performed after Mass - such as I have observed here at Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church in Philadelphia and at Our Lady of the Visitation Parish in Paramus, New Jersey - or is it performed at some other time?
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10. Do you consider the Chinese/Chinese American ancestral memorial service which is performed in the Catholic Church to be a secular or a religious ceremony? Why? (Please use back of page if necessary.)

11. Do you consider the Chinese/Chinese American ancestral memorial service which is performed outside of the Catholic Church to be a secular or a religious ceremony? Why? (Please use back of page if necessary.)

12. Do you have a permanent ancestral memorial table such as St. Therese Chinese Catholic Mission in Chicago's Chinatown does?

13. Why do you think the Chinese/Chinese American ancestral memorial service in the Catholic Church is an important ceremony? (Please use back or another page if necessary.)
APPENDIX II:
Initial Interview Questionnaire
APPENDIX II: Initial Interview Questionnaire

CHINESE AND CHINESE-AMERICAN ANCESTOR VENERATION IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 1993

1. What generation Chinese-American are you? / How long have you lived in the United States?

2. What part of China are you/your ancestors from?

3. When did your ancestors come here exactly?

4. Were you born into a Catholic family or did you convert?

5. Is everyone in your family a Catholic?

6. How long have you been a member of this parish? To what parish did you belong before coming here?

7. What significance does the ancestral memorial service have for you? Why do you participate in it? (filial piety; Confucius; good conduct; to get help from the deceased; to give help to the deceased)

8. Is the ancestor veneration ceremony, performed in the Chinese and Chinese-American Catholic Church during Chinese New Year, the only time you enact such a ritual for your ancestors?

(The Ancestor Memorial Liturgy Supplement from the conference of Episcopal Bishops in Taiwan states, "According to Chinese Catholic traditions, ancestors were specially remembered at New Year, Ching Ming, on All Souls' Day and other festivals"; The Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church Bulletin of 1988 states, "After five thousand years, the Chinese people still follow the observance of the adoration of God, which is heaven, and the worshipping of their ancestors not only at the beginning of the new year, but also on every important feast day according to our lunar calendar and the traditional customs.")
APPENDIX II: Initial Interview Questionnaire

9. Have you ever seen this memorial service performed differently than how it was performed in Holy Redeemer in 1993? Where? When? How? / Have you ever seen the service performed at any other time than at the end of Mass?

(The Ancestor Memorial Liturgy Supplement from the conference of Episcopal Bishops in Taiwan states that "This memorial liturgy can be performed either before Mass, during Mass after Holy Communion or at the end of Mass.")

10. During the ancestral memorial service performed at Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church in 1993, various gifts were put on display on a table on the altar after Mass. Do any of these gifts - the ancestor plaque, incense, flowers, fruit, rice, and wine - have any symbolic meaning for you? Of what significance is the deep bow which was repeated several times during the service?

(Holy Redeemer's Chinese Catholic Church Bulletin from 1989 states the following:

Incense - which symbolizes our prayers to the heavenly Father, Our God, to bless our ancestors' souls and give them eternal rest and peace. Ask them to protect each of us from every evil in this life.

Flowers - which symbolize our love and filial piety. It means also the multiplication of new born babies to increase the so called man-power of the family and prosperity as well.

Fruits & Wine - which represents the good harvest of crop which is extremely important to every country, particularly to the people of agricultural societies, such as in China

Bow of Head - which means our most solemn respect, piety and love to our ancestors, and the ancient custom and tradition of greeting to one another)
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11. Do Chinese and Chinese-American Catholics eat the food that is offered in honor of the ancestors after the service is over? If not, what is done with the food?

12. What do you believe is the difference between the Catholic and non-Catholic performance of ancestral veneration rituals in terms of beliefs? In terms of the gifts and acts which are included/excluded?

13. When you pray, to whom and for whom do you pray and why?
   a. God/Jesus Christ? Why?
   b. The Blessed Virgin Mary? Why?
   c. Saints? Why?
   d. the living? Why?
   e. To and/or for your ancestors? Why? Any ancestors in particular more than others? Why?

14. In what other ways and at what other times do you "remember" your ancestors?

15. How do your other family members "remember" your ancestors?

OPTIONAL:

16. What are traditionally done with the clothes and belongings of the deceased in China?

17. In traditional ancestral veneration rituals, can and do friends traditionally participate in rituals throughout the year or only on special occasions or what?

18. How is what the dead are buried in determined?
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CHINESE AND CHINESE-AMERICAN ANCESTOR VENERATION IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 1993 (for Catholics of Chinese ancestry who disapprove of the performance of the ancestral memorial service in the Church during Chinese New Year)

1. What generation Chinese-American are you? How long have you lived in the United States?

2. What part of China are you/your ancestors from?

3. When did your ancestors come here exactly?

4. Were you born into a Catholic family or did you convert?

5. Is everyone in your family a Catholic?

6. How long have you been a member of this parish? To what parish did you belong before coming here?

7. What significance does the ancestral memorial service have for you? Why don't you participate in it?

8. You are of Chinese ancestry. Filial piety has been a highly valued traditional virtue for Chinese since before the time of Confucius. How can you disapprove of a ritual performed in the Catholic Church which honors and respects ancestors?

9. Why would the Church allow and take part in the performance of such a ritual if its performance and the beliefs associated with it go against Catholic teaching?

10. Do you think there is a difference between the Catholic and non-Catholic performance of ancestral veneration rituals in terms of beliefs? In terms of the gifts and acts which are included/excluded?
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11. When you pray, to whom and for whom do you pray and why?

   a. God/Jesus Christ? Why?
   b. The Blessed Virgin Mary? Why?
   c. Saints? Why?
   d. the living? Why?
   e. To and/or for your ancestors? Why? Any ancestors in particular more than others? Why?

12. What is the difference, if any, in the beliefs associated with the Chinese ancestral memorial service and the Communion of Saints in your mind? Might not the ancestral memorial service simply be a way to act out belief and participation in the Communion of Saints in the Catholic Church?

13. Are there any special times or occasions in which you and/or your family members pay respects to or remember your ancestors outside of the context of the church and aside from praying for/to them?
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CHINESE AND CHINESE-AMERICAN ANCESTOR VENERATION IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 1993 (for Catholics not of Chinese ancestry who attend the ritual)

1. You are not of Chinese ancestry. What race are you and with what ethnic group do you identify, if any?

2. From what country did you/your ancestors come to the United States?

3. How long have you and/or your ancestors been in the United States?

4. Were you born into a Catholic family or did you convert?

5. Is everyone in your family a Catholic?

6. How long have you been a member of this parish? To what parish did you belong before coming here?

7. Although you are not of Chinese ancestry, you attend the ancestral memorial service which is held each year in this parish during Chinese New Year. Why? What significance does the ritual have for you? Why do you participate in it?

8 - 15: The same questions as as are asked of Catholics of Chinese ancestry.
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"PROPOSED CATHOLIC ANCESTOR MEMORIAL LITURGY"
(for Church and Family use)

Part I Objective
These liturgical rules are determined for the following purposes:
1) To Emphasize God's commandment "Honor thy Father and Mother" as the basic spirit, to encourage filial piety among Catholics, and to increase filial love towards God.
2) To correct a popular misconception about the Church that "to believe in God is to neglect the ancestors": and to give non-Catholics a correct impression in this matter.
3) To show forth the virtues in Chinese culture concerning filial love, and the "careful observance of obsequities (sic) and memorial remembrances"; and to foster the relationship between the Gospel and our national traditional culture.
4) To bring about a proper development among Catholics in reverence of their forebears and to break down any semblance of superstition in this regard.

Part II: General Principles

1) In honor of the ancestors, to give return for their blessings towards us, we must always pray and offer Mass for their entry into Heaven and to fulfill our duty of filial reverence.
2) The ancestors are not looked on as deities, so we do not burn paper money. The memorial ceremony is according to our national traditional customs, to which we add fitting Church customs.
3) According to the above principles, in every parish area (whether church, institution or organization) the Church and family homes may set up ancestor shrines with incense burners in any suitable place (although separate from the tabernacle, crucifix and statues), as a symbol of thanksgiving and filial reverence.

Part III: Style

The style of the ancestor tablet, for church use, can be made along the style suggested on Page 4. For use in family homes, any style can be freely patterned from this one.
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Part IV: The Ceremony

The memorial rite is divided into one for Church use and one for use in family setting.

I. Church Rite

(The rite for church use follows the national ceremonial directive #38.)

On the national occasions of the Spring Festival (Chinese NY), Ching-Ming festival (Sweeping of the Tombs) and the religious observances of All Saints and All Souls Day, the priest announces to the people that Mass will be offered and following the Mass the memorial service for the ancestors will be solemnly offered. After the Mass, the celebrant changes vestments, to the long Chinese ceremonial cassock, and then with 2 servers, goes before the ancestor tablet to offer the rite as follows:

1) The rite begins (conducted by the celebrant and another adult Catholic acting as Master of Ceremonies (MC)
2) All rise
3) Celebrant takes his designated position (either priest or a Catholic representing the priest celebrant)
4) Funeral music (or hymns can be used)
5) Firecrackers set off
6) Scripture Reading: (Book of Sirach 44:1-15, or another suitable reading chosen by the priest and read aloud by the server or one of the Catholics, with the congregation standing.)
7) Homily (the celebrant speaks of the meaning of the reading and its relationship to the day's ceremony)
8) Offering of Incense (Catholics stand)

The Master of Ceremonies lights 3 joss sticks of incense, and with both hands, passes them to the celebrant, who after receiving them, raises them with both hands to his forehead and then bows profoundly ( Formal Chinese ceremonial bow) and then places the incense sticks, one by one, in the incense holder pot which is in the middle of the shrine table right in front of the ancestor tablet. Powder (loose) incense can also be used.
9) The Offerings

a) Flowers: The MC gives a bouquet of flowers to the celebrant, who receives them with both hands and offers the prescribed ceremonial offering (object raised to the forehead followed by a profound bow)
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and then puts the flowers in a vase which is placed on either side of
the ancestor tablet, along with the already lighted red candles that
are there.
b) Wine: The MC gives a wine flask to the celebrant who again
receives it with both hands and offers it with the usual ceremonial
offering and bow, and then pours the wine into 3 small cups which
are placed immediately in front of the ancestor tablet.
c) Fruit: The MC gives a bowl of fruit to the celebrant, who again
after receiving it with both hands, makes the usual offering and bow
and places the fruit bowl on either side of the wine cups.
10) Rite of formal Obeisance
Three formal profound bows are made toward the ancestor tablet at
the spoken command of the MC, who calls out 'first bow' 'second bow'
'third bow' and the Celebrant and all the congregation deeply bowing
at his commands.
11) Prayer of the Faithful
Celebrant: My dear people, God's command is that we honor our
parents and revere our ancestors. Today we recall our forebears
with grateful hearts, specially pray for them before our Heavenly
Father.
i- Let us pray for our ancestors and all our deceased relatives,
beseeking the Lord to unite them together in Heaven to enjoy
eternal happiness. (resp) Lord hear our prayer
ii- Let us pray for the deceased whom no one remembers, asking the
Lord to pour out His mercy and bring them to His Heavenly home, to
join the ranks of God's children there. (resp)
iii- Let us pray for all children, asking the Lord to keep them ever
mindful of the blessing of their parental upbringing and their filial
reverence for them. (resp)
iv- Let us prayer [sic] for all families in our parish, asking the Lord
now to grant us peace and harmony, united in spirit, and in the life
to come, to be reunited with our forebears and relatives. (Other
intentions may be added)
Celebrant: Most merciful Heavenly Father, You are the God of
Abraham and Jacob, and the God of our ancestors. We beseech you
to hear the prayers of us your family and grant to our ancestors
eternal rest in Your bosom, forever sharing in Your love.
Thru Christ Our Lord
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12) Music (Funeral music can be played or hymns sung, or omitted)
13) Rite is concluded
14) The celebrant departs (the Celebrant along with the servers bow towards the ancestor tablet and then leave. The congregation, after a reverence towards the Blessed Sacrament, also leave).

II. The Ancestor Memorial Service for use in the Family
(The family memorial follows the national Ceremonial directive #44)
On the occasion of any national holiday that has no superstitious import, and on family birthdays, weddings, or anniversaries of death, Catholic families may follow this custom. Coming before the family ancestor shrine at their own time and with filial reverence, the following rites are used:
1) Memorial service begins
2) All rise
3) Celebrant takes his place (the head of the family or the oldest son may act as celebrant).
4) Music (This can be omitted; firecrackers can be used)
5) Scripture Reading Book of Sirach 44: 1-15 (text as on P.2 of the Chinese characters) or any other suitable reading chosen, read aloud by the celebrant or another family member and also an explanation of the significance of the memorial ceremony. Numbers 6, incense, 7, offerings, 8 formal bows - are all as done previously in the church ceremony.
9) The lives and deeds of the ancestors can be recalled; (can be omitted)
10) Prayers for the ancestors:
   God desires that we honor our ancestors and remember our deceased relatives so now we pray for them to the Heavenly Father that they may enter their heavenly home.
   All together pray the Our Father.
   We also pray to Our Blessed Mother Mary for them, that she intercede to our Heavenly Lord to grant them eternal happiness.
   All together pray the Hail Mary
   Celebrant: Finally we pray the 'Gloria' for them, that God grant them in Heaven to be together with all the saints, praising the Blessed Trinity and sharing in God's eternal happiness.
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All together pray: Glory be to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, as it was in the beginning, is now and always shall be, forever and ever. Amen.

11) Music (can be omitted)
12) Rite is concluded

Part V: If anything is lacking in this ceremony, it will be corrected or added by the Bishops' Conference at an appropriate time.

Part VI: The proposed ceremony has been approved for use by the Bishops' Conference on December 29, 1974.

CHURCH

Offered
By all
Catholics
of
Church

Memorial Tablet of
All Ancestors of
(Name of) Church

Date Established

1) Size - 30" by 25"
2) Cross on Top is Red
3) Carved Dragons on Side in Gold
4) Anything Else Left to
Proper Church to Decide
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FAMILY

Offered
By
Descendants
Of
(Name)

Date

Memorial Tablet
of the (Name)
Family

1. Size - 20" by 17" - or Whatever
   Determined by Family
2. Cross on top in Gold.
3. Carved Dragons on Side Cross
   in Gold
4. Anything Else Left Up to the
   People to Decide (5)

Published by the Chinese Bishops' Conference
- Liturgical Commission
#34 Lane 32 Kuang-Fu Road
Taipei 105
天主教祭禮暫行禮規

第一章：宗旨

本規範係依下列宗旨而訂定：
一、為使中國天主教會孝敬父母的教義精神，能發揚
二、在華教士人對故教會－－吾主而設宗旨－－的展
三、為使中國教會之故教會－－吾主而設宗旨－－的展

第二章：禮則

一、祀祖先，報答風先恩情，要常為他們祈福獻祭，
二、篤宗祠，先賢不朽，先聖不衰，故不可焚燒妥幣

第三章：規格

一、祀祖先之規格，為堂區使用者，可按以下第4頁
二、祭祖祭儀式，分兩類與家庭兩種制定如下：

第四章：禮儀

一、聖堂祭祖儀式

第六章：禮儀

1. 祭祀儀式

2. 供養

3. 呈獻

4. 禮儀

5. 賜福

6. 陳設

備註

當祭文，由輔祭或在宏陳，教員落座。
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Our Lady of the Visitation Church
Paramus, New Jersey
February 28, 1993

Ancestor Memorial Liturgy

1. All arise.

2-3. Main celebrant and co-celebrants take their positions in front of altar

4. Music

5. Reading (all be seated)
   Ecclesiasticus 44, 1:15

   Now let us call the roll of famous men that were our fathers, long ago. What high achievements the Lord has made known in them, ever since time began! Here were men that had power and bore rule, men that excelled in strength, or in the wisdom that dowered them; prophets that worthily upheld the name of prophecy, issuing to the people the commands their times needed, uttering, through their foresight, a sacred charge to the nations. Here were men that had skill to devise old melodies, to make songs and set them down in writing. Here were men rich in ability, (noble of aim), that dwelt peacefully in their times. These were the glories of their race, the ornament of their times; and the sons they begot have left a memory that adds to the recital of their praise. Not like those of others, who are forgotten in death as if they had never been; nameless, they and their children, as if they had never lived; no, these were men of tender conscience; their deeds of charity will never be forgotten. Blessings abide with their posterity; their descendents are a race set apart for God, the pledged heirs of his promises. For their sakes this line of theirs will endure for all time; their stock, their name will never be allowed to die out. Their bodies lie in peace; their names lasts on, age after age. Their wisdom is yet a legend among the people; wherever faithful men assemble, their story is told.
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Our Lady of the Visitation Church

6. Remarks by his Excellency, Ambassador Martin Feng (R.O.C.)
   Presentation of Plaque to Ambassador Feng by May Tsai,
   President of Chinese Apostolate O.L.V. Church

7. Prayer of the Faithful
   Main celebrant: God commanded us to honor our parents and
   ancestors. With that in mind, let us pray for our forefathers.

   I. Prayer in Chinese (Mandarin)
   Let us pray for all our ancestors, families and friends. May God
   grant us peace. May we be worthy progenies. Let us pray:
   God hear our prayer.

   II. Prayer in Chinese (Cantonese)
   Let us pray for all the Chinese. May God grant us the ability to
   endure hardships and make us love and unite with each other.
   May the grace of the Lord be with us. Let us pray: God hear
   our prayer.

   III. Let us pray for our brothers and sisters who are here
   today. May God bless them, grant them health to the body,
   peace to the mind and success in all that they do. Lord hear
   our prayer.

   Merciful Father in Heaven, God of Abraham, Jacob and our
   forefathers, hear the prayer of your family here. Let those we
   remember today share your love and rest in your care.

8. Salutation (All arise and read)
   God created our soul and our forefathers the physical being.
   These gifts of birth and nurturing are as high as the mountains
   and as deep as the ocean,
   At this beginning of a new year, a time when the earth returns
   to spring,
   We drink the water while remembering the source,
   Our gratitude to you is everlasting.
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Our Lady of the Visitation Church

9. Offertory: Incense
   The main celebrant is handed three lighted incense sticks which he receives with both hands and each co-celebrant is handed one lighted incense stick. The main celebrant raises them to his forehead to make a bow to the ancestors and places the incense into the center of the incense burner.

Offering of fruits
Offering of flowers
Offering wine

Bowing ceremony: three times to the ancestors' tablet, once to the celebrants wishing them a happy and successful New Year.

End of the Ceremony: the celebrants recede to the background. Thank all the participants for attending the Ancestor Memorial Liturgy.

Music and head of families offer incense.
APPENDIX III: Ancestor Memorial Liturgies

Saint Joseph Church
Chinatown, New York
February 13, 1994

Ancestor Memorial Liturgy

1. Beginning: All arise.

2-3. Main celebrant and co-celebrants take their positions in front of altar

4. Music

5. Reading (all be seated)
   Ecclesiasticus 44, 1:15

Now let us call the roll of famous men that were our fathers, long ago. What high achievements the Lord has made known in them, ever since time began! Here were men that had power and bore rule, men that excelled in strength, or in the wisdom that dowered them; prophets that worthily upheld the name of prophecy, issuing to the people the commands their times needed, uttering, through their foresight, a sacred charge to the nations. Here were men that had skill to devise old melodies, to make songs and set them down in writing. Here were men rich in ability, (noble of aim), that dwelt peacefully in their times. These were the glories of their race, the ornament of their times; and the sons they begot have left a memory that adds to the recital of their praise. Not like those of others, who are forgotten in death as if they had never been; nameless, they and their children, as if they had never lived; no, these were men of tender conscience; their deeds of charity will never be forgotten. Blessings abide with their posterity; their descendents are a race set apart for God, the pledged heirs of his promises. For their sakes this line of theirs will endure for all time; their stock, their name will never be allowed to die out. Their bodies lie in peace; their names lasts on, age after age. Their wisdom is yet a legend among the people; wherever faithful men assemble, their story is told.
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Saint Joseph Church

6. Salutation (All arise and read)
God created our soul and our forefathers the physical being.
These gifts of birth and nurturing are as high as the
mountains and as deep as the ocean,
At this beginning of a new year, a time when the earth returns
to spring,
We drink the water while remembering the source,
Our gratitude to you is everlasting.

7. Memorial Oration: The main celebrant reads (all arise and listen)
At the beginning of this year, we overseas Chinese and Chinese
descendants on the east coast gather together to honor our
forefathers in all sincerity. We follow the example of our
ancestors who were virtuous, industrious and frugal. They
cultivated their moral characters and brought benefits to the
people and society. The Chinese nation rises in the east. With
a history of more than five thousand years, it has a civilization
of long standing and boasts many lofty ideals. Even in the
1990s, it is no worse than the other nations. All of the ancient
civilizations pass away except the Chinese one which still
stands still in the east making its own contributions to the
world. This is the achievement made by our great ancestors.
All the Chinese people should follow the steps of our
forefathers. We must love, help and unite with each other thus
making greater contributions to the whole world. May God
grant them Heavenly peace. Here we have these fruits,
flowers and wine to offer on the altar to express our filial
obedience.

8. Offertory: Incense
The main celebrant is handed three lighted incense sticks
which he receives with both hands and each co-celebrant is
handed one lighted incense stick. The main celebrant raises
them to his forehead to make a bow to the ancestors and places
the incense into the center of the incense burner.

9. The main celebrant offers fruits, flowers and wine
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Saint Joseph Church

10. Bowing ceremony: three times to the ancestors' tablet

11. Greet the celebrants wishing them a happy and successful New Year, one bow to the celebrants

12. End of the Ceremony: the celebrants withdraw. Thank all the participants for attending the Ancestor Memorial Liturgy.

13. Music
春節祭天敬祖大典儀式

ST. JOSEPH CHURCH

5 MONROE STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10002

1. 典禮開始　全體肅立
2. 主祭就位
3. 陪祭就位
4. 靈：新年國慶
5. 宣請誦文（全體起立）
   現在讓我們承擔著我們歷代的祖先，他們做了許多光輝的事，顯示了他們的偉大；他們中有為王的，有將軍的，有智慧的，有作先知的，有作當時民衆領袖的，有教導民衆的，有作樂曲詩歌的，有愛好藝術的。他們在自己家
中過著平安的生活。所有這些祖先，在自己的家族中，歷代受人尊敬。他們的名譽，常受人珍視。他們的善行，不會被人遺忘。他們的子女及後裔約
世代常存。他們的榮耀決不會泯滅，留於永世。以上是天主的聖訓。
   （全體回答）：感謝天主
6. 宣請誦文（全體起立及誦請）
   「先賢我輩，誦得我身；生我養我，上主至尊；換我育我，祖宗至聖；洪恩
大德，山高水深；詩詩連連，祖宗承恩；春節歲首，吉日良辰；一元復始
，大地回春；飲水思源，茅心永存。」
7. 宣請祭文：主祭親自誦請（全體起立，齊唱）
   「今次甲子開元，我朝東皇樹華章，共慶一堂，向我們列祖列宗求索爱至
誠，步伍整規莊重，克勤克儉，修養立德，恪遵倫理，取媚社會。中華民
族興起於東方，已有五千多年，文化悠久，德高望重，即在二十世紀九十
年代，亦無盛於他邦。世界文明古國無多，且都逐步崩亡。唯我中華民族
，相傳不替。現今仍維立於東方，與世界文明各國爭奪自己力量。凡此佳
績，均有賴我祖先克明勤奮，不辭勞苦，克勤克儉。凡風炎黃子孫，理應
步伍先輩，祈諸團結，奮發圖強，友愛互助，俾於世界人類爭奪更大更好
力量。」「今我祈求上主，施恩及助於我列祖列宗，腦波等在天之靈，永
享安樂。謹獻美酒、鮮花、香酒於上主祭台之上，祈求亷納，以表孝心，
尚寳。」
8. 主祭上香：司儀點點香後一束，捧交三柱於主祭，揀香祭位兩柱。主祭接過點
以香杯端於香位，向列祖列宗，行一鞠躬進。陣祭台行一鞠躬進。後握主
祭棒香揀在香位中間，其他祭禮也揀香揀入香位。
9. 敬 祭 品：主祭敬美酒、鮮花、醇酒。
10. 敬 禮：主祭向列祖列宗行三鞠躬及敬次：一鞠躬、再鞠躬、三鞠躬。
11. 向主祭敬祭品：主祭獻鮮花，祭酒禱告。主祭一鞠躬。
12. 禱 祷：主祭與祭位列位進退。多謝各方參加今日祭天敬祖大典。
13. 結 團：中國新春欽佩。
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St. Theresa's Church
Chinatown, New York
February 13, 1994

* Beginning of the Ancestor Memorial Liturgy

1. All arise. The main celebrant and co-celebrants take their positions in front of the altar.
Singing of the hymns

Reading (all be seated)
Ecclesiasticus 44, 1:15

Now let us call the roll of famous men that were our fathers, long ago. What high achievements the Lord has made known in them, ever since time began! Here were men that had power and bore rule, men that excelled in strength, or in the wisdom that dowered them; prophets that worthily upheld the name of prophecy, issuing to the people the commands their times needed, uttering, through their foresight, a sacred charge to the nations. Here were men that had skill to devise old melodies, to make songs and set them down in writing. Here were men rich in ability, (noble of aim), that dwelt peacefully in their times. These were the glories of their race, the ornament of their times; and the sons they begot have left a memory that adds to the recital of their praise. Not like those of others, who are forgotten in death as if they had never been; nameless, they and their children, as if they had never lived; no, these were men of tender conscience; their deeds of charity will never be forgotten. Blessings abide with their posterity; their descendents are a race set apart for God, the pledged heirs of his promises. For their sakes this line of theirs will endure for all time; their stock, their name will never be allowed to die out. Their bodies lie in peace; their names lasts on, age after age. Their wisdom is yet a legend among the people; wherever faithful men assemble, their story is told.

2. Offertory: Incense
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Saint Theresa Church

3. Offering of flowers, wine and fruits

4. Bowing ceremony (Pray for forefathers)

The Main celebrant:
The Lord wants us to commemorate our forefathers, remember our relatives and friends who passed away. Now let us pray to the Lord that they may enter his Heavenly Kingdom.

All participants:
Our Father Who are in Heaven, Hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; forgive our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us; lead us not into temptation but deliver us from every evil. Amen.

The main celebrant:
Let us pray to Virgin Mary that she will pray to the Lord for the eternal happiness of our forefathers.

All participants:
Hail Mary, full of grace. The Lord is with thee. Blessed are thou amongst women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for our sins, now and at the hour of our death.

The main celebrant:
Lastly let us sing the Sanctus for our forefathers and ask the Lord to grant them union with all the apostles and saints in Heaven. May they praise the Lord and share God's eternal happiness.

All participants:
Glory be to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, as it was in the beginning is now and ever shall be. Amen.
(At the end, bow three times to the altar. When the master of the ceremonies announces three bows, the main celebrant and all the participants make bows together.)
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5. The prayer of the faithful

The main celebrant:
Brothers and sisters: The Lord commands us to respect our parents and commemorate our forefathers. With that in mind, we make a special prayer for them today.

Leader:
Let us pray for our ancestors and all the relatives and friends who passed away and ask to the Lord to grant them reunion in Heaven and share the eternal happiness. Let us pray together.
All participants: Lord hear our prayer.

Leader:
Let us pray for those who passed away but had no one to pray for them. May the Lord have mercy on them and allow them to enter his Heavenly Kingdom and be together with all God's children. Let us pray.
All participants: Lord hear our prayer.

Leader:
Let us pray for all the children. May they be grateful for their parents and show filial obedience. Let us pray.
All participants: Lord hear our prayer.

Leader:
Let us pray for all the families in our community. May the Lord make us united and get along with each other peacefully in this world and we may meet all the ancestors, relatives and friends in Heaven in days to come. Let us pray.
All participants: Lord hear our prayer.

The main celebrant:
Merciful Father, You are the Lord of Abraham and Jacob and also the Lord of our forefathers. May you hear the prayer of your family. May our ancestors rest in your care and share your love for the sake of our Jesus Christ.
All participants: Amen
説經

奉獻禮拜

現在讓我們來討論那些著名的偉人，如我們所記的祖先；上主在他們的身上，做出許多光榮的事，古時就為他們顯示了自己的偉大，他們中有在自己的肉身中，有自己自己的顯明而聞名天下的；有因自己的明智而作強堅的，有因自己的先知先智而明確一切的；有因自己的敬拜和敬畏，而成為受尊榮的；有許多聖潔的學者；有因其所言所行所作的，背負著重任的；有的是富有有諾言的人，有的是深知好歹，讓自己迷失到 Veg 算是的；這一切人在自己的民族中，給人所常敬畏，他們在這世代，是沒有人稱他，他們中有 有著角名於後世，敬人說好行；我所求告的人，都是光大於世的人，他們的 chambre，不會被人稱為；他們的德行使世間顯明，他們的字 路，邑有這標準的；他們的一生是我所作的，他們的守分，原是他們的；他們的古代如此，于於法王，永遠常存；他們的名分，决不能遺忘；他們的名分必留在永遠，永遠在天主的聖殿，將來必與他們的遺德，——以上是天主的註釋。——（摘自，感謝天主）

祝祭及鞠躬禮（為祖先祈福）

主祭：天主與我們同在，我們在天主前，現在我們為我們的祖先祈福，感謝天主將他們救出天國。

會禮念：我們姊妹弟兄，願將美福載福，願將説福載福，願將感謝載福，願將喜福載福，願將平安載福，願將恩福載福，願將福福載福。

主祭：我們也為他們作感謝祭，大聖拜候主，願他們在天主前永遠享有幸福。
禮成
唱聖歌

“在基督的愛內”
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Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church
Chinatown, Philadelphia
January 24, 1993

Ancestor Memorial Liturgy

According to Chinese Catholic traditions, ancestors are specially remembered at New Year, Ching Ming, on All Souls' Day and other festivals. This memorial liturgy can be performed either before Mass, during Mass, after Holy Communion or at the end of Mass. Its main purpose is to teach the young to show respect and appreciation to their deceased forefathers who as roots of the Chinese society have always been recognized and respected. We have edited for your reference the Chinese and English version of this liturgy, as a supplement of this issue of the newsletter.

Preparation

A. Before the Performance of the Liturgy

1. Announce to the faithful or friends at least one month ahead. Responses should be collected a week before so that seating, food, flowers, incense etc. can be arranged.

2. The following persons should be invited or assigned before the liturgy: one main celebrant, two assistant celebrants, one homilist, one master of ceremonies, one music director, one reader, and two (or more) for prayers of the faithful (Mandarin and Cantonese).

B. Materials needed

1. Ancestor Plaque and altar
2. Chinese black long gowns (for the three celebrants)
3. Incense and incense bowl
4. Flowers and vase
5. Wine, decanter and three small wine cups
6. Fruits and platter
7. Liturgy manual and song book
8. Audio equipment and selected Chinese music
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Holy Redeemer 1993

Ancestor Memorial Liturgy

1. All arise

2. Main celebrant and co-celebrants take their positions in front of the altar.

3. Music (those who do not have music may sing the hymns instead)

4. Reading (Ecclesiasticus 44, 1:15)

5. Homily (on the significance of the liturgy) (all seated)

6. Offertory (all arise)
The co-celebrants hand over three lighted incense sticks to the main celebrant who receives them with both hands and raises them to his forehead to make a bow to the ancestors and places them into the center of the incense burner respectively. The incense burner is usually put in the front middle of the incense table. Incense bowl is also an option.

7. Offering

Flowers: The assistant celebrant hands over flowers to the main celebrant who receives with both hands, raises them to his forehead and then puts them into the vase which is usually put on the right side of the memorial tablets for the forefathers and in line with the red lighted candles.

Wine: The assistant celebrant hands over the decanter to the main-celebrant. The celebrant raises the decanter to his forehead to make a bow to the ancestors, drinks three cups of wine and then puts them on the altar.
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Holy Redeemer 1993

Fruits: The assistant celebrant hands over the fruit plate to the main celebrant. The celebrant raises them to their forehead and then puts them on the altar.

8. Bowing ceremony
Make three bows to the forefathers. The master of ceremonies announces three times and the main-celebrant assistant celebrates and all the faithful make bows together.

9. The Prayer of the Faithful

The main celebrant: Brothers and sisters, the Lord commands us to respect our parents and remember our forefathers. With this in mind, we make a special prayer for them today.

Reader (Mandarin): Let us pray for our forefathers and all whose who passed away. May God grant them reunion in Heaven.
All participants: God hear our prayer.

Reader (Cantonese): Let us pray for those who passed away but had no one to pray for them. May God grant them reunion in Heaven and share eternal happiness. Let us pray together.

10. End of the Liturgy: every one sings hymns.

11. The main celebrant and co-celebrants make one bow to the memorial tablet before they withdraw.

12. Music
祭祖禮儀

一、當天應供之物

二、各供奉類

三、飲食

四、供奉

五、就座

六、禮拜

七、獻花

八、致哀

九、致謝

十、祭拜

十一、獻花

十二、致謝

注：各供奉類，飲食，供奉，就座，禮拜，致謝，獻花，致哀，祭拜，獻花，致謝。
ANCESTOR MEMORIAL LITURGY

According to Chinese Catholic traditions, ancestors were specially remembered at New Year, Ching Ming, on All Souls’ Day and other festivals. This memorial liturgy can be performed either before Mass, during Mass or Holy Communion or at the end of Mass. Its main purpose is to teach the young to show respect and appreciation to their deceased forefathers who are roots of a Chinese society have always been recognized and respected. We have edited for your reference the Chinese and English version of this liturgy, as a supplement of this issue of this newsletter.

PREPARATION

A. Before the performance of the liturgy

1. Announce to the faithful or friends at least one month ahead. Responses should be collected a week before so that seating, food, flowers, incense etc. can be arranged.
2. The following persons should be invited or assigned before the liturgy:
   One Main Celebrant, two co-celebrants, one homilist, one master of liturgy, one music director, one reader, and two (or more) for prayers of the faithful.

B. Materials needed

1. Ancestor Plaque and altar
2. Chinese black long gowns (for the three Celebrants)
3. Incense and incense bowl
4. Flowers and vass
5. Wine, decanter and three small wine cups
6. Fruits and platter
7. Liturgy manual and song book
8. Audio equipment and selected Chinese music

ANCESTOR MEMORIAL LITURGY

1. All arise
2. Main Celebrant and Co-celebrants take position in front of the altar
3. Priscus
4. Homily (on the significance of the liturgy) (all seated)
5. Offertory (all seated)
   Incense
6. Flowers
7. Wine
8. Fruits
9. Bowing ceremony (three times)
10. Prayers of the Faithful
11. Completion (selected songs or music)
12. The Celebrants leave the altar
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Holy Redeemer Chinese Catholic Church
Chinatown, Philadelphia
February 9, 1992

Ancestor Memorial Liturgy

Preparation

I. The main celebrant and two co-celebrants are in black robes and all the other clergy are in white robes with red ribbons.

II. When they enter the Church, the co-celebrant, empty-handed, walk at the front followed by bishop, clergy and brothers and then the main celebrant and the co-celebrants.

1) The co-celebrants come before the altar and bow together. Then they stand in the first row.

2) The 12 priests ahead bow before the altar and stand in the second row.

3) All the other priests make bows together and stand in the third row.

4) The main celebrant and co-celebrants bow and stand at their original places.

Ancestor Memorial Liturgy

1. All arise

2. Singing of the hymns

3. Readings (All arise)

Now let us call the roll of famous men that were our fathers, long ago. What high achievements the Lord has made known in them, ever since time began! Here were men that had power and bore rule, men that excelled in strength, or in the wisdom that dowered them; prophets that worthily upheld the name of
Appendix III: Ancestor Memorial Liturgies

Holy Redeemer 1992

prophecy, issuing to the people the commands their times needed, uttering, through their foresight, a sacred charge to the nations. Here were men that had skill to devise old melodies, to make songs and set them down in writing. Here were men rich in ability, (noble of aim), that dwelt peacefully in their times. These were the glories of their race, the ornament of their times; and the sons they begot have left a memory that adds to the recital of their praise. Not like those of others, who are forgotten in death as if they had never been; nameless, they and their children, as if they had never lived; no, these were men of tender conscience; their deeds of charity will never be forgotten. Blessings abide with their posterity; their descendents are a race set apart for God, the pledged heirs of his promises. For their sakes this line of theirs will endure for all time; their stock, their name will never be allowed to die out. Their bodies lie in peace; their names lasts on, age after age. Their wisdom is yet a legend among the people; wherever faithful men assemble, their story is told.

4. Offertory: Incense

1) The co-celebrants hands over lighted incense sticks to the main co-celebrant who receives them with both hands and raises them to his forehead to make a bow to the ancestors and then places them into the center of the incense burner respectively.

2) All the faithful and community representatives come before the altar and offer incense as the celebrants do.

5. Offering of the Flowers

The co-celebrant hands over flowers to the main celebrant who receives with both hands, raises them to his forehead and then puts them into the vase.

1) The co-celebrants accompany the main celebrant. When the main celebrant bows, all the co-celebrants bow together.
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2) The community representatives and all the faithful come before the altar. One presents flowers and the others accompany.

6. Offering of Wine
The co-celebrant hands over the decanter to the main celebrant who raises the decanter to his forehead to make a bow to the ancestors and drinks three cups of wine.

1) The main celebrant accompanied by the co-celebrants
2) One of the representatives of the faithful.

7. Offering of Fruits
The co-celebrant hands over the fruit plate to the main celebrant who raises them to their forehead and then puts them on the altar.

1) The main celebrant accompanied by the co-celebrants
2) Representatives of the faithful

8. Bowing Ceremony
Make three bows to the forefathers. The main celebrant and co-celebrants come before the altar and the master of the ceremonies announces three bows.

9. The Prayer of the Faithful

The main celebrant: Brothers and sisters, the Lord commands us to respect our parents and remember our forefathers. With this in mind, we make a special prayer for them today.
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**Reader (Mandarin):** Let us pray for our forefathers and all those who passed away. May God grant them reunion in Heaven.

**All participants:** God Hear our prayer.

**Reader (Cantonese):** Let us pray for those who passed away but had no one to pray for them. May God grant them reunion in Heaven and share eternal happiness. Let us pray together.

**All participants:** God hear our prayer.

**Reader (Mandarin):** Let us pray for all the children. May they be grateful for their parents and show filial obedience. Let us pray.

**All participants:** God hear our prayer.

**Reader (Cantonese):** Let us pray for all the families in our community. May the Lord make us united and get along with each other peacefully in this world and we may meet all the ancestors, relatives and friends in Heaven in days to come. Let us pray.

**All participants:** God hear our prayer.

**The main celebrant:** Merciful Father, You are the Lord of Abraham and Jacob and also the Lord of our forefathers. May you hear the prayer of your family. May our ancestors rest in your care and share your love for the sake of our Jesus Christ.

Holy Mass (The main celebrant and the co-celebrants go to change the vestments and all the other priests take their positions.) Lord have mercy on us.

**Reading:** Mass for Spring Festival.

**Hymn:** Holy, Holy, Holy
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Seattle Archdiocese
Seattle, Washington
no date

Ancestor Memorial Liturgy in New York

1. Beginning: All arise

2. Main celebrant takes his position.

3. Assistant celebrant takes his position.

4. The co-celebrants takes his place.

5. Music

6. Singing of hymns

7. Reading (all be seated)

Ecclesiasticus 44, 1:15
Now let us call the roll of famous men that were our fathers, long ago. What high achievements the Lord has made known in them, ever since time began! Here were men that had power and bore rule, men that excelled in strength, or in the wisdom that dowered them; prophets that worthily upheld the name of prophecy, issuing to the people the commands their times needed, uttering, through their foresight, a sacred charge to the nations. Here were men that had skill to devise old melodies, to make songs and set them down in writing. Here were men rich in ability, (noble of aim), that dwelt peacefully in their times. These were the glories of their race, the ornament of their times; and the sons they begot have left a memory that adds to the recital of their praise. Not like those of others, who are forgotten in death as if they had never been; nameless, they and their children, as if they had never lived; no, these were men of tender conscience; their deeds of charity will never be forgotten. Blessings abide with their posterity; their descendents are a race set apart for God, the pledged heirs of his promises. For their sakes this line of theirs will endure for
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all time; their stock, their name will never be allowed to die out. Their bodies lie in peace; their names lasts on, age after age. Their wisdom is yet a legend among the people; wherever faithful men assemble, their story is told.

8. Salutation (All arise and read)
God created our soul and our forefathers the physical being. These gifts of birth and nurturing are as high as the mountains and as deep as the ocean,
At this beginning of a new year, a time when the earth returns to spring,
We drink the water while remembering the source,
Our gratitude to you is everlasting.

9. Memorial Oration: The main celebrant reads (all arise and listen)
At the beginning of this year, we overseas Chinese and Chinese descendents on the east coast gather together to honor our forefathers in all sincerity. We follow the example of our ancestors who were virtuous, industrious and frugal. They cultivated their moral characters and brought benefits to the people and society. The Chinese nation rises in the east. With a history of more than five thousand years, it has a civilization of long standing and boasts many lofty ideals. Even in the 1990s, it is no worse than the other nations. All of the ancient civilizations pass away except the Chinese one which still stands still in the east making its own contributions to the world. This is the achievement made by our great ancestors. All the Chinese people should follow the steps of our forefathers. We must love, help and unite with each other thus making greater contributions to the whole world. May God grant them Heavenly peace. Here we have these fruits, flowers and wine to offer on the altar to express our filial obedience.

10. Presentation of Music
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11. Offertory: Incense (all arise)
The main celebrant is handed three lighted incense sticks
which he receives with both hands and each co-celebrant is
handed one lighted incense stick. The main celebrant raises
them to his forehead to make a bow to the ancestors and places
the incense into the center of the incense burner.

12. Offering: flowers, wine and fruits

13. Bowing ceremony: three times to the ancestors’ tablet
(community representatives offer incense) (household
representatives offer incense)

14. Reading of Scriptures

15. Assembly greetings: Make one bow to the main celebrant to
wish him a Happy New Year.
The Priest: May the holy and almighty God, source of life, grant
you a happy New Year, happiness and peace. In the name of
the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit! Amen

16. Breaking of the Bread

17. End of the ceremony: Singing of the Lord’s Prayer
Our Father who are in Heaven. Hallowed be thy name; thy
kingdom come; thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread; forgive our trespasses as we
forgive those who trespass against us; lead us not into
temptation but deliver us from every evil. Amen.

18. The main celebrant and co-celebrants withdraw.

19. Music
1. 典禮開始：金鑰開启
2. 立祭壇位
3. 供祭位
4. 檢祭位
5. 奠 餐
6. 唱 歌：
7. 读 副：（請坐）

恭请德主

現在讓我們來讚揚那些著名的偉人，和我們歷代的祖先：上主在他們身上，做出許多光耀的事，自古就對他們顯示了自己的偉大。他們中有在自己國內高貴的，有因自己的勛功而聞名天下的；有因自己的明智而作君王的，有因自己的先知任務而顯徽一切的；有因自己的決策和明智，而作當時民衆傾倒的；有以自己崇高的名言，教導民衆的學者；有因其所作，創作樂曲的，有寫作故事的，有的是富豪而有權勢的人，有的是善好美術，在自己榮中，過著安靜的生活，有這些人，在自己的民族中，歷代受人尊敬，他們在世時，就有人民讚揚他們中有的以留名於後世，使人讚嘆不已；有所為所行，人皆為之 entreprise 的人，他們的美譽，不會被人遺忘；他們的善行與子弟同存，他們的後裔，保有這善行的產業；他們的子弟及族弟們，他們的子女，因了他們，也是如此：子子孫孫，永世長存；他們的光榮，決不會消滅；他們的名譽，必留於永遠；民衆必傳述他們的智慧，萬世必傳揚他們的美德。

以上是天主的聖訓。全文：感謝天主。

8. 诵祝詞：（起立）

天主，我霍，誰信我者，生威望我，天主主宰；信我者我，但言主信，
洪恩大德，山高海深，炮織織連，根本長恩，春節秋壽，古日長存，
一元撫仰，大地回春，飲水思源，孝心永存。

9. 请祭文：（起立）

我今虔誠謂言，我虔極悲痛靡言，共殤一堂，向我主親到宗申表子
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愛至誠，善至德，仁至義，以至高無上，達諸人間，諸善行善。吾族民族興起於東方，已歷五千年餘年，文化悠久，道德高尚，即在二十世界八十年代，亦無遜於他邦。世界文明古國無多，且皆相繼淪亡，惟吾宗族，相傳不絕，迄今雖立於東方，與世界文明各國，貢獻自己力量。凡此佳績，均有賴我祖先無窮奮發，不渝不諱，克勤克儉。凡我炎黃子孙，當憶我先聖之，諸誠团结，愛國愛家，友愛互助，俾於世人類兄弟友誼，更大力量。

今我度御上主，施恩加惠，我先祖列宗，昭彼在天之靈，永享安榮。謹具藥酒鮮花於主祭台之上，致訴誠忱。尚謹敬之。
CEREMONIAL TRIBUTE TO THE ANCESTORS:

Comment

The Catholic Church accepts the ideas and practices of ancestor veneration because aside from worshipping God, the Church also practices the veneration of saints and angels and in a special way the Virgin Mary.

In Chinese culture, heaven, earth, heaven and terrestrial spirits, ancestors and the dead can be the objects of sacrifice. In different situations the term sacrifice takes on different meanings.

As Catholics and as Chinese we offer to the heavenly Father in the Eucharist the body and blood of Jesus Christ - once the victim of the cross and now under the species of bread and wine. In a symbolic ceremony incense, flowers, wine and fruit are offered to the ancestors to express our sentiments and our gratitude towards them and our communion with them in the Lord.

As Catholics, we do not consider our ancestors as idols. We venerate them and remember them as we do the angels and saints.

All rise.

The main celebrant and the clergy take their place.

Music

Prayer of a dutiful son or daughter

My soul is from God, my body from my parents. Creator and sovereign of life all power to you! Life is as high as the mountains, wide as the sea. In gratitude, may I always be mindful of the debt to my parents, both in life and death, and grateful for all the merits passed down from my ancestors. At this New Year, a bright and happy day, the first day of a new beginning, a new spring, returning to life's source, a true son/daughter may I always be Amen

Tribute: At the beginning of this New Year, we, the Chinese in America, gather together to offer our respects to our ancestors, our fathers and mothers. We want to emulate their illustrious virtues and work diligently and earnestly to lead a virtuous life so as to benefit the whole of society and bring happiness to all mankind. Today, we ask our Lord graciously to bestow His blessings on our ancestors and grant them eternal rest. May our offerings of flowers and wine which we place upon the altar be kindly accepted before God.

Offerings of Music, Incense, Flowers, Wine and Fruits

Ceremony of Reverence

Three bows to the Ancestors' Shrine
向主報讀，互問新年快樂；大聖言
祝你們平安、喜樂、康健。

Group Greeting

New to the main celebrant and one another
wishing everyone New Year happiness.

Celebrant's Blessing: May the almighty and
merciful God, source of all life and goodness,
grant you New Year's happiness, peace and joy,
in the name of the Father, and of the Son and
春節奉天經典祝

2 唱聖歌。

3 頭炮。

4 聆信者恭讀聖詠。

5 聆信者奉天經典祝
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교사 등급과 관련된 문제입니다.

교사의 등급은 주로 받는 동물과 관련된 것으로, 다음과 같은 방법으로 할 수 있습니다.

1. 師資級별과 관련된 문제입니다.
2. 師資級별과 관련된 문제입니다.
3. 師資級별과 관련된 문제입니다.

문제를 해결하는 방법은 다음과 같습니다.

1. 等級별과 관련된 문제입니다.
2. 等級별과 관련된 문제입니다.
3. 等級별과 관련된 문제입니다.
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APPENDIX IV: 1983 Hsin Chu, Taiwan Funerary Narrative

I was living in Hsin Chu, Taiwan when a former student and very good friend of mine, Rhiannon Chen, knowing that I was an English instructor by profession, but a folklorist at heart, gave me the honor of inviting me to her eighty-five year old grandmother's funeral. Before the day of the funeral, Rhiannon's grandmother's closed casket and altar in her honor could be visited or 'viewed' in what resembled, to my American eyes, a large garagelike building which was attached to her family's semi-rural home. I visited Rhiannon, her family and the deceased family member in this room several days before the funeral and burial. I remember sitting in that cold, damp, dreary room with only Rhiannon, her father, the deceased and myself.

The altar had Rhiannon's grandmother's picture on it, incense burning, and food piled on it. I remember fruit and canned foods of some sort. The casket was located behind the altar, but from where we were sitting on the side of the room we could see both the altar and the casket. The foot of the beautifully carved wooden casket was facing the door. Suddenly, as we three were quietly sitting there, an elderly woman walked through the door and and just as suddenly threw herself on the floor and began wailing on the top of her lungs as she crawled up to the altar on her knees. When she arrived at the altar, she kowtowed before the grandmother's portrait. Then, just as suddenly as all of her other actions, she got up, dried her eyes, and walked over to Rhiannon's father and started chatting. This is all I remember of that day except for my feeling of shock over this incident.

On the day of the funeral Rhiannon's boyfriend picked me up. We found Rhiannon ritually wailing next to her grandmother's casket which was now located outside - but partly jutting into a huge tent where there were located the altar - with canned food all wrapped in plastic, incense, and candles piled on it - in addition to hundreds of seats which were set up for the grieving to listen to speeches about Rhiannon's grandmother and also about other members of the Chen clan. Rhiannon was standing next to the casket, dressed in traditional burlap mourning clothes with a white saclike cloth skirt and white hood made out of the same material. The other
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six or seven women who were standing in the two rows with her, ritually crying, were wearing the same outfit as were many other women who were present.

When Rhiannon saw her boyfriend and me, she came running over to us; but soon she returned to her ritual wailing. (I could see it was a ritual because they were standing in those two rows hour after hour, just crying.) Rhiannon's boyfriend and I roamed around; I remember feeling slightly disoriented. It seemed like more of a festival than a funeral. The loudspeaker had one Chinese person after another making speeches in the tent. Outside the tent, across a small path, there were people cooking noodles and passing bowls of them around.

A very strong memory in my mind of this day is the music - the Chinese music being played by elderly men who just sat in this open truck and played hour after hour. It had a very tinny sound - no melody really - just combinations of seemingly discordant notes strung together. This music was not new to me, however. I often heard men playing this funeral music in a truck as they drove past the house I lived in with an American Baptist missionary. It seemed like there were always a lot of funerals going on. So many people! No wonder I heard this sound so often.

Another visually memorable sight on this day were these round objects: I don't know what to call them either in Chinese or in English. These round objects, which were about four or five feet wide in circumference, were covered with different colored flowers, stood on two legs, and were about five feet tall. I saw these objects everywhere and was told that they were used to signify death at funerals and to signify the opening of a new store or restaurant.

People milled around; people said speeches I really could not understand; people ate and cried and made music and put flowers on those round objects and wore those clothes - some of the children wore big red hats....
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I remember Rhiannon telling me that not everyone wears the same mourning clothes, that what each person was supposed to wear was determined by tradition. In other words, what the relationship of the family member was to the deceased determined what that person wore at the funeral. I recall Rhiannon telling me that because her father was the eldest son of her grandmother, her father was obligated to wear the heaviest and most uncomfortable mourning clothes. This was his obligation as a filial son. He was obligated to wear these specific burlap clothes so that the material would scratch him so that he would be uncomfortable so that he could demonstrate how filial he was to the society around him.

I also remember Rhiannon telling me that her father was not supposed to eat a lot and that he had to eat while standing up. He could not sit down. This too was supposed to make him uncomfortable and thereby demonstrate his filiality.

Late in the afternoon a group of about ten men hoisted up the casket up onto their shoulders with the help of wood and rope constructs. Everyone present followed them, in a procession, to the cemetery. It was quite a far walk into the countryside.

One object I noticed on our walk was a little burlap bundle which Rhiannon's father had flung over his shoulder. Rhiannon told me that these were the clothes that Rhiannon's father's younger brother was designated to wear if he had been present at the funeral. For some reason, it was impossible for Rhiannon's uncle to be physically present; however, because her father carried the burlap clothes over his shoulder throughout the day, the uncle was able to be symbolically present at the mother's funeral.

The cemetery was composed of trees and rolling hills and graves with elaborate markers on them. They were strewn all over the land with no visual order or visually discernable system which could tell me why these graves were laid out so haphazardly. (I know why now.)
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There are two points about ancestor veneration which I remember Rhiannon telling me after the funeral was over. She told me that her grandmother's spirit was supposed to return to their house on the seventh day after the funeral to let the family know whether she was all right or not. I do not recall Rhiannon telling me whether or not this event did or did not occur, however. The other piece of information she gave me concerning beliefs about the afterlife was that her family had spent a lot of money on colorful paper dolls and houses and other beautifully designed objects which were ritually burned so that these things could join and comfort her grandmother in heaven.

When I recall my memories of this day in Hsin Chu, Taiwan, I am struck by two seemingly contradictory impressions. On one hand, many of the rituals I have described seem to have been formally prescribed: the sacrificing of food, incense burning, speech saying, ritual weeping, noodle eating, music playing, flower object displaying, and the wearing of mourning clothes. On the other hand, there was no service, or organized meeting, or saying of prayers (as far as I witnessed). Everything seemed to me - to my Western Catholic trained mind - to be quite arbitrary and haphazard. However, the more I learn about ancestor veneration and Chinese culture in general, the more I understand that there was indeed method to that seeming arbitrariness - ritual method - and the outward expression of the Chinese way of dealing with death and of demonstrating filial piety.
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