Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu
vol. LXXXVIII, fasc. 176 (2019-II)

Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? Part 2: The Canton Conference and Prospero Intorcetta SJ's Report of 1668

Thierry Meynard SJ*
Sun Yat-sen University, Canton

We have already presented in this journal the background of the discussion in Canton in 1668 on the question of the Chinese fasters and published a transcription and English translation of the report by the French Jesuit Adrien Grelon.[1] In this article, we would like to present the corresponding report by the Italian Jesuit Prospero Intorcetta[2]. Although this report overlaps in some areas with the previous one, it offers new insights on the controversy that help us to measure better Intorcetta's reading of Chinese culture and society and the boldness of his propositions. While Intorcetta has become quite familiar to scholars for his engagement with the Confucian Classics, especially the *Zhongyong*, his report on the question of the Chinese fasters shows us a further aspect of engagement: Buddhism and Chinese popular religions, both of which deserve more research.

As we saw in Part One of this study, the relevant Article at the Canton Conference established considerable flexibility for dealing with the matter of admitting Chinese fasters to Christian baptism: in response, Grelon's report tried to secure a harder line against the baptism of fasters, while Intorcetta's text argued for their accommodation. The issue continued to simmer until the 1704 papal condemnation of the Chinese rites offered to the ancestors, to Confucius and to the emperor, when it was resolved by adopting the

* Thierry Meynard is professor at the Philosophy department of Sun Yat-Sen University and director of the Research Center on Canton and Foreign Cultural Exchanges. He has authored *The Jesuit Reading of Confucius* (Brill, 2015), *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (IHSI, 2011), and co-authored *Jesuit Chreia in Late Ming China* (Peter Lang, 2014). The author wishes to thank Mirella Saulini, for her assistance with the Latin transcription of Grelon's report, and co-translator of the Latin text into English, Daniel Canaris.

1 Adrien Grelon, * 29.IV.1618 Aubeterre, SJ 1.VI.1643, † 3.III.1696 Jiangxi, *DHCJ* II, 1812.

2 Prospero Intorcetta, * 28.XII.1625 Piazza Armerina, SJ 31.XII.1642 Messina, † 3.X.1692 Hangzhou, *DHCJ* III, 2059–60.

position advocated by Grelon that banned baptism to fasting Chinese vegetarians. The Intorcetta text provides a window onto the contested and uncertain path to this outcome, and onto the history of this important theme more broadly.

The report under investigation is found in ARSI *Jap. Sin.* 150, "Ritus Sinici, Liturgica 1622–1708," ff. 71–77 (*prima via*). There is another copy *Jap. Sin.* 150, ff. 83–90v (*tertia via*). The report was sent together with the one by Grelon and other documents and was authenticated by Luis da Gama[3] on 10 December 1668. The report itself is not signed, but just after it, there is a five-page appendix by Jacques Le Faure[4] (ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 150, ff. 77–79) who mentions explicitly Intorcetta as the author of the report.

Since the formal conference of the twenty-three missionaries ended on 26 January 1668, we may presume that Intorcetta wrote his report just after, during the month of February. When he saw the report by Grelon, Intorcetta inserted an addendum of two pages (ARSI *Jap. Sin.* 150, ff. 70rv).

Intorcetta's report bears quite a long title: "It is asked whether Chinese fasters should always be forced by the missionaries to break their fast before receiving baptism because of its nature and despite the fact that they detest Idols and all superstitions, including the fasts previously observed out of superstition, and make the formal and firm promise that they shall fast from now on for the love and veneration of God and in penance for their sins; or whether they ought to be baptized without breaking the fast if they can give a just reason for not breaking the fast."

This title incorporates all the elements of the sixth article of the Canton conference on the Chinese fast, but adds a new condition for the baptism of the fasters, that is, the formal and firm promise of the faster to fast for God. This can be seen as a concession that Intorcetta makes to Grelon. Indeed, Grelon had envisioned that the fasters would be forced to publicly break their fast before baptism by eating a piece of meat. As a counter-proposition, Intorcetta adopts Grelon's strategy of bringing the question of the fasters in the public life of the Christian community, but instead of a public ceremony of breaking the fast by meat consumption, Intorcetta designs a public ceremony containing a promise of the fasters to keep fasting for God, making an oath if necessary.

3 Luis da Gama, * 1610 Lavre (Montemor or Novo, Portugal), SJ 1625 Lisbon, † 5.VIII.1672 Macao, *DHCJ* II, 1564.

4 Jacques Le Faure, * 20.III.1613, SJ 8.I.1630, † 28.I.1675, *DHCJ* III, 2302–03.

Just like Grelon, Intorcetta reasons in his report through the theological categories of the material act and formal act, but he wants to prove that the Chinese fast is not intrinsically evil in material terms. It is only the intention of the faster that determines whether the act is formally good or evil. The fundamental question concerns the legitimacy of adopting in Christianity some elements of Chinese culture and religions — in this case the fast inherited from Buddhism — while keeping the material act exactly the same and changing the formal intention.

Intorcetta starts with some preliminary considerations, offering a rather detailed list of ten fasts practised at that time. In contrast, Grelon was satisfied with a much briefer presentation since he rejected all types of fast as idolatrous or superstitious. Intorcetta goes in greater detail because he wants to prove that among the ten types, eight of them are directly associated with Buddhist worship, but two types of fast, despite also being of Buddhist origin, have been Confucianized, such as when children fast to express their filial piety towards their parents. The mention of Confucian fasts supports Intorcetta's belief that the material fast, though Buddhist in origin, is not intrinsically linked to Buddhism and can be concretely detached from it. Though Intorcetta does not explicitly make the parallel, his allusion to the Confucianization of the Buddhist fast gives quite a strong legitimacy to his attempt to Christianize this same Buddhist fast. However, throughout his report, there is little discussion on the Confucianized fast, and instead Intorcetta deals with the conversion of people who have been practising the Buddhist fast and now want to convert to Christianity while keeping their fast. We can already see how Intorcetta's project differs radically from Grelon's conservative approach. While Grelon sees the Chinese fast as an obstacle and something to be eradicated in the life of Chinese Christianity, Intorcetta conceives fast as a positive practice that can be fully Christianized.

However, there is one type of fast which stands prominently in Grelon's report and which is completely absent in Intorcetta's, namely the fast practised by the *Teaching of the fasters*, or *zhaijiao*, a heterodox and rebellious sect very active at the beginning of the Qing dynasty. Intorcetta does not ignore this group, at one point alluding to "the sect causing troubles in the country" only to mention that he does not wish to discuss it. Intorcetta's decision to leave aside the question of the *zhaijiao* may appear surprising in regards to the importance of heterodox groups using fast as a religious marker at that period of time. However, while he strives to incorporate

the fast within the religious life of Chinese Christianity, he also considers the moral and cultural dimension of the fast, which goes beyond any religious affiliation. For Intorcetta, promoting the fast inside Chinese Christian communities serves the larger project of positioning Christianity within the moral and cultural framework of China. The fast appeared to him as a cultural imperative, and he calls it later in the report, "a national custom" (*mos Regni*), that Christianity should embrace to be better integrated within society.

After these preliminary considerations, Intorcetta provides two grounds for not requiring the break of the fast. First, according to the Church's rules, a general renunciation and the intention to observe the commandments of the Church are sufficient for baptism, and there is no need to ask for specific renunciations.

The second ground concerns the excessive burden imposed on the faster if he or she were required to break the fast. Two difficulties are raised. First, there is the social stigma attached to the breaking of the fast, because this action would be reproved by servants and neighbors. Grelon rejects in his own report this argument as extremely weak, as it would imply that Christians were not able to stand up for their faith against familial and societal pressure. Yet Intorcetta asserts that the fast is a cultural imperative which should be respected and observed by Christians, so that Christianity may not be perceived as being systematically opposed to the fast. For Intorcetta, this cultural imperative is strong enough for allowing Chinese converts to continue their fast after baptism. Intorcetta understands that a frontal opposition of Christianity the fast would create a scandal within the larger Chinese society. The second difficulty operates on a personal level, being expressed as a nausea or distaste among the fasters for eating meat. In his report, Grelon discarded the claim of nausea provoked by the consumption of meat as quite improbable and as more a pretext and illustration of the bad faith of the fasters who wish to be Christian but who remain attached to their superstitions. When Intorcetta and Grelon talk about nausea, they make it clear that this may not be purely physical but also psychological, due to the religious education received from youth. For Intorcetta, however, some people can personally break away from their previous faith while having great difficulty in discarding a fasting practice that has become part of their lifestyle. Therefore, Intorcetta considers that those two difficulties, one social and another psychological, are legitimate reasons for not breaking the fast, since this would impose an unnecessary burden.

The two difficulties mentioned by Intorcetta are rightly

appreciated within the framework of the Chinese cultural background, whereas for Grelon, who does not show the same social and cultural sensitivity as Intorcetta, those two difficulties appear unfounded and unreal. The priest needs to evaluate properly the difficulties so that he can reach moral certitude about the good faith of the baptismal candidate. Clearly, there cannot be absolute certitude, but for Grelon, the refusal of the faster to eat a piece of meat and his obstinacy in refusing to break the fast even only once makes him highly suspicious. On the contrary, Intorcetta accepts the words of the fasters who ask for baptism as sincere, and if he requests the fasters to make a public promise, it is to alleviate the worries of missionaries like Grelon. In a certain way, the positions of Intorcetta and Grelon are diametrically opposed. Intorcetta stresses that the catechumen can make a personal and informed decision in asking for baptism while understanding how his fasting practice could materially be the same and yet reoriented towards a Christian end. In contrast, Grelon stresses the authority of the priest in collecting enough proofs that would convince him that he could licitly baptize a faster.

After having revealed his stance and the two supporting grounds, Intorcetta provides five supporting confirmations. The first one is the consistency in the missionary policy because the missionaries do not request a special rejection of any superstition. Just above this discussion, Intorcetta had mentioned the example of the Buddhist prohibition on killing life, which is based on the belief in transmigration. Since the missionaries do not ask people to kill an ant to express their renunciation to this superstition, similarly they should not ask the fasters to break their fast.

The second confirmation invokes the authority of Thomas Aquinas, quoted not directly from the *Summa theologica*, which was probably not available in Canton, but indirectly from the Jesuit moral theologian Paul Layman (1574–1635). Since baptism is the first sacrament, an individual is not under ecclesiastical jurisdiction before baptism. Hence, there is no sacrament of reconciliation before baptism, and the priest has no authority to ask the baptismal candidate anything specific; only a profession of faith and a general renunciation of Satan are required. Those dispositions ensure that baptism is as widely accessible as possible. For Intorcetta, the supplementary condition of breaking the fast would make many people stay away from the Church. In addition, he argues that many fasters who were forced to break their fast before receiving baptism have relapsed into Buddhism. On the contrary, among the

many fasters who converted to Christianity without breaking their material fast, changing only the formal act of fasting, the majority of them have remained good Catholics. Intorcetta criticizes opponents like Grelon because of their rigorist approach, which make them unable to measure the success of an open policy. In Intorcetta's view, his policy of accommodation is more effective than the radical policy promoted by Grelon, and he suggests that the conversion of the Buddhists to Christianity cannot be realized by a full rejection of the Buddhist practices but is more easily secured by the Christianization of Buddhist practices like the fast.

The third and longest confirmation argues that accepting fasters does not create a scandal within either Chinese society or the Church. As said above, for Intorcetta, fasting is a positive moral value in Chinese culture and society, disconnected from Buddhism. Thus, by accepting the fasters, the Church avoids the great scandal of asking Christians to renounce their previous fast. Instead, for Grelon, keeping those fasting practices would be equivalent to keeping Buddhist statutes at home, and he considers that keeping those statues even for a secular use, like decoration, is illicit and reveals that the person is still attached to past superstitions. For Intorcetta, the new Christians should replace the statues of Buddha and other gods with the one of Christ, put in place of honor, but instead of destroying the statues or getting rid of them, he suggests that they could be kept. He argues that in Europe, there is clearly no danger that pagan statues used for decorative purposes in places like the kitchen could be seen as objects of worship, but rather as a means of denigration. If such conditions could be replicated in China, then pagan statues could be kept. Since the formal intention of worshipping the statues has disappeared, it is possible to keep them at home in a place and a function which is clearly non-religious. Similarly, since the Chinese fast has lost its association with Buddhism and can even be Christianized, the new Christians could continue fasting the same way, avoiding the great scandal in the society that would occur should they publicly break their fast. In this section about the perception of the non-Christians, Intorcetta still makes it clear that new Christians have the duty to indicate to visitors to their homes that, if Buddhist statues are kept in the kitchen — with the image of Christ located in the central altar — and if they keep fasting as before — but now for Christ — then there is to be no risk of non-Christian visitors misunderstanding these statues.

In this second section of the third confirmation, Intorcetta tackles

the issue of the scandal among the Christians. As Intorcetta admits in his report, the negative attitude of the Christians was a real issue, and the sixth article of the conference deals precisely with this point: "Christians are strongly advised not to deter the fasters from listening to catechism by carelessly reproving them for their fast, but should gently take them to the priest to be taught about their obligations." In his own report, Intorcetta restates the main measure to be taken so that the fasters may join the Christian communities, adding the public promise, as mentioned above.

Besides the resistance of Chinese Christians in accepting the Chinese fasters, another problem was the conservative policy of missionaries like Grelon who had systematically denied baptism for all Chinese fasters who do not first break their fast. For Intorcetta, all the priests should abide by the same rules, and the rules should be applied uniformly, including in places where the question had arisen. This argument of uniformity favoured allowing fasters to be baptized, since fasters in some areas had been baptized already, both at the time of the reports, and possibly before the time of these Jesuit fathers.

Related to this point, and as part of the third confirmation, the policy of the first missionaries of the China mission is also discussed. Intorcetta is aware that there was no uniform and consistent policy at the time of Ricci, but he makes the point that the first generation of missionaries in China did not consider the fast itself as an intrinsic evil, since this would have implied that any baptism of the fasters was illicit. Intorcetta reaffirms the theological rationale behind the sixth article of the conference, that is to say, the fast itself is not intrinsically evil. This indicates that the first generation of missionaries may have indeed baptized fasters, though concrete evidence of this is lacking. In his own report, Grelon boldly affirms that Giulio Aleni,[5] Lazzaro Cattaneo,[6] Alfonso Vagnone,[7] etc, never baptized any faster, but this is hard to prove, or, as Intorcetta says in his report: "For this reason alone, there is one [Father] arguing this position against the opinion of the twenty-two Fathers in the meeting. His teaching should not be accepted because it wants to

5 Giulio Aleni, * 1582 Brescia (Italy), SJ 1.XI.1600 Novellara (Italy), † 10.VI.1649 Yanping, *DHCJ* I, 72–3.

6 Lazzaro Cattaneo, * 1560 Sarzana (Italy), SJ 27.II.1581 Rome, † 19.I.1640 Hangzhou, *DHCJ* I, 721.

7 Alfonso Vagnone, * January 1568 Trofarello (Italy), SJ 24.X.1584 Arona (Italy), † 14.VIII.1606 Nanjing, *DHCJ* IIII, 3867.

prove so much that it proves nothing and it contradicts what was already decided after much discussion." Despite being isolated on this question of the policy of the first mission, Grelon was not alone in opposing the baptism of the fasters, and, when the vote came, six of them, out of the twenty-three being present, voted against the sixth article, according to the Spanish Dominican Domingo Navarrete (1618–86). For those six missionaries, baptism should under no circumstances be given to a faster who does not first break his fast.[8] In his report, Intorcetta used many times the word adversaries with the plural, but no one is explicitly mentioned, not even Grelon.

The fourth confirmation echoes a concession presented by Grelon: "If some fasters, after having broken their fast, still want to abstain all their life from meat, eggs, dairy and wine — which I think will seldom or never happen — this could be allowed provided that they have changed the form of their fast, using for example onions and leeks or at least a bit of pork fat as condiment for their vegetables in the Chinese way."[9] Intorcetta sees this concession as a way for Grelon to salvage his faulty policy, but this appears as a logical contradiction because Grelon holds that the fast, not only in its intention, but in its materiality, is intrinsically evil, and should be absolutely avoided. Intorcetta points out other problems. For example, the mixed practice of the faster may still be regarded by Chinese Christians as suspect. Also, the equivalency established by Grelon in keeping the fast and keeping Buddhist statues (on the condition of following certain protocols and the correct attitude), for Intorcetta, becomes untenable because Buddhist statues should never be retained under any circumstances; Grelon, instead, allows that the fasting practice could still be resumed after a symbolic break.

The final confirmation of Intorcetta's text draws an evocative analogy between keeping the fast and the Chinese veneration of the spirit protectors of a city. Just as the Chinese fast can be Christianized, the pagan rite to the spirit protectors of a city, known in Chinese as *chenghuang*, can be Christianized according to advice that two Jesuits teaching moral theology at the Jesuit College in Palermo

8 Domingo Navarrete, *Controversias antiguas y modernas de la misión de la Gran China*. Madrid: Imprenta Real por Juan García Infançon, 1679, 199b.

9 Thierry Meynard, "Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? The Canton Conference and Adrien Grelon SJ's Report of 1668". *AHSI* LXXXVII, fasc. 173 (2018-I), 111.

sent to Francesco Brancati,[10] another Sicilian of the China mission: "Knowledge was earlier given to the nations that God had assigned to each city or kingdom one holy guardian angel as its protector, and that when the Christians reverence and venerate the tutelary spirit of the city, they intend to adore its holy guardian angel; under this condition and declaration, Christians can participate in those processions and venerate the image, venerating through it the guardian angel." The answer was given in a letter dated 1642, and Brancati probably had the letter with him in Canton and showed it to Intorcetta.

In conclusion, Intorcetta's aim is twofold. He first strives to reach out to people who practise some form of Buddhism or popular religions, especially those who fasted. Instead of advocating a complete destruction of their former practices, Intorcetta is ready to Christianize some of them. Secondly, he sees the fast as an important practice across the Chinese society that should be respected and even embraced by Chinese Christianity for a better insertion in Chinese culture and society.

I hope that those short indications may be useful for reading Intorcetta's report, translated into English by myself and Dr Daniel Canaris.

Cited works

Manuscript Sources

Rome. Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI)
Jap. Sin. 150, ff. 69–79.
Jap. Sin. 158, ff. 51–61.

Madrid. Archivo Histórico Nacional (AHN)
Universidades y colegios 1197 F, ff. 66–76.

Published Primary Sources

Layman, Paul. *Theologia moralis in quinque libros partita*, Munich: Nicolaus Henricus, 1625.

López-Gay, Jesus, SJ. "Un Documento Inédito del P. G. Vázquez (1549–1604) sobre los Problemas Morales del Japón," *Monumenta Nipponica* 16 (1960): 118–60.

Meynard, Thierry, SJ. "Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized?

10 Francesco Brancati, * 1607 Palermo, SJ 14.VIII.1623 Naples, † 1.V.1649 Shanghai, *DHCJ* I, 521–22.

The Canton Conference and Adrien Grelon SJ's Report of 1668". *AHSI* LXXXVII, fasc. 173 (2018-I): 83–114.

Navarrete, Domingo. *Controversias antiguas y modernas de la misión de la Gran China*. Madrid: Imprenta Real por Juan García Infançon, 1679.

Further readings

Asami, Masakazu. "Solutions to the Chinese Rites Controversy proposed by Antonio Rubino, SJ (1578–1643) Visitor to Japan and China." *Christianity and Cultures: Japan & China in Comparison 1543–1644*, edited by Antoni J. Űçerler, pp. 128–41.

Höpfl, Harro. *Jesuit Political Thought*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Overmyer, Daniel. *Folk Buddhist Religion: Dissenting Sects in Late Traditional China.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Reinders, Eric. *Borrowed Gods and Foreign Bodies: Christian Missionaries Imagine Chinese Religion*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

Seiwert, Hubert. "Popular Religious Sects in South-East China." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 20 (1992): 34–37.

ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 150, "Ritus Sinici, Liturgica 1622–1708"; ff. 71–77: P. Prospero Intorcetta SJ. *1a via cum nota authent.* P. Luis da Gama, 10 dec. 1668

It is asked whether Chinese fasters should always be forced by the missionaries to break their fast before receiving baptism because of its nature and despite the fact that they detest Idols and all superstitions, including the fasts previously observed out of superstition, and they make the formal and firm promise that they shall fast from now on for the love and veneration of God and in penance for their sins; or whether they ought to be baptized without breaking the fast if they can give a just reason for not breaking the fast.

On this question, it is not our intention to argue against what the venerable meeting of the Fathers recently decided,[11] but we shall investigate this issue only for the sake of truth, especially in a matter of such importance, as it is, either to open the door of salvation to the seemingly endless number of Chinese people called fasters if, after just cause has been presented, we are satisfied with the declarations of the fasters mentioned in the title above and baptize them; or to close the door to those who refuse breaking the fast, not out of ill will, but either because of a natural repulsion, or out of self-respect, fearing being mocked by their servants, and so on, even though there are not strong reasons for the fasters to be completely unable to break physically or morally their fast. Indeed, if it happens that a faster is physically or morally unable to consume meat, broth, fish, garlic or onions, wine, and so on, there is no doubt that the declaration mentioned above is sufficient, and he should be baptized without breaking his fast, since no one is bound to do the impossible.

[Preliminary considerations about the different fasts]

To determine the core of the issue, we need to examine whether breaking the fast among the Chinese fasters, or the breaking of a specific fast, is by its very nature a condition so absolutely required of a candidate to baptism that, without it, the minister cannot licitly baptize him. According to a theological rule, whenever the minister considers a candidate morally unprepared, he cannot licitly baptize

11 Conference of the 23 missionaries in Canton from 18 December 1667 to 26 January 1668.

him; but whenever he considers him morally prepared, he cannot licitly refuse baptism and close him the door of salvation, opened so generously by Christ the Lord to all.

We should distinguish certainties from uncertainties. First, it is certain that the fast or abstinence from meat, eggs, wine, fish, lard, and onions etc., just as the consumption of meat, fish, eggs, lard, onions and the drinking of wine, is materially and ordinarily found among the superstitions of Chinese pagans. However, those things themselves, even here in China, can be distinguished from formal superstition, just as in Europe, fast and abstinence from meat are distinct from divine worship and penance. Some may fast twice during the sabbath out of hypocrisy.[12] Also, a hermit may abstain all his life from certain things because of a hidden pride, so that he may be praised by people, and may mistakenly think that he has been magnified with many merits from his fasting. If the hermit in Europe confesses [his sin] and truly repents of this pride, and is taught that he did not acquire any merit through all his previous fasts because of his sinful pride, but on the contrary, merited the eternal punishment of hell, would his confessor force him to break his fast, so that he could know for sure that the hermit recognizes his mistake and repents?

Surely the Chinese fast is not a sign so fixed and bound to [Buddhist] superstition or any other religious sect that it could be considered as the external worship and declaration of adoring some Idol or that sect [the Buddhists], such as burning incense or kneeling in front of an Idol, which are illicit acts of worshipping. Gabriel Vásquez[13] was asked about a case, whether a Christian servant could

12 This is a reference to the hidden Jews in Europe.

13 Gabriel Vásquez (1549–1604) was a famous Jesuit theologian at the University of Alcalà, Spain, where he developed the Jesuit doctrine of probabilism. Alessandro Valignano (1539–1606) had submitted to the Superior General Acquaviva (1543–1615) cases of conscience, which were forwarded to Vásquez. This one prepared his answers in 1593 which were examined and approved in 1595 by three theologians appointed by the Inquisition in Rome. The answers of Vásquez arrived Japan in 1598. Being preserved in the Archives of the Japanese province, Intorcetta consulted them in Canton. The original document by Vásquez is lost but the Archivo Histórico Nacional of Madrid holds a copy of the Latin text with the Spanish title: "Respuestas del Padre Vázquez a varios casos, que de Japón preguntaron los nuestros, los cuales truxo el Padre Gil de la Mata procurador de Japón" (*Universidades y colegios* 1197 F, ff. 66–76). Jesús López-Gay has presented and published the Latin text with a translation in Spanish: "Un Documento Inédito del P. G. Vázquez (1549–1604) sobre los Problemas Morales del Japón". *Monumenta Nipponica* 16 (1960): 118–160.

kneel together with his pagan master in front of an Idol, offering the worship not to the Idol but to God, and limiting himself to the kneeling, and he answered: "As I understand, the external act of kneeling is not allowed if the other persons who are present see it as an act of adoration." [14] (At the University of Alcalà on 4 April 1595). However, Roman theologians then decided to authorize a servant to kneel, as it will be shown below.[15]

Nor is this fast the mark of any particular sect in China, unlike the abstinence from pork and wine being one of the marks of Islam. I do not recall European theologians requesting Turks and Moors to eat pork or drink wine before baptism, but they only ask them to reject Islam in its entirety with its rituals. The customary fast in China consists in abstinence from meat, wine, fish, lard, garlic and onions while the ecclesiastical fast consists in having a single meal [a day] and abstinence from meat. Hence the Chinese laugh at how Europeans still drink wine and eat fish, eggs and onions while fasting.

In Europe, some fast all their life; others, only a few years; others, three times a week; others, only on Saturdays in honor of the Virgin Mary; others, on Fridays in remembrance of the Lord's Passion; others, on certain days for some help they have received or to ask something from God. In China, the same universal fast may have different superstitious ends and may take different forms according to the customs of the country.[16] Some practise the fast called *Guanyinzhai* 觀音齋; they fast three months every year, during the second, sixth and ninth months, in honor of the Idol called Guanyin, whom they regard as a virgin, so that she may aid them in their needs.

Others practise the fast called *Zhuntizhai* 準提齋, which lasts ten days over the 1st, 8th, 14th, 15th, 18th, 23rd, 24th, 28th, 29th and 30th days of the lunar month, in honor of this other woman

14 This is the case 33 submitted to Vásquez. For the question and the answer of Vásquez, see AHN, *Universidades y colegios* 1197 F, ff. 70v and 75v; López-Gay, "Un Documento Inédito," 137–38 and 143.

15 See below the very last section of Intorcetta's report. The theologians mentioned here are three Jesuits: Juan Azor, Miguel Vázquez and Muzio De Angelis. See Masakazu, "Solutions to the Chinese Rites Controversy", 134. Intorcetta suggests that even kneeling in front of an Idol could be licit under certain conditions. The fast which is less connected to Buddhism should be considered a *fortiori licit*.

16 Grelon gives a much shorter description of the different fasts; see Meynard, "Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? The Canton Conference and Adrien Grelon SJ's Report of 1668", 112–13.

and mother of the Idol Buddha, so that she may help them in their needs.[17] Others practise the fast called *Sanguanzhai* 三官齋, fasting for three entire lunar months of the year, namely the first, seventh and tenth months.[18] Those who practise the fast called *Yanwangzhai* 閻王齋 fast for three entire months, namely the first, fifth and ninth months, in honor of Yama.[19] Those who observe the fast called *Xiaozhai* 孝齋 fast for forty-nine days after the death of parents so that their corpses may be preserved from corruption and from being eaten by worms; it is also called the *Jingtuzhai* 淨土齋.[20]

Those practising the fast called *Baomuzhai* 報母齋 fast out of gratitude and submission [to their mother] for having born them in her womb and having given them blood and milk, and for the pains she endured while nursing them as infants and toddlers. The *Xianxiao xinzhai* 顯孝心齋 fast consists in adolescents and young men (but not all of them) fasting generally for ten years, while some fast for three entire years.[21] Those who follow the fast called *Shiyuanzhai* 十緣齋 fast for ten whole days during any month from the beginning of the lunar month so that their next reincarnation will be propitious. The fast called *Shenzhai* 神齋 is practised by many literati, mandarins and the like; in order to not practise total abstinence from all the things [forbidden by Buddhism], on any day they fast for only half a day, that is they abstain from meat, wine, fish, onions, etc., in the morning, while in the evening they can eat everything. Those who practise the fast called *Changzhai* 長齋 fast for their whole life in the same way as explained above. These are the main fasts in China and I omit others for the sake of brevity. From this it can be known that most Chinese are practising one form or another of this fast, and everyone is free to practise or not a particular fast.

There are also fasts and abstinences from specific foods, such as only from meat or wine in the way the ancient Chinese and even Confucius had once practised, or from a greater or lesser number

17 This fasting became very popular in Ming and Qing dynasties in China. The other woman referred to is the deva Molizhi 摩里支, or Marīci.

18 This seems to be a Daoist fast in honor of the three officers (*sanguan*) in charge of Heaven, Earth and Water.

19 Yama is the Buddhist god of the underworld.

20 This fast accompanies the 49 days of Buddhist funerals, but expressing Confucian filial piety, or *xiao*.

21 Those two fasts are purely Confucian.

of other foods according to individual choice. We have listed above the most important fasts which are now in common use after the introduction of Buddhism [into China].

In Europe, a fast consisting of a single meal and abstinence from meat is not such a [sure] indication of Christianity that it is always an external expression of Christian devotion because many heretics follow the same fasting practices. Hence, I do not see why in China fasting must be [considered] such an indication and external devotion of a certain religious group that, from [the nature of] those idolatrous external acts, it has been deemed absolutely necessary for the candidates to baptism to give an opposite sign like eating meat or onions in order to be licitly baptized. From this it can be gathered that fasters are not bound by any oath made before an Idol (except perhaps a few in some cities who belong to the sect causing trouble in the country, but I do not talk here about them)[22], and they are fasting freely, according to the fasts related above, and for the purposes already mentioned. All those purposes appear superstitious, except the fast of the sons who abstain for three or more years from those foods in gratitude and on account of the pains endured by their mothers while nursing them as infants.[23] It can be also gathered that here in China fasting does not indicate religious affiliation because any man, commoner or magistrate, old or young, can freely decide to fast if need arises, either for a period of time in thanksgiving, to seek a favor from the idols, or in gratitude for their parents, or for life on account of these or other purposes.

[Intorcetta's stance: No need of breaking the fast before baptism]

Now that these things have been explained, it must be affirmed from the nature of the matter (I do not deal with the case of scandal) that the missionaries in China should not require a particular sign, such as breaking the fast by eating a small or large quantity of the things from which the fasters abstained before, either for a certain period of time, or for their whole life so that the fasters can be considered ready for baptism. The basis of this conclusion is the following: the sign which the missionaries consider needed from the candidate and minister for the reception of baptism is, on one

22 This refers to the sect of the fasters or *Zhaijiao*.

23 This refers to the two confucianized fasts mentioned above: Baomuzhai, and *Xianxiao xinzhai*.

hand, absolutely unnecessary and, on the other, would close the path of eternal salvation to an almost infinite multitude of pagans. Once the pagans have heard that the holy Law of Christ absolutely requires the breaking of the fast for them to join, they not only would be unable to question the truth of this Law but also greatly abhor it (albeit rashly) while they do not come to seek the truth [of the matter] from a prudent minister.

[First ground: general renunciation as sufficient for baptism]

The first part of the conclusion is proven: on the part of the candidate with an absolute desire for baptism, there are those necessary conditions which present no impediment for a licit baptism, as there would be in our case with a sinful will attached to some superstition. Indeed, in the case we are discussing, there is not such a will, but rather the faster detests all superstitions, including that fast which previously had been erroneously performed in connection to superstitions. Indeed, in our case the faster declares before all Christians through a public promise strengthened with an oath (though the oath does not seem necessary) that his future fasting will be devoid of all superstition, and will be conducted only for the love of God and in penitence for his sins, explaining also the reasons why he is unable to break his material fast. Therefore, there is no obstacle on the part of the candidate to licitly receiving baptism.

Nor does the minister require the candidate to break the fast, because whenever the minister is morally certain that there is no obstacle in the candidate, he cannot licitly refuse him baptism when he is well disposed and seeks it. The public declaration mentioned above is sufficient for the moral certitude of the minister. (I do not condemn a minister who, on account of his probable reasons or other circumstances thinks that the fasting candidate is approaching [the sacrament] under false pretenses and is untrustworthy, and refuses to baptize him because the minister does not think him well-disposed and, above all, is not morally certain that the faster has changed his intention [for fasting]. Therefore, I discuss the nature of the thing itself, leaving aside scandal and other similar situations).

Indeed, when a Turk wants to receive baptism, European theologians believe there is sufficient moral certitude if he publicly denounces Islam in its entirety and its superstitious practices, while wishing to observe the commandments of Christianity.

They do not require such an extreme and comprehensive degree of moral certitude that they would want the Turk to declare his rejection of every single precept of Islam through external signs opposed to those precepts, so that he could be licitly baptized, but they are satisfied with a public and general renunciation of the whole sect and its superstitious practices. Why, therefore, would the theologians require the Chinese to demonstrate their inner renunciation of a particular superstitious precept with a particular external sign that is in opposition to it? And since one of the five precepts of Buddhism prohibits the killing of life (*wu shasheng* 無殺牲), why do the missionaries not require Buddhists a sign such as killing a chicken or let alone an ant, so that they are morally certain that the candidate to baptism has wholeheartedly rejected this superstitious precept of the Idol Buddha and his sect? How easy it would be to trample an ant before baptism! However, the missionary is satisfied with a general renunciation of this sect and all its superstitions. Based on this moral certitude, he forms the judgment that baptismal candidate is well disposed, and regardless of whether the person kills or not ants, he confers on him baptism. But in our case, he requires the breaking of the fast, at least by drinking a spoon of broth, so that he could determine that the baptismal candidate wholeheartedly rejects the superstitions which are found in some fasters. But is it not easier to trample an ant than to drink a spoon of broth? Is there something more special and more superstitious in the fast than in the precept of not killing life? How is it that in the latter case the superstitious intention can be distinguished from external action and sign, whereas in the former the superstitious intention cannot be distinguished from the fast?[24]

[Second ground: too heavy burden imposed on the faster]

[I– First difficulty: social stigma]

Moreover, it is not so easy in China for some fasters to actually break their fasting.[25] Even if they reject their previous mistaken belief that through fasting they have already multiplied many merits and will then receive an excellent transmigration and many

24 Intorcetta wants to show here the absurd consequence of moral rigorism on the question of fasting since this would require the converts to show concrete proofs of their rejection of all Buddhist practices.

25 See Grelon's report, Second objection, ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, f. 56.

more good things, dignities and honors in their afterlife compared to the others who do not fast, they often meet other difficulties and emotions which are not inherently bad, but make the material break of their fasting extremely difficult for them. Indeed, if the servants and neighbors know that they have broken their fast, they are sometimes mocked for being gluttonous, childish and the like. Those who laugh at them are servants and pagans "who do not understand that saying",[26] and they openly reproach Christianity for promoting gluttony and disrupting works which they consider good. The pagans are blind and ignorant of a higher truth, calling drunkards the people divinely inspired by the Holy Spirit.[27]

Even if a catechumen is told by a minister: "Let them be; they are blind and leaders of blind",[28] he who has not yet received baptismal grace and its accompanying virtues and goods very often does not understand that manner of speaking, especially concerning the matter of the fast, which is not intrinsically evil but rather in itself is the mortification of flesh. Thus, the catechumens are obliged to endure serious discomfort when the thing which is commanded to be given up before baptism is evil and an obstacle for receiving baptism. However, the fast is not intrinsically evil. Thus, it happens that should those receiving baptism not suffer such mockery, including from children, they would not have much difficulty in actually breaking their material fast, because they have already rejected the fast as being attached to the superstition [of Buddhism], and they have truly recognized that they have accumulated no merit for themselves through their previous fasting, but rather demerit. In this regard, the weakness of those wanting to be baptized but lacking the strength to endure the mockery of servants, neighbors, and children, should be excused (barring scandal). Indeed, often they are not endowed with such a vigorous intelligence that they can, through disputations, defend and cleanse Christianity from attacks brought up by pagans, who say that Christianity commands gluttony and prevents works which seem to be good, and they are unable to prove to them that the fast considered materially is inherently an evil action when pagans clearly see that fasting *per se* mortifies the flesh and its desires.

Surely there does not seem to be greater difficulty in breaking the

26 Cf. Matthew 19:11: "Not all understand this saying, but only those to whom it is given" (*qui dixit non omnes capiunt verbum istud sed quibus datum est*).

27 Cf. Matthew 11:19.

28 Matthew 15: 14.

fast before baptism than in treading over an ant. However, the latter is not required by the missionaries to demonstrate the intention [of the candidate] to reject the faith and precepts of the Idol Buddha. Therefore, much less they should require the breaking of the fast to which it is difficult to induce the baptismal candidate, who raises just reasons not to break the material fast. I said that he proposes just reasons, not because any minister should judge as just the reasons which we present here only for the sake of example, but a prudent minister should consider as just any reason which, on one hand, makes him morally certain that the candidate has changed his past superstitious intention, and on the other, the scandal is removed here and now, and a serious inconvenience would ensue should the candidate break his fast.

[II– Second difficulty: natural distaste]

Another difficulty in breaking the fast may arise. Indeed, it may happen that the faster has a natural nausea towards the things that the missionary forces him to eat before being baptized.[29] No one can deny that apprehension (as it is said) is an important consideration: from youth, those fasters were taught by their parents not to eat or even taste those things. They have grown up with this apprehension, and each day dread is ever more impressed in them. Similarly, some people in Europe may abhor the meat of dog, donkey, horse, humans, snakes and even fish. Though those things in themselves are edible and are even delicacies in some countries, nonetheless because from youth they were taught by their parents to abstain from those things, which they regarded as dirty and nauseating with the result that if a European is offered just a small sip of a broth with dog meat or human flesh, some would rather die than taste it, though many may sometimes eat it when forced by hunger or necessity, such that they develop a taste for it and abstain no more. Indeed, they were first made to abstain out of apprehension, but then after their strong apprehension was gradually removed, experience made it possible for them to eat.

Therefore, is not it difficult for the missionaries to compel those Chinese fasters to eat or even taste a little of those things from which they are abstaining since they have been fasting from their youth out

29 See in Grelon's report the second point (*nausea*) showing the evil intention of the faster; ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, f. 55; English translation: Meynard "Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? The Canton Conference and Adrien Grelon SJ's Report of 1668": 94–95.

of the apprehension that eating those things will provoke nausea? And why are they forced to do those very difficult things before baptism when the breaking of the fast is not at all a requirement for the baptismal candidate or the minister? Indeed, the minister can have the moral certitude that the subject is well disposed when the baptismal candidate rejects every superstition, every Idol, and every precept of the sect, when he admits that he was wrong to fast for the demon and to think that he had accumulated many merits, and when he declares in front of all the Christians, under oath if necessary, that he shall fast in the future for the love of God and in penance for his own sins.

The second part of the conclusion is easy to prove from the things said above. Indeed, how could the missionary require from the fasters the sign of breaking their fast before baptism, when this sign in particular is unnecessary and it would be very difficult for certain fasters to give such a sign, and when there is an almost numberless mass of fasters in China, who, having heard that the law of Christ requires the sign of breaking the fast before baptism, do not come to enquire about the truth of the Law and also find abhorrent that the Law requires such a sign? Who doubts that we have closed the door of salvation to countless Chinese? I say countless not because we suppose that they all have a just reason for not breaking materially their fast, but because nearly everybody, after having heard that Christianity commands the consumption of meat and garlic before baptism, do not approach [the sacrament]. But if they were to come, they could be led, gently and with little effort, by a wise and prudent minister to break the fast.[30]

[Confirmations]
[I– Consistency in missionary policy]

Our opinion is confirmed firstly by the fact that those who do not fast have countless other superstitious practices, or taboos of no lesser importance than fasting. However, [our] opponents do not request any particular external sign in opposition to the superstitions, that would show a true interior rejection of the superstition generally bound to superstitious practices. But following the customs of the Church itself, for the conferral of baptism they require only from the candidate a complete rejection of the demon and of all

30 As a tactical concession to Grelon, Intorcetta suggests that the fasters could be eventually led after their baptism to discard their fasting.

his works, of the Idols and all their superstitions. Experience tells us that many people who do not fast easily relapse into their old superstitions, and even fall out from the Christian faith. Rather, they return to their vomit more easily than those fasters return to their past superstitious intention because the fasters have changed their evil and superstitious intention, and promised that they shall fast afterwards in honor and worship of true God and for the penance of their own sins. Therefore, if the missionaries do not require from the non-fasters any particular sign in opposition to their superstitions, they should not require it from the fasters.

[II– Success of the open policy towards the fasters]

Secondly, this is confirmed from the teaching of Saint Thomas in the *Summa Theologiae*, question 68, article 6, where it is said: "Baptismal candidates do not need to make a special confession of all their sins, but a general one suffices, since according to the ritual of the Church, they renounce Satan and all his pomps" (Layman, chapter 6, On Holy Baptism, Book 5, n.4. col. 797).[31] For Saint Thomas, a baptismal candidate needs only an interior confession of sins whereby he makes a general examination of his sins, feels sorrow for them and makes this confession to God. It is sufficient for it to be done through an act of inner contrition, or as Layman says: "Any sorrow of the soul for sins that has been conceived for a supernatural motive suffices."[32] The external and extrinsic requirement of baptism is not a special confession of sins, or of such and such a crime, and such and such a superstition, but a general confession whereby pagans acknowledge all their errors and superstitions, and reject past idolatries. Indeed, not merely is it internal in that there is an interior rejection and confession which is made to God and not known to the minister such that that he could have moral certitude of his interior rejection for the licit conferral of baptism, but also an external confession and renunciation through external signs is required. According to Saint Thomas and the practice of the Church, a general confession is sufficient, not of any

31 Intorcetta does not quote directly from Aquinas but from Layman. Paul Layman, born in 1574 near Innsbruck, had studied law before entering the Jesuit order, then taught moral theology in Munich (1609–25), and died in 1635 at Constance. His main work is quoted here by Intorcetta: *Theologia moralis in quinque libros partita*, Munich: Nicolaus Henricus, 1625.

32 Layman, *Theologia moralis*, Lib. V, Tract. II, cap. VI, n. 4, 310.

specific superstitious action, but of all superstitions in general. The practice of the Church assigns to the minister questions to be asked during the rituals: "Do you renounce Satan and all his pomps?" If he should respond "I renounce," then he would be baptized.

But now some missionaries in China require a greater moral certitude for the baptism of the fasters. A general confession and rejection of the demon, Idols and all superstitions is not enough for them, but they request a special confession and refutation of the superstitious fast. And yet it is not enough for them if the fasters verbally reject the fast as superstitious, change that evil intention of the previous fast, which is in itself morally neutral, and offer a just explanation of how they would endure the greatest detriment were they to break the material fast. As I say, for them it is not enough if they publicly reject before all Christians, and even by oath if necessary, but they require an additional particular sign in opposition to the material fast, namely, to break their fast by consuming some meat or broth, so that they may be absolutely certain that the superstitious intention of the faster has been settled and changed. Because there are difficulties in obtaining this sign, as said above, either they do not come to enquire about the truth of the Law, or if they come, they find it difficult to break the material fast and are sent back home without baptism. The door of salvation is completely closed to them. I do not completely blame the minister who send them back without baptism out of the supposition that he is not morally certain that the fasters do not come under false pretenses. Indeed, much caution, vigilance and examination have to be used with such persons and we should not trust their words too easily.

This teaching is not contradicted by the other practice of the Church or decrees of the Holy Inquisition and the councils against those suspected of heresy or of Judaism. They require a public and sworn renunciation of particular crimes which is sometimes to be publicly proven through opposite acts. Indeed, this rigor is rightly and justly required in cases where there are special reasons to deny sacramental absolution to the baptized, unless they give proof [of their repentance] and fulfil conditions enjoined by canons, councils, etc. But as for these pagans who have not yet entered under the jurisdiction of the Church, it is not necessary in our case to request particular signs before baptism, nor to follow the same standards used to deny sacramental absolution to the baptized and those suspected of heresy or Judaism, since those standards do not concern [baptism,] the gate of all the sacraments or pagans.

In the case of pagans, the teaching of Saint Thomas and the other theologians, and the ritual of the Church stipulate that a general rejection of the demon, Idols and all superstitions is sufficient for the baptismal candidate. It should not be presumed that the conditions [for sacramental absolution] are the same as for the licit baptism of pagans.

There would be an equivalence if after baptism the pagans were to return once and again to the vomit of their former superstitions and were the fasters to verbally declare that they had not changed their superstitious and erroneous intention with which they believed they had gathered for themselves many merits through the fast done when they were still pagans, and that they persevere [in their fast] because they still believe their fasts done in honor of the demon truly bring them merits. Absolution should be denied to these people since their faith is suspect, and some specific signs in opposition [to these superstitions] and amends should be demanded to remove the scandal. Rigor should be rightly exercised towards those who have lapsed once or more and have suspect faith.

However, as for those who have not yet entered under the jurisdiction of the Church, I disagree with the assertion that they do not wholeheartedly reject their past superstition and wrong intention. Rather, I believe it is the contrary because of their words, public rejection and promise, which is sworn even under oath when necessary. Why should I use such rigor in requesting this special sign of breaking the fast? Will you perhaps tell me that none of those who broke the fast before baptism have returned to their vomit, and all those who refused to break it returned to superstition? Experience tells us that many of those who broke the fast in the end returned to their former superstition, and many did not. Among those who did not break the fast, some returned to the vomit, but many of them observed the Law and commandments of God. I have said some because the missionaries who considered that the fasters refusing to break their fast should not be baptized could not have had this experience. But both outcomes have been experienced by those missionaries who believed that when just cause has been given candidates ought to be baptized regardless of whether they had broken or not the fast before baptism, having changed their former bad intention to the intention of fasting for the love of God and in penance for their sins. Thus, they bear witness to the fact that among those who did not break the material fast but "broke" the wrong intention and changed it into a good one while

maintaining their fast, some in the end returned to the vomit, as is to be expected with a corrupted human nature, but the majority kept the faith and commandments of the divine law.

[III– Answers on causes of scandal]

Our opinion is confirmed by a third point. For, if the temples of Idols where all pagan idolatries and superstitions are performed can be purified, such that the true God can be worshipped in them by the faithful, why is it that this Chinese fast cannot be so purified that, once the superstitious or idolatrous intention has been replaced with the intention of worshipping God and mortifying oneself in penance for sins, it still cannot be purified but remains idolatrous, superstitious and unpurifiable? Surely just as the Chinese have shown that the fast serves evil, can they show that the same fast can be used in service of justice? If they can, why are they obliged to break it before baptism? Even though they are breaking it in honor of God, they can intend the same honor to God when not breaking the fast, and nor can you say that God is more dishonored than worshiped and honored by this ridiculous Chinese abstinence from meat, wine, fish, egg, as well as onion and garlic, etc. As we have shown at the beginning, in the Chinese tradition, abstinence from vegetables and meat is not such [i.e. inherently idolatrous], but even parents and important personages are venerated by their own children who practise this abstinence in thanksgiving. Similarly, it would be ridiculous in Europe to abstain from drinking hot water in the summer, but among the Chinese not only is it not ridiculous, but also this abstinence is a great mortification of the appetite. As for the Chinese fast, is there anything ridiculous about it according to the customs of the country? Otherwise you would consider ridiculous the abstinence of some [Christian] saints who even abstained from all vegetables.[33] Indeed, the end for fasting should be regarded as a national custom when superstition and scandal, if any, are removed from the fast.

[III–1 Avoiding scandal or error among pagans]

But you may say that such abstinence in honor of God will be ridiculous if

33 In fact, the Catholic Church has historically expressed a great reluctance towards vegetarianism. For example, the Council of Braga in 561 condemned the Priscillianists, and in the beginning of the thirteenth century the Cathars were suppressed.

they abstain from what they dislike and find extremely nauseating.

I answer that there is no lack of people who fast superstitiously without nausea, and even they cannot be said to honor God with this ridiculous abstinence. But those who have a strong nausea, they still have other means with which they can overcome themselves for the sake of God. As long as they have this strong nausea and cannot break the fast, they should not be kept away from baptism.

We cannot say that, if this were the case, pagans could retain Idols at home after having changed their intention, namely that they worship God in them, or at least keep them for decoration. There are some things which are considered in material terms and can be retained at home as before, but for another intention. However, due to their established meaning and other circumstances, if they are kept and worshipped in the same way as in their own home, in and of themselves always tend to express the customary worship which is chiefly represented by its image. Therefore, it is not permitted to retain an Idol at home in the same way as before, even for decorative purposes. I said "in the same way as before" because if we were to consider a case like in Europe where the images of Hercules, Saturn and Jupiter may be easily understood by observers as being placed for decoration and not for worship or veneration, it may happen that the Idol serves as a bench in the kitchen or elsewhere, so that no one who sees it used in such a way in such a place could think that it was placed there to be worshipped, and rather they may even judge that this is done to disgrace the Idol. Instead of the Idol, the image of Christ the Lord is placed on the altar. In that case no one would deny that the Idol may be retained at home for a similar use. As it appears from what was said above and because of its established meaning, the fast of the Chinese could be better compared to the Temple of an Idol than to the Idol itself, because the Chinese fast can be purified just like the material temple of the Idol.

You may object that the Chinese fast, by its established meaning, was born out of superstition and remains superstitious among the pagans. Yet it still cannot be assimilated to an Idol, just like the water that is blessed, or rather cursed by the Buddhist monks for sprinkling on the houses of the pagans and the sick. Although this water was born here out of superstition and remains superstitious, the water blessed by priests when they sprinkle houses and the sick is not regarded as superstitious for the Christians in China, nor even scandalous for the pagans. Notice also that the consumption of meat, garlic and onions, is not commanded by our Christ our Lord or by the Church. Nor is the Idol placed on the altar inherently

representative of such an Idol being placed there for worship. What I mean by this is that the Chinese fast is indeterminate, such that it can be used for worshiping the Idol, or for children to pay respect to parents.

You may say that the Idol cannot be retained in the house in the same way as before, even once the intention changed, because this would cause scandal and people would think that the one who was baptized still retains his old previous religion. The same reason militates against the fast because if the Idol cannot be preserved as before in the house, neither can the fast.

I answer that no scandal would arise out of the fast were the faster to observe it for the love of God and in penance for his sins. For if it is a question of his pagan neighbors and servants fasting for superstitious reasons, they would also know and see that he adores the image of Christ at home and observes the Christian commandments. They could easily learn from the baptized man himself that he fasts to worship the image which he adores now as a Christian, just as those non-Christians fast in worship of the Idol which they adore. In sum, the pagans would form the judgment that Christianity does not forbid the material fast but only the wrong end for which pagans fast, and this judgment could become the reason that other fasters are incited to embrace Christianity instead of holding it in contempt.

Moreover, a Christian faster could hide the Christian faith so that he does not suffer the shame of mockery from the neighbors and children who are fasting. This is inferred from the teaching of the theologians and the Roman Theologians of the Society of Jesus, who were asked (their teaching is drawn from *Answers of the Superior General and of the Theologians* in the Archive of the College of Macao) whether the attendants of a prince who is prejudiced against our religion would sin against their faith if they hide for a long time the signs of our religion, since should they reveal [their faith], they would not endanger their life nor even risk losing their position, but at most land income, which they receive from the prince. The theologians answered in this way: "They need not be compelled to reveal [their Christian faith] unless they are not asked or the situation requires an external profession. Indeed, they can hide their Christian religion in order to avoid losing some benefice or favor of the Lord."[34]

Why, therefore, could not the Christian fasters (since there is

34 Not only for the sake of Christian faith, but also in the domains of politics, Jesuits held that a certain degree of dissimulation was available to a ruler, but telling lie is always morally wrong; see Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought*, 150–55.

nothing evil in the fast itself, but it was evil only on account of its bad end), after having changed the intention of their fast into something good, hide their Christian faith so that they do not meet continual brawls from their servants, neighbors and the mocking of children? In our case, there would be no scandal among the pagans, and if there is, a minister can teach the baptized how to remove it. But this depends on the circumstances, wisdom and teaching of the minister. Nor is there is danger that the pagans may be further entrenched in their error, because the material fast is not intrinsically bad, but in so far as it is directed toward a demon or Idol. When the pagans see that their friend or relative, who has become a Christian, has trampled upon the Idol at home, has erected an image of Christ the Lord in place of the Idol, and declares that his fasting is in [Christ's] honor, it does not seem that the pagans would be entrenched in the error [of believing he is still a Buddhist].[35]

[III–2 Avoiding scandal among the Christians]

It is proven that no scandal would ensue among the Christians. How could this give rise to scandal among them? Indeed, it arises from the fact that they see the baptized man still fasting after having received baptism, and they could think that the evil and superstitious intention of fasting remains in him. However, this cannot give rise to scandal. When the Christians have considered the just reason for not breaking the fast, and have heard the renunciations made by the faster before baptism and his public promises to fast in the future in honor of God and in penance for his sins, if then they see him persevere in his fast, there will be nothing new for them. Nor do they have any grounds to say that he fasts in honor of the Idol which he shattered and cursed, together with all his works and superstitions.

But should you suppose that the Christians do not want to believe his words and tell the minister that this man cannot be trusted, a wise minister would delay the conferral of baptism, or refuse to confer it unless the fast is broken. Precisely no scandal can arise among Christians on this account. Nor is there any equivalence between the Chinese fast and an external act of infidelity because the fast by its own nature is instituted for the mortification of the flesh and is

35 Intorcetta suggests that the Christian faster may decide to remain a hidden Christian to avoid trouble, or he may assume his new Christian identity by explaining the new meaning of his fast.

not the mark of a sect or false religion as we have explained above. For example, some wrongly think that they can obtain children from an Idol by fasting a certain number of days, and children fast in gratitude for their parents. Though the fast is the same, children fasting in gratitude for their parents are not Buddhists and do not join any sect since they do not offer any worship to an Idol.

There could be another cause of scandal among Christians, that is to say, the [Chinese] have been taught by certain missionaries that the fasters cannot under any circumstance licitly receive holy baptism without breaking their fast at least once, by drinking for example a small quantity of meat broth. When they see now a faster being baptized without drinking the broth, they may be scandalized, thinking the teaching they were told by others to be wrong, or that the policy of the new missionary is sinful. I have no doubt that those missionaries acted with the best zeal and intention by spreading this teaching among the Christians. Although it would have been better for them to hide this and other teachings from the Christians, they believed they acted according to the precept and opinion which they considered probable. The Christians would not know that these difficult and serious theological questions pose an obstacle to someone who wants to be baptized, believes in God, and wants to observe His commandments, that is to say, that they open or close the gate of salvation to the many fasters in China. This [teaching] has been spread in certain Christian communities, but this is a matter of such weight which closes the way of salvation to many by impeding baptism with an obstacle that neither exists nor is ordered by Divine Law, nor approved by the custom of the Church. If any minister follows a contrary opinion promulgated by others, he ought not be so easily condemned by the supporters of a contrary opinion.

You will say that now this doctrine has been disseminated, scandal will arise in those Christian communities.

I answer that the missionaries should explain the true meaning of the teaching with great discretion and caution. They may say that, ordinarily speaking, it is safer for the baptismal candidate to break his material fast by drinking the broth. In this way, the demon is deprived of every opportunity to seduce him and make him think that the vain merits which he thought having accumulated for himself through many years are real, and that he should still persevere. Or they may say that the teaching is always true in all those cases where it is impossible for a minister to be sure that the candidate has truly changed his prior wrong intention. However,

this teaching does not apply when the minister ascertains by other means that the faster has already changed his previous wrong intention and converted it into a good one while providing a good reason for not breaking the material fast. Other reasons could be prudently conceived for why the Christians, seeing the truth of the matter, will not have grounds to determine whether the teaching taught by another missionary is wrong, or whether the policy of a new missionary is sinful. The Christians should be particularly taught that if they meet a faster wishing to convert to the faith, they should not immediately mention that he needs first to break his fast before approaching [the Church], because those words may prevent him from approaching the Church and a missionary, and make him and others hate the law of God. Instead, he should be brought to a missionary of prudence and learning, who shall gently lead him either to break his superstitious fast, or to ascertain at an opportune time his original intention and whether it is moral for him to continue [fasting] or not, and to open to him another way so that he may join the flock of the Church.

[III–3 Policy of ancient missionaries]

You may refer to the policy practised by the ancient Fathers of this mission of forcing the fasters to break their fast before baptism, and those Fathers did not lack theological training or knowledge of China.[36]

I answer that generally speaking we have decided the same, and we are of the same mind as the first Fathers of this mission. In extraordinary circumstances, even after a just reason for not breaking the material fast is given, the Chinese faster may need to be deprived of baptism, as if the fast were intrinsically evil, even after the intention of the faster has changed and were of the [same] type as external idolatry, which is not permitted even with a change of intention. As for this question, the first Fathers of this mission did not reach a conclusion on whether the Chinese fast itself was intrinsically bad and idolatrous, such that it would be illicit in all cases. And yet, this meeting of the priests decided the contrary, because it was determined that the Chinese fasters should not be admitted to baptism, unless in some extraordinary cases when the change of the wrong intention into a good one is proven with another

36 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, ff. 51v–52v; English translation: Meynard "Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? The Canton Conference and Adrien Grelon SJ's Report of 1668", 85–87.

means.[37] In consequence, it was determined that the fast is neither intrinsically bad nor the sign of a religion due to its established meaning, but that it is idolatrous and superstitious because it is made in honor of an Idol or for some superstitious end. If someone wants now to say that the Chinese fast is an evil practice, even after having eliminated its bad intention, such that it would never be licit to baptize a faster who has not first broken his fast, this would go against the common opinion of the Fathers, some of whom are very learned and long established in the mission. None of them would say that the first Fathers of the mission had regarded the Chinese fast as an evil practice, leaving aside the evil intention and end for which the Chinese fast. For this reason alone, there is one [Father] arguing this position against the opinion of the twenty-two Fathers in the meeting. His teaching should not be accepted because it wants to prove so much that it proves nothing and it contradicts what was already decided after much discussion.[38]

[IV– Contradiction of allowing them to fast after having broken once the fast]

Fourth, our stance is confirmed by the practice of the missionaries who adopt in China a stance contrary [to ours]. So that they may have the moral certainty which ecclesiastical custom requires, when a Chinese faster has difficulties in breaking his fast, they are satisfied if he tastes in secret at least a bit of meat or drinks a sip of broth. Once this is done, if he still wishes to continue his fast for the love of God and in penance for his sins, and in order to seek the conversion of the whole family, he is allowed to continue fasting as before. (It was publicly said in this way at the meeting of the Fathers, and we do not know whether the adversaries have changed their opinion). This being said, I infer the following: those who follow our stance and do not press a faster to break his material fast before baptism, but only teach and press him to change the superstitious and evil intention into a holy and meritorious one while providing a just reason, do very well. Indeed, they have their moral certitude, and one even stronger than the one requested by the Church for the licit conferral of the sacrament of baptism to pagans who want to

37 This refers to the text of article 6 of the conference.

38 Intorcetta indicates that Grelon stood alone against all the others, but mentions also in this document adversaries with the plural, suggesting that Grelon was later supported by others.

embrace faith, believe in all the necessary mysteries of faith, reject Idols and all superstitions, and promise to keep the commandments of the Law.

Therefore, if they act as said, the Chinese fasters should be admitted to baptism even though they do not break materially their fast. The adversaries cannot say that the Chinese fast is of such nature and has such circumstances here in China that when even considered materially it is always the sign of a false religion or superstitious sect (as mentioned above), even to the point that the fast is equivalent to an Idol which cannot be kept at home or worshiped as before even after having changed one's intention to worshipping God through the material element of the Idol or even for decoration; therefore, the material fast must absolutely be broken. In fact, the position of the adversaries contradicts their own practice in this way: for an idolater cannot keep an Idol at home, even though, before baptism, he could trample on the Idol in secret or in the presence of some Christians, to prove that in the future he shall no longer use it to worship the demon but God. Thus, it is not enough for a faster to break secretly his fast, even in front of some Christians to prove that in the future he shall no longer use his fast to worship the demon but God.[39]

But the practice of the adversaries does not allow it in dealing with an Idol. However, in the case of the fast, they allow [the fasters] to continue their fast at home after secretly breaking their fast, since the evil intention is changed into a good one. Therefore, one can see from the practice of the adversaries that the Chinese fast is not of such a nature, nor are its circumstances such that it would be utterly impossible to purify it from any kind of superstition or scandal. If it can be purified from any kind of superstition and scandal, why are the fasters who have a just reason and meet hardship in breaking their material fast not admitted to baptism? Why is the door of salvation absolutely closed to them, while the missionaries could easily help them?

The adversaries do not consider the fact that the entire superstition of the fast consists in breaking the fast. Once this has been done, even if the faster continues fasting, all the superstition is removed.[40] Even if they were to imagine in vain a way to salvage their practice, they would not be able to overcome scandals. Similarly, you may

39 According to Grelon's report, the fasters have to break their fast publicly, by eating a piece of meat, in front of the Christian community.

40 This refers to the belief that all the merits would disappear at once.

imagine a demon's pact with an idolater, but if he tramples on the Idol, the demon shall not help him, and if he tramples in secret, the pact of the demon to help him is also dissolved. However, everybody will still consider him as an idolater if he continues to keep at home an Idol and worship it. Thus, although someone secretly breaks the superstitious fast, despite having granted for argument's sake that the entire superstition consists in breaking the fast, if the faster continues fasting as before, every [Christian] shall consider him as superstitious.

Notice also that this is false, for, as I mentioned above, many Chinese people fast with exactly the same fast as everybody else. However, some fast three times a month, others ten. Some fast for only three years, others for ten. Some never fast, others for their whole life. If the superstition of the Chinese fast were to constitute a demonic pact in which the fast is of such nature that, once broken, any kind of superstition is removed, Chinese fasts would certainly include this life-long pact and superstition, but would exclude other fasters who eat meat and fish except on three or ten days a month, etc. The adversaries do not concede this point, since those fasts, done for a wrong end, are evil and superstitious.[41]

Moreover, lifetime fasters are often deceived by friends into eating one of the things from which they are abstaining, and then if they find out, they hardly care, and persevere in the same fast. In cases of serious illness, if doctors urge them to eat something that they usually abstain from in order to recover their health, they probably do not refuse, though they may experience a great difficulty. But for the sake of health and because in such a situation they are not mocked by children and neighbors, they eat it as a medicine, and once they have recovered health, their fasts are observed harmoniously by the entire family.

Therefore, this is an indication that the superstition is not so connected to the fast, that any kind of superstition is removed upon breaking the fast, but the whole superstition lies in the evil intention for which the fast is undertaken. Custom has established that the nature of the Chinese fast does not admit any small amount of a material element [meat]. While the Church fast allows [us to consume] a small quantity of matter [i.e. food] without breaking the fast, even the smallest amount of the things from which they

41 If the whole superstition lays in the fear of losing merits by breaking the fast, as Grelon suggests, then discontinuous fasts cannot be considered as superstitious, and this is obviously a wrong conclusion according to Intorcetta.

abstain, if tasted, breaks the Chinese fast. Hence there is such great difficulty among Chinese fasters in tasting even a little bit of broth with meat, or the smallest morsel of meat or egg. The fast is equally broken regardless of how much or how little food is offered for eating, because both those who fast for life and those who fast for a given time do not admit any small quantity of [prohibited] matter during their fasts.

You may say that the fasters think that, if they break their fast, regardless of whether it is undertaken for a certain period of time or for their whole life, those merits earned before which they believe real are completely lost as if they had never existed. This is the specific reason why in the Chinese fast the faster is forced to break the fast before baptism and is not baptized if he refuses.

I answer first that this case shows only the error of the faster, and not that the Chinese fast is especially bound with error. Indeed, children, adolescent boys and girls, who have no idea of merit when they fast with the same fast to express gratitude to their mother, have great difficulty in breaking their fast even though they are not affected by any such error. Likewise, others who fast to obtain children from the Idols are not tied up by such error. Therefore, this error about losing merits is not so specifically connected to the observance of the Chinese fast that it is inseparable from it. Thus, the error can be removed from the mind of some fasters through the teaching of a missionary, just like how many other and more serious errors are removed, such as the error of believing that an Idol is God, or that mankind can be saved without the faith in Christ. Once all the errors have been removed, pagans can be baptized following the universal renunciation of the demon and all superstitions, prescribed by the custom of the Church.

I answer next that if there were people who would eat meat, fish, garlic or onions, and eggs and would drink wine in honor and worship of the Idol, and would think that they are expressing their gratitude to the demon by such eating and above all accumulating many merits for themselves, what do you think the Apostle Saint Paul himself would have done if he wanted to convert those men? Would he have forbidden them from eating those things, or would he have rather removed their error and led them to thank God whenever they eat every day since He created those things to feed people, so that they could serve God in their every endeavor, and in the end be saved? Indeed, both fasting from and consumption [of these foods] can be found in China. If the intentions for which they are doing it are erroneous, the error should be removed and the

fasting should not be forbidden as if the fasting or the consumption of food is intrinsically evil, unless there is another obstacle, either because of scandal, or some other circumstance.

[V– Analogy with the worship to spirits protectors of the city]

Our opinion is confirmed by a fifth point. The Chinese fast is not like those cults in adoration of those spirits that the Chinese consider Protectors of the Cities or that daily genuflection made by a Christian servant while his pagan master kneels before the Idols. But both that adoration and this genuflection in front of an Idol can still be purified of formal idolatry, and after being purified, can be licitly practised by Christians. Therefore, it is even more the case that the Chinese fast can be purified from superstition and error, after being purified, the Chinese faster can continue to practise it licitly.

As for the spirits which the Chinese call Protectors of the Cities, Francesco Bardi, Giuseppe Agostini, and other theologians from the College of Palermo, made the following answer to Francesco Brancati: "Knowledge was earlier given to the nations that God had assigned to each city or kingdom one holy guardian angel as its protector, and that when the Christians reverence and venerate the tutelary spirit of the city, they intend to adore its holy guardian angel; under this condition and declaration, Christians can participate in those processions and venerate the image, venerating through it the guardian angel" (excerpted from the original letter dated 17 May 1642).[42]

As regards the kneeling of a Christian servant when his pagan master kneels in front of the Idols, there is a decision of the Roman theologians who by order of the Superior General Claudio Acquaviva responded to a question proposed by the Fathers in Japan on whether it is licit for a Christian servant to kneel before an Idol assuming that to remain upright would be extremely rude when the pagan master is himself kneeling and orders the kneeling

42 Like Intorcetta, Francesco Brancati (1607–71) was from Sicily and entered China in 1636, more than twenty years before Intorcetta. Before 1642, Brancati sent a letter to his former teachers of moral theology at the Jesuit College of Palermo, Francesco Bardi (1583–1661) and Giuseppe Agostini (1573–1643), and he asked them for clarification on the case of Chinese Christians participating to rituals towards the Spirits protecting the city, chenghuang 城隍. Brancati most probably kept the letter of Bardi and Agostini with him in Canton and he showed it to Intorcetta.

not out of contempt for our faith but as a service. They answered: a servant can kneel, offering the worship to his Master alone, whether or not others are personally present.[43]

I submit my opinion to wiser judgment.

43 This refers to the question of Valignano, transmitted by Acquaviva to Vásquez, and his answer, approved by Roman theologians in 1595. See above notes n. 3–4–5. For Vásquez, the kneeling of a Christian servant is licit if he cannot easily avoid it, and if the others present all know that he is a Christian, so that his kneeling should not be construed as a recognition of another god.

Summary
We have presented in an earlier issue of this journal (*AHSI* LXXXVII/173 (2018-I), pp. 75–145) a study and translation — with transcription of the original Latin text — of the report written by the French Jesuit Adrien Grelon in Canton in 1668, presenting his argument against admitting to baptism those people who practised vegetarianism, known as fasters. Around the same time, the Italian Jesuit Prospero Intorcetta wrote a report refuting Grelon's position, arguing that those people could be admitted to baptism without renouncing their practice, and he even suggested that fasting could be Christianized and integrated within the life of the Christian community. Intorcetta's ideas show his openness in accommodating people coming from Buddhism and popular religions into the Christian faith; it represents an important but neglected aspect of the encounter between China and Christianity.

Résumé
Nous avons présenté dans ce journal notre étude et traduction de rapport d'Adrien Grelon, écrit à Canton en 1668, présentant son argumentation contre l'admission au baptême de personnes pratiquant le végétarianisme, ou les jeûneurs comme elles sont appelées. Au même moment, le jésuite italien Prospero Intorcetta écrivait un rapport réfutant les arguments de Grelon et démontrant que ces personnes pouvaient être admis au baptême sans renoncer leur pratique, et il suggérait même que leur pratique pouvait être christianisée et intégrée dans la vie de la communauté chrétienne. Les idées d'Intorcetta révèlent son ouverture et accueil envers les personnes venant du Bouddhisme et des religions populaires, et cela représente une dimension importante de la rencontre entre la Chine et le christianisme qui a été négligée.

A note about the Latin text

The transcription of this text contains only necessary minor adjustments to assist the comprehensibility of its contents: 1) Abbreviations have been silently expanded. 2) Punctuation has been made uniform, and capital letters are used according to modern style. Accents have been removed. 3) The letter "j" has been substituted by the letter "i" throughout: before and in between vowels, and at the beginning and end of words, while for verbs with the letters "io", the "ii" form has been retained. 4) Graphic variations have been eliminated, favouring the most frequently-used version or, as applicable, the most correct. 5) The letters "u" and "v" have been differentiated, while the use of the letters "h", "y", and double letters have not been adapted. The numbering system is shown in square brackets. Additions made to the original text are shown by means of parentheses (< >); the cross symbol, (†) is used for illegible words. Errors are marked by [sic].

ARSI Jap.Sin. 150, "Ritus Sinici, Liturgica 1622-1708"; ff. 71-77 P. Prospero Intorcetta SJ. *1a via cum nota authent.* P. Luis da Gama, 10 dec. 1688

[70r] Prima via

Quaeritur an ieiunantes in Sinis ante quam baptizentur semper et ex natura sua cogi debeant a missionariis ad frangendum suum ieiunium, et quamvis detestentur in genere Idola et omnia superstitiosa, et etiam ieiunia praeterita superstitiose facta, et expresse ac solide promittant se in posterum ob Dei amorem et cultum et in paenitentiam suorum peccatorum ieiunaturos; si tamen iustam dent causam non frangendi ieiunium, an a missionariis non violato ieiunio baptizandi sint.

In hac quaestione mentis nostrae non est contra ea quae Religiossimus Patrum coetus nuper in hac materia statuit disserere, sed hanc instituimus quaestionem indagandae dumtaxat veritatis gratia; praesertim in re tanti ponderis, ut est vel infinitis fere Sinarum populis, qui ieiunantes vocantur, ianuam salutis aperire si iusta causa oblata contenti simus protestationibus illis in titulo expressis, et eos baptizemus; vel claudere, nolentibus frangere ieiunium ob sua motiva non mala, sed vel ob naturalem nauseam,

vel ob respectum aliquem honoris ne irridiantur [sic] a domesticis, et similia; quamvis non ita fortia motiva, ut omnino reddant ieiunantem physice aut moraliter impotentem ad fra<n>gendum ieiunium; nam si daretur casus ut ieiunans physice vel moraliter impotens esset ad comedendum carnes, iusculum, pisces, allia, cepasve vinum et caetera, nulli dubium est quin sufficeret tantum illa protestatio supradicta, et absque eo quod frangeret ieiunium baptizandus esset; ad impossibile enim nemo tenetur.

Ut detur igitur quaestioni locus, videndum est, an fractio ieiunii in ieiunantibus Sinensibus, seu an fractio talis ieiunii sit ex natura sua conditio omnino requisita ex parte subiecti recipientis baptismum, ita ut si non praecedat, minister licite non possit talem ieiunantem baptizare. Quia ex regula illa Theologica, quoties ministro constat moraliter volentem baptizari esse indispositum, non potest minister licite illum baptizare; sicuti e contra quoties ministro moraliter constet volentem baptizari esse dispositum, non potest licite minister negare baptismum et occludere illi ianuam salutis, quam tam liberaliter Christus Dominus aperuit omnibus omnino hominibus.

Separemus ergo certa ab incertis; certum est primo ieiunium seu abstinentiam a carnibus, ovis, vino, piscibus, sagimine, cepis etc., sicuti et comestio carnis, piscis, ovorum, sagiminis, ceparum vinique potus, materialiter se habere in ordine ad superstitiones Sinicae gentilitatis, et sunt res ex natura sua hic etiam in Sinis separabiles a formali superstitione. Uti et in Europa separabile est ieiunium et abstinentia carnium etc. a cultu divino et, a motivo paenitentiae peccatorum etc., potest enim in Europa quis ieiunare bis in sabbato ob hypocrysim [sic], et abstinere ab his omnibus per totam vitam potest eremita ob occultam superbiam, et ut laudetur ab hominibus, et per errorem putare, se, ob talia ieiunia multis meritis adauctum. An enim in Europa si confiteatur eremita, et revera eum paeniteat huius superbiae, et doceatur se ob talem peccatum superbiae suis illis ieiuniis ante actis non solum nil meriti acquisivisse, sed potius promeritum esse aeternas Inferni poenas; an inquam a confessario ante absolutionem cogeretur frangere ieiunium, ut certo isto signo cognoscere posset, revera eremitam cognoscere errorem, et poenitere?

[71v] Certum item est, hoc ieiunium in Sinis, non esse signum ita determinatum et annexum superstitioni aut alicui sectae vel Religioni, ut reputetur exterior cultus et professio adorationis alicuius Idoli vel ipsius sectae, ut sunt vg. adolere incensum et genuflectere ante Idolum. Nam hi actus, in quibus consistit actus

ipse adorandi non licent (ut respondit Gab. Vasq. interrogatus de casu, an licet servo Christiano simul cum domino infideli genuflectere ante Idolum: pr<a>estando cultum non Idolo, sed Domino: quin de genuflexione limitat dicens; intelligo, actum exteriorem genuflexionis, non licere tunc cum videretur astantibus actus adorationis. Compluti 4 Aprilis 1595. Quamvis deinde Romani Theologi statuerint genuflexionem famuli licere, (ut infra patebit) quia nec exterior Idololatria licet.

Nec in Sinis hoc ieiunium est signum alicuius determinatae sectae, ut forte est unum ex signis Mahometanae sectae abstinere a carne porcina et vino (quin non memini Theologos Europ<a>eos baptizantes ibi Turcas, et Mauros obligare hos ante susceptionem baptismi ad esum carnis porcinae, et haustum vini, sed illis Theologis sufficere, ut detestentur hi sectam omnem Mahometanam cum actibus suis). Nam hoc ieiunium in Sinis est ex usu Regni tale, ut qui ieiunant abstineant a carne, vino, pisce, sagimine, alliis cepisque, uti ieiunium Ecclesiae consistit in unica comestione cum abstinentia carnium; unde Sinenses rident Europ<a>eos ieiunantes, cum et vinum bibant, et pisces, ova, cepasque comedant.

Et sicuti ex Europ<a>eis sunt qui per totam vitam ieiunant; qui per aliquot annos; qui ter in hebdomada; qui tantum die sabbati in honorem Sanctissimae Virginis; alii die veneris in memoriam passionis Domini; alii per aliquot dies ob aliquod beneficium acceptum, vel ad impetrandum aliquid a Deo. Ita et in Sinis ob varios fines suos superstitiosos eodem prorsus ieiunio universali, et quod est ex consuetudine regni, varie ac diversimode ieiunant; sunt enim qui ieiunant ieiunio quod vocant *quōn-īn-chaī* 觀音齋, qui quolibet anno per tres menses ieiunant 2ª luna, 6ª luna, et 9ª luna in honorem Idoli vocati *Quōn-īn* 觀音 (quam Virginem putant), ut ista adiuvet illos in suis necessitatibus.

Sunt qui ieiunant ieiunio vocato *chùn-tî-chaī* 準提齋, qui quolibet mense per decem dies ieiunant eodem ieiunio ac primi scilicet pa die lunae, 8ª, 14, 15, 18, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30 in honorem huius alterius mulieris, et Idoli Foe matris, ut haec adiuvet illos in suis necessitatibus. Sunt qui ieiunant ieiunio vocato *sān-quōn-chaī* 三官齋, qui quolibet anno item per tres menses integros ieiunant videlicet pa luna, 7ª et 10ª luna; sunt qui ieiunant ieiunio vocato *yên-vâm-chaī* 閻王齋, qui item in honorem huius Idoli ieiunant per tres menses integros quolibet anno; scilicet pa luna, 5ª et 9ª luna. Sunt qui ieiunant ieiuno vocato *hiáochaī* 孝齋, post mortem parentum ieiunant multi per 49 dies, ut libe<re>ntur cadavera parentum a putredine et esu vermium, alio nomine vocant *cen-tu-chaī* 淨土齋.

Sunt qui ieiunant ieiunio vocato *paó-mù-chaī* 報母齋, qui ob beneficium gestationis uteri, et sanguinis seu lactis a matre accepti, et ob labores quos mater passa fuit in alendo infantem et puerulum in memoriam grati animi et obedientiae. *Hien-hiaó-sīn-chaī* 顯孝心齋 ieiunant adolescentes, et adolescentules (sed non omnes omnino) per decem annos communiter, alii per tres integros annos. Sunt qui ieiunant ieiunio vocato *xě-yûen-chaī* 十緣齋, qui ob finem transmigrationis futurae, ut accidat illis felix transmigratio quolibet mense ieiunant per decem integros dies, incipientes ieiunium a prima die lunae usque ad decimam. Sunt qui ieiunant ieiunio vocato *xînchaī* 神齋, quo ieiunio ieiunant multi litteratorum, mandarinorum, et similes, hi ne totaliter abstineant ab his rebus, quolibet die ieiunant per medium diem, scilicet mane abstinent a carne, vino, piscibus, cepis , etc. sed vespere haec omnia comedunt. Sunt qui ieiunant ieiunio vocato *châm-chaī* 長齋. Hi semper ieiunant per totam vitam, et eodem prorsus ieiunio supra explicato; haec sunt ex principalioribus ieiunia Sinensia; multa alia ob brevitatem relinquo; unde colligi potest, quod fere maior pars Sinensium hoc ieiunio laborat, et liberum est cui libet Sinensi, se arctari tali ieiunio, vel illo non arctari.

Sunt talia [72r] ieiunia, et abstinentiae a certis quibusdam cibis, vel a carne, et vino dumtaxat, ut prisci Sinae, et ipse Confucius olim abstinebat, vel ab aliis pluribus aut paucioribus cibis ad arbitrium cuius libet; nos autem hic quae in communi usu nunc sunt ex principalioribus post invectam sectam Foe supra dicta ieiunia enumeravimus.

Si igitur in Europa ieiunium unicae comestionis cum abstinentia carnium non est tale signum Religionis Christianae, ut semper sit actus exterior et cultus Religionis Christianae; nam multi ex haereticis sectis ieiunant eodem ieiunio; sane non video quare in Sinis debeat esse signum tale, et cultus exterior alicuius sectae, ita ut estimetur ex illis actibus externis Idololatricis, ut ante baptismum omnino sit necessarium, ut baptismum suscepturi dent oppositum signum, vg. comestionis carnis, aut cepae, ad hoc ut licite possit baptizari. Hinc colligi potest non obstringi ieiunantes aliquo iure iurando ante Idolum elicito ad ieiunium suum (nisi forte in aliqua urbe sint aliqui ex secta aliqua perturbantium Regnum qui id faciant, de quibus non ago) sed comiter ieiunant ieiuniis supra allatis, et ob fines iam dictos. Qui fines omnes videntur esse superstitiosi; excepto ieiunio filiorum familias, qui tribus annis, aut pluribus abstinent ab illis cibis in grati animi memoriam, et ob labores, quos tulit mater tempore quo ipsos aluit infantes. Colligi item potest non

esse signum sectae hic ieiunium in Sinis; nam quicunque ex populo, et ex magistratu, ex senibus, vel pueris ad arbitrium suum, si instet necessitas instituit ieiunium hoc vel ad tempus, et in gratiarum actionem, et ad petendum beneficium aliquod a suis Idolis, vel ob beneficium acceptum a parentibus etc. vel ad vitam, ob hos, vel alios fines.

His ita explicatis videtur dicendum ex natura rei (non ago in circumstantiis scandali etc.) non esse in Sinis a missionariis requirendum signum hoc particulare, ut scilicet frangant ieiunium comedendo aliquid, vel multum, vel parum, ex illis rebus a quibus antea abstinuerunt ad tempus, vel ad vitam, ad hoc ut sint dispositi ieiunantes hi ad recipiendum baptismum: fundamentum huius Conclusionis est: quia missionarii determinarent signum aliquod requisitum ad susceptionem baptismi ex parte suscipientis, et ministrantis, quod nullo modo est necessarium ex una parte, et ex alia parte in Sinis clauderet viam aeternae salutationis infinitae fere multitudini gentilium; qui vel audito nomine, quod Lex sancta Christi requirat omnino fractionem ieiunii ad hoc ut quis illam valeat amplecti, non solum non accedant ad interrogandum de veritate Legis sed maxime illam abhorreant (quamvis temere) sed interim non accedunt ad explorandam a prudenti ministro veritatem. Ergo etc.

Prima pars Conclusionis probatur: illa sunt necess<ari>a ex parte suscipientis et absolute volentis baptizari quae non sunt obex ad licitam susceptionem baptismi, ut esset voluntas peccaminosa et annexa in casu nostro ad aliquod superstitiosum; sed haec voluntas in casu nostro non est talis, quin est detestativa in genere omnium superstitionum, et etiam ipsius ante acti ieiunii ut annexi superstitionibus per errorem, quin et in casu nostro per promissionem etiam iuramento firmatam (quod iuramentum non videtur necessarium) et publicam ante omnes Christianos ieiunans declarat se in posterum non ieiunaturum sine ullo superstitioso, sed ieiunaturum ob amorem Dei, et in paenitentiam suorum peccatorum explicat item causas ob quas non valeat ieiunium illud materiale violare, ergo ex parte suscipientis non datur obex ad licite suscipiendum baptismum.

Neque ex parte ministri necessaria est ista fractio ieiunii in suscipiente. Nam quoties minister est moraliter certus quod in suscipiente non datur obex non potest licite negare baptismum disposito et petenti illud: sed sufficiens est ad moralem certitudinem ministri illa publica protestatio iam dicta (non damno tamen ministrum illum qui ob suas rationes valde probabiles vel

circumstantias alias putet, candidatum ieiunantem ficte accedere, nec fide dignum esse, et deneget baptismum; quia illum iudicat indispositum atque adeo minister non est moraliter certus de mutata intentione: loquor igitur ex natura rei in se, praescindendo a scandalo, vel alia simili circumstantia).

Nam si in Turca volente recipere *baptismum*, si protestetur omnem sectam, et actus superstitiosos sectae, et volente servare mandata Legis hoc sufficit ad moralem certitudinem Theologorum Europ<a>eorum (qui non requirunt illam maximam et omnimodam certitudinem moralem; ita ut velint ut Turca omnia et singula praecepta Mahometanicae sectae per singula signa extrinseca praeceptis illis opposita, declaret adhoc ut licite baptizetur Turca, sed contenti sunt illa publica detestatione totius sectae et actuum superstitiosorum illius) quare Theologi Sinensis requirant particularia signa extrinseca detestationis interioris alicuius [72v] particularis praecepti superstitiosi quae sint opposita ipsi precepto; et quare cum ex quinque praeceptis sectae Idoli Foe Unum sit non occidere viventia *uû xă sēm* 無殺牲 antequam baptizentur, qui hanc sequuntur sectam, a missionariis non requiritur hoc signum occidendi gallinam, aut saltem formicam unam, ut moraliter reddatur certus missionarius, quod suscepturus baptismum ex corde detestetur superstitiosum hoc praeceptum Idoli, et sectae ipsius Foe; cum sit adeo facilis pede premere unam formicam ante baptismum! Contentus itaque est missionarius detestatione illa universali ipsius sectae, et cuiuscumque rei superstitiosae, et hac morali certitudine praevia iudicium fert quod baptizandus sit dispositus, et parum curans si deinde occidat vel non occidat formicas, confert illi baptismum; et in nostro casu omnino requirit fractionem ieiunii, saltem per haustum unius cocleari iusculi ad hoc, ut ferat iudicium, quod baptizandus ex corde detestetur superstitiosa illa quae inveniuntur in aliquibus ieiunantibus; non ne facilius est pede premere formicam unam, quam deglutire coclear iusculi? Est ne quid specialius et quid superstitiosius in ieiunio, quam sit in praecepto non mactandi viventia? Anne hic ista superstitiosa voluntas separabilis est ab opere, et signo externo; et ibi inseparabilis est superstitiosa ieiunio?

Accedit quod non tam facile est quibusdam ieiunantibus in Sinis frangere actu ieiunium; nam quamvis detestentur priorem errorem, quo putabant se illo ieiunio multiplicasse iam multa merita, et deinde assequuturos optimam transmigrationem, et multa bona in alia vita ac dignitates et honores plurimos, prae caeteris qui non ieiunant; tamen alias saepe habent difficultates et motiva quae non

sunt ex se mala et unde difficillimum illis reddatur talis fractio materialis sui ieiunii: nam aliquando isti, si sciatur a domesticis et vicinis quod fregerint ieiunium, irridentur tanquam gulosi, et se pueriliter gerentes et similia; et cum qui illos irrident sint domestici, et gentiles, qui non capiunt verbum istud, in faciem exprobrant quod Lex divina (quamvis caeci gentiles, et altioris veritatis ignari, potatoris [sic] vini vocent, quos Sp<irit>us Sanctus sanctitate donavit) iubeat gulositatem et abrumpat opera, quae videntur ipsis bona.

Et quamvis minister dicat cathecumeno [sic]: Sine illos, caeci sunt, et duces caecorum, tamen qui non dum gratiam baptismalem recepit, et virtutes illas ac bona quae gratiam comitantur, saepe saepius non capit verbum istud, praecipue in materia hac ieiunii, quae ex sua natura non est intrinsece mala, quin ex se est mortificatio carnis; et cathecumini [sic!] tunc obligationem habent ad patiendum gravia incommoda, quando res quae relinquenda praecipitur ante baptismum, est mala, et obex ad receptionem baptismi at ieiunium ex natura sua non est intrinsece malum. Hinc est quod recipientes baptismum ne tales irrisiones, etiam puerorum patiantur, non parum difficultatis habeant ad actu frangendum suum ieiunium materiale, quod ut annexum superstitioni iam detestati sunt, et revera cognoscunt per illa praeterita ieiunia nullum meritum cumulasse sibi, sed potius demeritum. Ex hoc capite igitur infirmitas istorum volentium se baptizare, et non valentium sufferre irrisiones domesticorum, vicinorum et puerorum excusanda esset (nisi scandalum obstet) nam saepe non sunt tam vivacis ingenii ut per disputationes possint defendere et purgare Sanctam Legem ab iniuriis quas inferunt illi gentiles dicentes, eam iubere gulositatem, et impedire opera, quae videntur bona; nec probare illis possunt, ieiunium materialiter sumptum, esse ex se opus malum, cum clare videant gentiles, ieiunium esse ex se mortificationem carnis et appetituum illius.

Nonne hic apparet maior difficultas in fractione ieiunii ante baptismum, quam sit pede calcare formicam? Et tamen hoc 2um non exigitur a missionariis ut signum voluntatis detestantis fidem et praecepta Idoli Foe. Ergo multo minus debent exigere illud fractionis ieiunii, ad quod difficulter inducitur baptizandus, et iustas causas proponit ne materiale ieiunium frangat. Dixi iustas causas proponit, non quia quilibet minister debeat iudicare iustas causas aliquas quas hic ex. gr. tantum innuimus; sed iusta causa censetur illa quaecunque sit ob quam prudens minister ex una parte redditur moraliter certus quod mutaverit candidatus

superstitiosam illam priorem intentionem, ex alia parte hic et nunc tollitur scandalum, et grave incommodum sequeretur candidato ex fractione illa ieiunii materialis.

Accedit aliud caput difficultatis in fractione ieiunium; nempe posset quandoque evenire ex nausea quadam [73r] naturali rerum illarum ad quae commedenda cogeretur ieiunans a missionario ante baptismi susceptionem. Nam nemo negare potest, quod apprehensio (ut dicitur) faciat casum: isti ieiunantes saltem qui a teneris unguiculis docentur a parentibus non esse illas res, non modo comedendas, sed nec gustandas; et cum hac apprehensione crescunt, et in illis in dies magis ac magis imprimitur horror: sicuti unde nam oritur in Europ<a>eis abhorrere carnem canis, asini, equi, hominis, viperarum etiam aquatilium et similium; cum sint res ex se comestibiles et in aliquibus Regnis cum gustu comedantur; non nisi quia a teneris annis docti fuerunt a parentibus ab illis se abstinere, tanquam a rebus vel immundis vel nauseam causantibus, et ita, ut si proponatur gustandum Europ<a>eo vel tantillum iusculum carnis caninae vel humanae, sint qui potius mortem patiantur quam gustent; quamvis sint etiam multi, qui fame aut necessitate compellente aliquando ita comedant, ut deinde gustum in comedendo perpiciant [sic], et non abstineant amplius. Prius enim apprehensio facerat abstinere, ablata deinde tali vehementi apprehensione paulatim, experientia facit ut comedant.

Sinae igitur a teneris annis ieiunantes, et apprehendentes comestionem illarum rerum esse nauseabundam; nonne difficulter inducuntur ad comedendum, vel tantillum quid gustandum illarum rerum a quibus abstinuerunt si obligentur a missionariis ante baptismum? Et quare ad difficillima ista agenda cogantur ante bapt**is**mum cum talis fractio ieiunii non sit dispositio omnino requisita ex parte suscipientis; et ex parte ministrantis non requiratur absolute; nam minister potest habere certitudinem moralem, quod sit dispositum subiectum; cum baptizandus detestetur omne superstitiosum, omne Idolum, omne praeceptum sectae et cognoscat se erravisse ieiunando ob daemonem, et putando se merita multa cumulasse, et promittendo, vel si necesse foret, iurando se in posterum ieiunaturum ob amorem Dei, et in paenitentiam suorum peccatorum, et hoc ipsum ante omnes Christianos profiteatur.

2a pars Conclusionis ex supradictis facile probatur. Nam missionarius qui requirit ante baptismum ieiunantis signum fractionis ieiunii, cum tale signum, in particulari non sit necessarium et supposita difficultas non parva in quibusdam ieiunantibus ad

dandum tale signum, et cum sit infinita fere multitudo istorum ieiunantium in Sinis, qui vel audito nomine quod Lex Christi requirat ante baptismum tale signum fractionis ieiunii, non solum non accedant ad interrogandum de veritate Legis, sed e contrario abhorrent Legem illam, quae talia signa requirit. Quis dubitet, claudi ianuam salutis infinitis populis in Sinis? Infinitis inquam, non quia supponamus omnes habere causam iustam non fra<n>gendi suum ieiunium materiale, sed quia fere omnes audito nomine quod Lex Christi iubeat comedere carnes, aut allia ante baptismum, non accedunt, quod si accederent facili negotio a Docto, et prudenti ministro inducentur suaviter ad fractionem talis ieiunii.

Confirmatur 1º nostra sententia. Non ieiunantes infinitas alias habent superstitiosas operationes, vel abstinentias ab operationibus; nec minoris ponderis quam habeant ieiunantes; et tamen adversarii non requirunt signum aliquod particulare extrinsecum oppositum superstitionibus et indicans veram detestationem interiorem illius superstitionis quae operibus superstitiosis communiter annexa est; sed a baptizando detestationem illam universalem daemonis, et omnium operum eius, Idolorum, et omnium superstitionum eorum exquirunt ex usu ipsius Ecclesiae, et conferunt baptismum his; cum tamen experientia notum sit, multos ex his non ieiunantibus facili negotio ad suas antiquas superstitiones redire, et vel ab ipsa Christiana fide deicere; quin facilius isti ad vomitum revertentur; quam ieiuniantes illi quia mutarunt voluntatem illam malam et superstitiosam, et promiserunt se ieiunaturos posthac in honorem veri Dei quem colunt, et paenitentiam suorum peccatorum, ad priorem voluntatem superstitiosam revertantur. Ergo si missionarii a non ieiunantibus non exquirunt ante baptismum signa particularia exteriora opposita superstitionibus suis; neque a ieiunantibus debent exquirere.

Confirmatur 2º ex doctrina divi Thomae q. 68 art. 6 ubi ait: "In baptizandis non requiritur specialis confessio peccatorum, sed sufficit generalis; cum secundum ritum Ecclesiae [73v] abrenuntiant Sathanae et omnibus pompis eius etc" (Apud Layman cap. 6 De Sacr. Bapt. Liber 5, n. 4, col. 797). Requiritur tamen per Divum Thomam in baptizando interior illa peccatorum confessio, qua homo sua peccata in genere recogitans de illis doleat, et haec confessio fit Deo, et sufficit ut fiat per actum attritionis interioris, seu, ut Layman ait: "Sufficit qualiscunque dolor animi de peccatis ex supernaturali motivo conceptus." Quod autem requiritur in baptizando exterius et extrinsecum, non est specialis confessio peccatorum, seu talis, aut talis criminis, talis ac talis superstitionis,

sed sufficit generalis confessio, qua Infideles cognoscunt errores suos omnes et superstitiones, ac Idololatrias ante actas illas detestetur; non quidem dumtaxat interius, quia sic esset interior detestatio et confessio quae fit Deo, et non potest innotescere ministro ad hoc, ut hic habeat suam certitudinem moralem interioris detestationis, et licite conferat sacramentum, sed etiam requiritur haec confessio, et detestatio exterior seu per signa exteriora; et haec ex D<ivo> Thoma, et ex usu Ecclesiae sufficit si sit generalis, non autem huius vel alterius superstitiosi operis, sed omnium superstitionum in genere, hinc usus ex praxis Ecclesiae assignant ministro in ritualibus verba illa interrogantia: "Abrenuntias Satanae et omnibus pompis eius?" Si respondeat: "Abrenuntio," baptizetur.

Nunc vero missionarii aliqui in Sinis maiorem certitudinem moralem requirunt, in ieiunantibus baptizandis: non illis sufficit generalis confessio et detestatio daemonis, Idolorum et omnium superstitionum, sed adhuc requirunt specialem confessionem et detestationem ieiunii superstitiosi, et adhuc hoc illis non sufficit, si per verba detestentur ieiunium ut superstitiosum; et mutent intentionem illam malam ieiunii praeteriti, quod est res ex se indifferens, et proponentes causam iustam propter quam maximum incommodum subirent si frangeret ieiunium illud materiale, non inquam, illis sufficit si detestentur per verba, et publica, et ante omnes Christianos, et etiam si necesse esset per iuramentum, sed in super requirunt signum aliud particulare oppositum ipsi ieiunio materiali, nempe, ut per comestionem carnis, aut iusculi, frangatur ieiunium, ut sint omnino certi quod prior superstitiosa ieiunantis intentio sit iam pacta et mutata, et cum ad obtinendum hoc signum, tot ut supra diximus, interveniant difficultates, ieiunantes omnes, aut non accedunt ad interrogandum de veritate Legis, aut si accedant, et difficultatem habeant in fra<n>gendo ieiunium materiale sine baptismo domum remittuntur. Et omnino illis clauditur ianua salutis. Cum toto tamen hoc non damno ministrum qui sine baptismo eos remitteret, ex suppositione quod non sit moraliter certus, quod tales ieiunantes non ficte accedant, cum eiusmodi enim hominibus multa cautela, vigilantia, et examen adhibenda sunt, nec tam facili negotio eorum verbis debemus fidem praestare.

Nec huic doctrinae obstat alia praxis Ecclesiae vel Sacrae Inquisitionis, aut Conciliorum aliqua decreta contra suspectos haeresis, vel Iudaismi, quod de aliquibus criminibus particularibus, particularem exquirant detestationem, et publicam, et iuratam, et quandoque per actus oppositos publice declaratam etc. Nam rigor

ille iuste ac sancte exigitur ibi cum baptizatis et sunt speciales rationes ad negandam absolutionem sacramentalem his, nisi specialiter dent illa signa, et satisfactiones iniunctas per canones concilia etc. At vero cum gentilibus his, qui nondum ingressi sunt sub potestatem Ecclesiae, antequam baptizentur requirere ista signa particularia et non necessaria in caso nostro ac dirigi illis paritatibus ubi agitur de absolutione sacramentali neganda baptizatis, et suspectis de haeresi aut Iudaismo, non autem agitur de ianua omnium sacramentorum, et de Infidelibus, in quibus iuxta Doctrinam Sancti Thomae et Theologorum, et iuxta ritum Ecclesiae sufficit detestatio generalis daemonis, Idolorum et omnium superstitionum ex parte subiecti recipientis baptismum, ad hoc ut minister possit licite Infideles baptizare, non videtur sumenda paritas.

Curreret tamen suo modo paritas, si postquam Infideles susceperunt baptismum, ad huc semel et iterum reverterentur ad vomitum, et ad antiquas suas superstitiones; et ieiunantes verbis suis declararent aliquando vere non mutasse voluntatem illam superstitiosam, aut erroneam, qua vg. credebant se multa merita sibi coacervasse ieiuniis illis factis tempore infidelitatis, et adhuc credere, quod illa facta in honorem [74r] daemonis vere fuerint merita, et adhuc perseverare, his enim utpote suspectis de fide, neganda esset absolutio, et signa particularia opposita, et satisfactiones tollentes scandala exigendae essent ac iuste et sancte rigor aliquis exercendus cum illis, sunt enim lapsi, vel relapsi, et suspecti in materia fidei.

At vero cum iis, qui nondum ingressi sunt sub potestatem Ecclesiae, nec mihi constat non detestari ex animo omnem praeteritam superstitionem, et voluntatem malam, quin et verbis, et detestatione publica et promissione, et vel ipso iuramento si necesse foret, contrarium mihi constat; quare utar rigore illo exigendi signum hoc speciale fractionis ieiunii? An forte dicas, qui fregerunt ieiunium ante baptismum, nulli ad vomitum reversi sunt; et qui noluerunt frangere omnes reversi sunt ad vomitum? Experientia docet, multos ex iis qui fregerunt reversos deinde ad suam pristinam superstitionem, et multos non; et ex iis qui non fregerunt aliquos reversos ad vomitum; multos vero servasse Dei Legem et mandata. Dixi aliquos nam hanc experientiam non potuerunt habere missionarii illi, qui putarunt non baptizandos eos, qui nollent frangere ieiunium; illi vero qui putarunt data iusta causa baptizandos esse sive ante baptismum frangerent, sive non frangerent, sed mutarent intentionem illam malam

priorem, intentionem ieiunandi ob amorem Dei, et in paenitentiam peccatorum, utramque experientiam habent; atque adeo hi testantur, ex iis qui non fregerunt ieiunium illud materiale, sed fregerunt voluntatem malam, et mutarunt in bonam perserverante ieiunio, aliquos, ut moris est naturae hominum corruptae, ad vomitum deinde reversos esse, et maiorem partem servasse fidem ac divinae Legis mandata.

Confirmatur 3º nostra haec sententia. Nam si ipsa templa Idolorum ubi fiunt omnes Idololatriae, et superstitiones gentilic<i>ae valent purificari, ita, ut in illis deinde verum numen a fidelibus adorari queat: quare ieiunium hoc Sinensium non valeat ita purificari, ut ablato motivo superstitioso, vel Idolatrico, et accedente motivo colendi Deum, se seque mortificandi in paenitentia peccatorum, adhuc non possit purificari sed remaneat hoc Sinensium ieiunium Idolatricum et superstitiosum, ac inpurificabile? Nonne Sinenses isti sicuti exhibuerunt ieiunium servire iniquitati? Possunt et idem ieiunium exhibere ad serviendum iustitiae? Si possunt, quare obligentur ante bapti**s**mum ad illud **f**ra<n>gendum? Esto frangant in honorem Dei, possunt tamen non frangendo eumdem honorem Dei intendere neque dicas, hac Sinensium ridicula abstinentia a carne, vino, piscibus, ovis, in super alliis caepis etc. potius dehonorari Deum quam coli et honorari; tum quia ut supra in principio ostendimus, abstinentia ab his etiam oleribus, et carnibus, tamen ex more Sinensium non est talis; sed vel ipsi parentes, etiam magnates, a filiis suis coluntur, per talem abstinentiam, factam a filiis in grati animi memoriam: et sicuti ridiculum esset Europ<a>eo tempore aestivo aquae calidae potu abstinere, apud Sinas tamen non solum non esset ridiculum, sed non parva mortificatio gulae talis abstinentia. Ita et in casu ieiunii Sinensis: ex more Regni igitur ieiunium hoc non esset quid ridiculum? Aliter diceres ridiculam abstinentiam aliquorum sanctorum ab omnibus etiam oleribus. Finis igitur in ieiunio considerandus mos Regni, cum ieiunio illo tollitur omnis superstitio, et si quod est scandalum.

At enim ideo ridicula (inquies) erit huiusmodi abstinentia in honorem Dei, si ab eo quod horrent, et cuius insigni tenentur nausea, abstineant.

R<esponde>o, etiam non deesse qui citra nauseam superstitiose ieiunarint, et saltem hi dici non poterunt honorare Deum ridicula abstinentia; qui autem vehementi nausea tenentur, his alia in quibus se vincant Dei causa utique non deerunt, dummodo et quod ii qui vehementi nausea tenentur, nec valeant materiale ieiunium frangere, non amoveantur a baptismo.

Nec valet hic dicere, si ita esset, possent et gentiles retinere domi suae etiam ipsa Idola mutata intentione, scilicet vel in illis colendi Deum, vel saltem ornatus causa. Nam sunt aliquae res, quae quamvis materialiter se habeant, et possint ob aliud motivum, domi sicuti antea retineri; tamen [74v] quia ex institutione sua et ex aliis circumsta<n>tiis si eodem modo ac priva domi retineantur et colantur, ex se tamen semper sunt aptae indicare cultum qui adhiberi solet illi, quem per se primo repr<a>esentat imago illa, ideo non licet Idolum retinere domi eodem modo ac antea etiam ornatus causa. Dixi: eodem modo ac antea; nam si daretur casus (uti in Europa imago Herculis, Saturni, Iovis etc., posita in loco, ubi adornatum, et non ad cultum ac reverentiam posita sit reputetur facile a conspicientibus). Si datur inquam casus quod Idolum illud posset inservire vg. pro scamno in culina, aut alibi, ubi nemo ex iis qui illud vident in tali loco, et ad talem usum inservire, possint iudicare, quod sit ibi positum ad hoc ut colatur, quin potius ferunt iudicium, quod ad dedecus Idoli fit; et loco Idoli in ara, ubi fuerat Idolum ponatur imago Christi Domini, in tali casu nemo negaret, Idolum posse domi retineri ad talem, vel similem usum. At ieiunium Sinensium, ut patet ex iis quae supra diximus et de eius institutione, potius templo Idoli possit comparari, quam ipsi Idolo, et uti templum materiale Idoli purificabile est, ita et ieiunium Sinense.

Et quamvis contenderes ieiunium Sinense ex sua institutione fuisse ortum a superstitione et adhuc esse superstitiosum in gentilibus, adhuc non posset cum Idolo comparari, sicuti et aqua benedicta, seu potius maledicta a Bonziis, qui illa aspergunt domos gentilium et infirmos, quamvis orta sit ex superstitione hic, et adhuc superstitiosa sit; non ideo Christianis aqua benedicta a sacerdotibus cum aspergunt domos et infirmos erit in Sinis superstitiosa, aut saltem scandalosa gentilibus. Adde quod non a Christo Domino vel ab Ecclesia praecipitur commestio carnis, aut alliorum et caeparum, etc. Nec est sicuti figura illa Idoli posita in altari ex se repraesentiva talis Idoli positi in illo loco ad hoc ut veneretur: ieiunium enim Sinicum est indifferens ad hoc ut illo colatur Idolum vel colantur a filiis, parentes, etc.

Dices Idolum non posse eodem modo ac antea domi retineri, mutata intentione, quia scandalum causaret, et putarent homines, baptizatum adhuc persistere in sua antiqua Religione. Sed eadem ratio militat de ieiunio quo si Idolum non potest domi conservari ut antea, nec ipsum ieiunium potest.

R<esponde>o nullum esse scandalum quod sequeretur ex

ieiunio si a baptizato servaretur ob motivum amoris Dei et paenitentiae suorum peccatorum; nam si agatur de gentilibus vicinis et domesticis suis ieiunantibus superstitiose, hi simul etiam scirent et viderent illum adorare domi Christi imaginem, ac servare Legis praecepta, et facile etiam ab ipso baptizato possent scire, eum ieiunare in cultum illius imaginis quam nunc factus Christianus adorat, uti et illi non Christiani ieiunant in cultum Idoli quod adorant: ad summum igitur gentiles formarent iudicium quod Lex Christi non prohibet ieiunium illud materiale, sed tantum motivum malum, ob quod gentiles ieiunant; atque adeo hoc iudicium posset esse causa, ut alii ieiunantes animarentur potius ad sanctam Legem amplectendam, quam ad odio habendam.

Accedit quod posset Christianus ieiunans (ne dedecus irrisionum patiatur a vicinis et pueris ieiunantibus) Christianam fidem dissimulare; iuxta doctrinam Theologorum, et colligitur ex responsis datis a Theologis Romanis Soc. Iesu (Doctrina decerpta ex Archivio Collegii Macaensis ex Libro Responsorum Praepositi Generalis et Theologorum), qui interrogati: An famuli alicuius Principis male affecti erga nostram Religionem, contra fidei confessionem peccant, longo tempore signa nostrae Religionis occultantes, cum alioqui si sese manifestent non subituri sint vitae periculum, nec fortasse amissionis officii; sed ad summum amissionis redditum terrae, quos a Principe accipiunt. Responderunt in hunc modum: "Non se prodere cogendi sunt, si nec interrogentur, nec externae professionis faciendae occasio urgeat; possunt enim, ne beneficium aliquod vel favorem Domini amittant, Christianam Religionem dissimulare."

Quare igitur non poterunt isti ieiunantes Christiani suo ieiunio (quod non est ex se malum, sed erat malum ratione motivi mali) mutato motivo in bonum, dissimulare Christianam fidem, ne in continuas rixas domesticorum, et vicinorum, atque in irrisiones puerorum incidant? Scandalum igitur ex parte [75r] gentilium nullum esse videtur in nostro casu, et si foret, a ministro docendus esset qui baptizatur, quomodo scandalum tollendum. Sed hoc dependet a circumstantiis, et a prudentia, ac doctrina ministri; nec est periculum ut in suo errore gentiles magis obfirmentur; quia ieiunium illud materiale cum non sit malum intrinsece, sed in quantum dirigitur ad daemonem vel Idolum, cum gentiles videant domi ab amico vel parente iam Christiano conculcatum Idolum, et erectam loco Idoli imaginem Christi Domini, in cuius honorem protestatus est se ieiunare, non apparet quare obfirmentur gentiles in errore.

Quod autem nullum sequatur scandalum ex parte Christianorum probatur, nam ex quo tandem capite oriretur scandalum istud in Christianis? Vel enim oritur, ex eo quia vident hunc hominem baptizatum ieiunare adhuc post baptismum receptum, et possent putare adhuc manere in illo motivum malum ieiunandi superstitiose; et hoc scandalum ex hoc capite oriri non potest; quia Christiani visa iam causa iusta non fra<n>gendi ieiunium et auditis detestationibus factis a ieiunante ante baptismum, et promissionibus publicis, quod in posterum sit ieiunaturus in Dei honorem et in paenitentiam suorum peccatorum; si deinde videant illum adhuc perseverare in ieiunio, nihil illis novum; nec ullum fundamentum habent dicendi ex hoc capite quod illi [sic] ieiunet in honorem Idoli, quod etiam fregit, et detestatus est, cum omnibus operibus et superstitionibus suis.

At si supponas quod Christiani nolint credere verbis illius, et ministro innuant, hominem illum non esse fide dignum prudens minister aut differet baptismum, ei conferre, aut nullo modo conferet, nisi violet ieiunium. Ergo praecise ex hoc capite nullum scandalum oriri potest in Christianis. Neque enim in ieiunio Sinico paritas ulla est cum actu infidelitatis etiam extrinseco; ieiunium enim ex natura sua est ad mortificationem carnis institutum per se et primario, et non est signum sectae aut falsae Religionis ut supra diximus; nam qui filios vg. putant falso posse impetrare ab Idolo aliquo, aliquando ieiunant per aliquot dies; et filii familias ieiunant in grati animi memoriam erga parentes, eodem prorsus ieiunio, et tamen hi non sunt sectarii; non enim per hoc ieiunium ingrediuntur in sectam aliquam, neque filii familias cultum ullum Idolo deferunt.

Aliud posset esse caput, ex quo oriretur hoc scandalum in Christianis; videlicet, ex eo quia docti a missionariis quibusdam, hos ieiunantes non posse licite et in nullo casu recipere sanctum baptismum, nisi frangant ieiunium, saltem semel, et per haustum vg. parvae quantitatis iusculi carnis; atque adeo cum nunc videant hunc baptizari, et non accipere haustum iusculi, maxime scandalizantur, putantes vel doctrinam acceptam ab aliis esse falsam, vel praxim huius novi missionarii esse in tali casu peccaminosam. Non dubito quod optimo zelo ac fine fecerint, si qui missionarium [sic] disseminaverint hanc doctrinam inter Christianos, cum melius potuerint hanc suam particularem doctrinam Christianis celare, et alias, agere iuxta dictamen, et opinionem quam probabilem existimabant, absque eo quod Christiani scirent has opiniones Theologicas, et difficiles, ac in materia tam gravi, ut est, ponere, vel non ponere obicem volenti se baptizare, et credenti in Deum,

et volenti servare Dei mandata; et aperire faciliter, vel non aperire ianuam salutis tot populis ieiunantibus in Sinis. Attamen esto sit disseminata in aliquibus Christianitatibus; cum in materia tanti ponderis, ubi clauditur multis via salutis ponendo obicem volenti se baptizare, qui nec obex est, nec a divina Lege iubetur, nec, ex usu Ecclesiae signatur; si aliquis minister contrariam opinionem hanc ab aliquibus promulgatam sequatur, non ideo tam facile damnandus esset a contrariae opinionis fautoribus.

Dices hac disseminata iam doctrina, oritur scandalum in quibusdam Christianitatibus.

R<esponde>o: Explicetur a missionariis verus sensus illius doctrinae, et quidem cum magna prudentia et cautela; vel dicendo quod ordinarie loquendo securius est recipienti baptismum violare etiam ieiunium illud suum materiale, per haustum vg. iusculi; ut sic tollatur daemoni omnis ansa tentandi deinde illum, ac incitandi ad dubitationem aliquam, [75v] an merita illa vana, quae ieiunio tot annorum putabat sibi cumulasse, sint vera merita, et adhuc perseverent. Vel dicendo: quod doctrina illa vera semper sit in iis omnibus casibus, quando ministro non aliunde possit constare, quod iste baptizandus revera mutet prius motivum malum; non autem doctrina illa vim habeat quando ministro aliunde constat iam mutasse motivum malum, et in bonum convertisse, accedente causa iusta non frangendi ieiunium materiale, et aliae plures rationes prudenter excogitari possent quibus Christiani rei veritatem percipientes non habeant amplius fundamentum iudicandi, vel doctrinam ab alio missionario acceptam esse falsam; vel praxim huius novi missionarii esse peccaminosam. Et praecipue docendi sunt Christiani, ut si incidant in ieiunantem volentem se ad fidem convertere, non statim illi dicant, debere prius violare suum ieiunium, ac deinde accedere, ne istis suis verbis impediant accessum ad Ecclesiam, et ad missionarium, et efficiant ut ille, et alii odium concipiant contra Dei Legem, sed ducat illum ad Patrem missionarium, cuius prudentiae et doctrinae erit illum suaviter vel inducere ad violandum suum illud superstitiosum ieiunium; vel probare ad tempus circa voluntatem illam pristinam, an moraliter perseveret nec ne, et aperire illi aliquam viam ad hoc ut possit aggregari Ecclesiae ovili.

Dices usus hic cogendi ieiunantes ad frangendum suum ieiunium ante baptismum fuit Patrum antiquorum istius missionis, et primorum, qui nec doctrinis Theologicis, nec experientia rerum Sinicarum caruere.

R<esponde>o et nos etiam ordinarie loquendo statuimus idem, et sumus in eadem sententia in qua fuere primi nostri huius missionis

Patres. Quod autem in aliquo casu extraordinario data iusta causa non frangendi ieiunium materiale, sit tamen a baptismo privandus ieiunans Sinicus, tanquam ieiunium hoc esset quid intrinsece malum etiam mutata intentione ieiunantis, et eius speciei esset, ac sunt Idololatria extrinseca quae non licet etiam mutata intentione. Circa hanc quaestionem, non constat Patres primos huius missionis statuisse, ieiunium Sinicum esse ex natura sua intrinsece malum et idololatricum, ita ut in nullo casu sit licitum. Quin potius coetus Patrum hic contrarium determinavit; nam statuit non debere admitti ieiunantes Sinicos ad baptismum, nisi in aliquo casu extraordinario, quando aliunde constaret de intentione ieiunantis mala, iam mutata in bonam; unde statuit consequenter ieiunium Sinicum non esse intrinsece malum aut ex sua institutione signum alicuius Religionis falsae; sed ideo esse idololatricum aut superstitiosum, quia fieret in honorem Idoli, aut ob finem superstitiosum. Si quis igitur nunc dicit: ieiunium Sinicum praecisa mala intentione esse opus malum, atque adeo in nullo casu posse licite baptismum conferri ieiunanti non fracto prius ieiunio, contra communem Patrum sententiam diceret; inter quos Patres, et sunt docti et antiqui in missione; ex illis nemo dixerit primos Patres huius missionis existimasse ieiunium Sinicum esse opus malum praescindendo etiam a mala intentione et fine ob quem Sinae ieiunant. Et vel ob hanc unicam rationem quod asserens hanc propositionem sit unicus contra sententiam 22 Patrum huius coetus, valde redditur tota eius doctrina suspecta quod nihil probet, quia nimium probat, et contra id quod post tot tantasque disputationes statutum tandem fuit.

Confirmatur 4º nostra sententia ex ipsa praxi eorum missionariorum qui contrariam sententiam in Sinis sequantur. Hi enim, ut supra illam, quam usus Ecclesiae requirit, certitudinem moralem habeant, si Sinicus ieiunans difficiliter inducatur ad violandum ieiunium, contenti sunt ut secreto saltem parum carnis gustet, aut hauriat parum iusculi, et hoc iam peracto, si iubeat ieiunanti prosequi suum ieiunium ob amorem Dei, et in paenitentiam suorum peccatorum, et ad impetrandam a Deo conversionem totius familiae, prosequi, ut antea ieiunium permittunt. (Sic in publico Patrum coetu dictum fuit: "Nescimus an deinde Adversarii mutaverint sententiam"). Hoc posito: sic infero: ergo qui nostram sententiam sequuntur, et non cogunt ieiunantem [76r] ad violandum ieiunium suum materiale ante baptismum, sed tantum docent, ac cogunt, ut mutet motivum superstitiosum et malum, in motivum sanctum, et meritorium accedente iusta causa optime faciunt: nam hi suam habent moralem certitudinem, et

illam, aut forte maiorem, quae ex usu Ecclesiae requiritur ad hoc ut licite conferatur baptismi sacramentum Infidelibus volentibus se ad fidem convertere, et credentibus omnia fidei mysteria necessaria, ac detestantibus Idola, et superstitiosa omnia, et promittentibus quod servaturi sint Legis mandata.

Ergo Sinici ieiunantes admittendi sunt ad baptismum quamvis non violent suum illud ieiunium materiale; si tamen agant quae modo dicta sunt. Nec possunt dicere adversarii ieiunium hoc Sinense esse talis naturae, et habere tales circumstantias hic in Sinis, etiam materialiter sumptum, ut sit semper signum Religionis falsae, vel superstitiosae sectae (ut supra notavimus) atque adeo aequivalere hic ipsi Idolo quod sicuti etiam mutato motivo colendi Deum in Idolo illo materiali, aut etiam ornatus causa non potest, uti antea retineri domi ac coli, ita nec hoc ieiunium materialiter sumptum posse non violari. Hoc enim modo adversarii contra praxim suam pugnarent: nam sicuti non potest retineri domi Idolum, quamvis Idololatra ante baptismum secreto vel praesentibus quibusdam Christianis pedibus illud conculcaret ad ostendendum, quod in posterum in illo non sit amplius culturus daemonem, sed Deum; ita nec sufficiens est, ut ieiunans secreto frangat ieiunium, vel praesentibus aliquibus Christianis, ad ostendendum, quod in posterum per ieiunium non sit amplius culturus daemonem, sed Deum.

At praxis adversariorum, quamvis de Idolo agendo, non permittunt; tamen de ieiunio loquendo permittunt ut postquam secreto fregerunt ieiunium, domi prosequantur suum ieiunium mutato iam motivo malo in bonum. Ergo ex praxi adversariorum constat, ieiunium hoc Sinense non esse talis naturae, nec in se imbibere tales circumstantias, ut sit omnino vel impurificabile ab omni superstitione, vel scandalosum. Si potest igitur purificari ab omni superstitione et scandalo, quare non admittantur ad baptismum ieiunantes illi, qui habent iustam causam, et difficultatem violandi suum illud materiale ieiunium? Quare his omnino claudatur ianua salutis, si possint facile a missionariis adiuvari?

Nec recurrant adversarii ad id, quot tota superstitio ieiunii consistat in ipsa fractione ieiunii, qua semel habita, etiam si perseveret ieiunium, superstitio tamen omnis iam ablata est. Hoc enim gratis fingerent ad salvandam suam praxim; scandala tamen salvare non possent; eodem modo ac si fingas pactum daemonis cum aliquo Idololatra, videlicet si Idolum pedibus conculcaretur, daemonem non opem laturum Idolatrae; si hic pedibus conculcet secreto, pactum quidem daemonis ad ferendam illi opem

solvitur; sed non ideo non reputabitur Idololatra ab omnibus si Idolum retinere domi ac colere prosequatur. Ita quamvis secreto quis frangat ieiunium superstitiosum, etiam si, dato, et non concesso, superstitio omnis consisteret in illa fractione ieiunii; si tamen ieiunans perseveret, ut antea in suo ieiunio, non ideo non reputabitur superstitiosus ab omnibus.

Adde quod hoc est falsum, nam ut supra indicavi, sunt ex Sinensibus multi, qui eodem prorsus ieiunio, quo reliqui, ieiunant; et tamen alii ter in mense, alii decies, alii per tres annos tantum, alii per decem annos, alii nunquam, alii per totam vitam. Si superstitio ieiunii Sinensis, aut pactum aliquod daemonis consisteret, in eo quod ieiunium sit talis naturae, ut si semel frangatur pactum daemonis, aut superstitio omnis auferatur; hoc pactum, et hanc superstitionem illam tantum Sinensium ieiunia includerent quae essent ad totam vitam; non vero alia aliorum, qui exceptis tribus, aut decem diebus quolibet mense comedunt carnes et pisces etc. quod adversarii non concedunt; nam etiam ista ieiunia ob finem malum, ob quem fiunt, sunt mala et superstitiosa.

Accedit etiam quod illi ieiunantes ad totam vitam saepius vel decepti ab amicis comedunt aliquid eorum a quibus abstinent, et deinde si sciant parum curant, et in eodem suo ieiunio [76v] perseverant; in gravibus infirmitatibus, si ad salutem recuperandam urgeantur a medicis, ut comedant aliquid illorum a quibus abstinent forte non recusant, quamvis difficultatem magnam aliunde patiantur, sed ob amorem salutis, et quia in tali casu non irridentur a pueris et vicinis, per modum medicinae comedunt, et sanitatem consequti [sic] sua ieiunia prosequuntur cum pace totius familiae.

Ergo signum est quod superstitio ista non est annexa ita ieiunio, ut si semel hoc frangatur tota superstitio auferatur: sed tota consistit in motivo malo, ob quod fit ieiunium. Natura tamen ieiunii Sinensis ex consuetudine ita institutam [sic] est, ut non admittat parvitatem materiae; uti admittit ieiunium Ecclesiae, quod parvitas materiae non frangit ieiunium, sed quaecunque parvitas materiae illarum rerum a quibus abstinent, si gustatur, frangit ieiunium Sinicum etc. Hinc tanta difficultas Sinarum ieiunantium in gustando vel tantillum iusculi carnis, aut minimum frustuli carnis, vel ovi; per ipsos enim eodem prorsus modo se habet ad fractionem ieiunii, sive sit multum, sive sit parum id quod comedendum offertur, quia nullam admittunt parvitatem materiae in suis ieiuniis, tum qui ad totam vitam ieiunant, tum qui ad tempus ieiunant.

Dices putant ieiunantes, quod si frangatur ieiunium, sive sit ad tempus sive per totam vitam, merita illa ante acta, quae putant esse vera merita,

omnino deperdantur, et sunt ac si non fuerint. Ergo specialis ratio est in hoc ieiunio Sinico ad hoc, ut ieiunans ante baptismum cogatur frangere suum ieiunium, et nisi velit frangere, non baptizetur.

R<esponde>o 1º. Casum hunc, solum indicare errorem ieiunantis, non autem specialem nexum erroris cum ieiunio illo Sinensium. Nam pueri, adolescentes, vel adolescentulae, qui nec ipsum nomen meriti sciunt cum ieiunant eodem ieiunio et in grati animi memoriam matris suae, maximam habent difficultatem ad frangendum ieiunium suum, nec ullo errore simili afficiuntur. Item alii sunt qui ieiunant ad impetrandos filios ab Idolis etc. Nec tali errore ligati sunt, ergo error iste, quod amittant merita, non est specialis ratio annexa observantiae ieiunii Sinici, ut non possit a ieiunio separari. Tolli igitur potest talis error a mente aliquorum ieiunantium, per doctrinam missionarii, sicuti et tolluntur plures alii errores, et maioris momenti, ut vg. est error ille, quo putant Idolum esse Deum, aut hominem posse salvum fieri sine fide in Christum etc. Et ablatis omnibus erroribus baptizari deinde possunt Infideles, praecedente ex usu Ecclesiae detestatione illa universali daemonis, et omnium superstitionum.

R<esponde>o 2º. Si qui essent populi, qui comederent carnes, pisces, allia, caepasve [sic], ova, et vinum biberent in honorem et cultum Idoli, ac putarent se per tales comestiones et gratos esse daemoni, et in super multa sibi merita coacervare; et vel ipse Divus Paulus, si vellet hos homines convertere, quid putas facturus esset Apostolus? Prohiberetne esum rerum istarum, an potius tolleret errorem, et eos induceret, ut quoties comederent, vero Deo gratias referrent, quod ista procreaverit ad alendos homines, ut hi omni conatu servirent Deo, et salvi tandem fierent? Itaque et comestio et ieiunium materialiter se habent in Sinis; si motiva igitur ob quem fiunt sint erronea, tollatur error, et non prohibeatur ieiunium, tanquam in se malum habeat intrinsecum aut comestio; nisi aliud obstet, vel ratione scandali, vel alterius circumstantiae.

Confirmatur 5 nostra sententia. Ieiunium Sinense non ita se habet in Sinis, ac cultus illi adorandi spiritus illos, quos Sinae putent Tutelares Urbium; vel genuflexionis quotidianae quae fieret a famulo Christiano genuflectente Domino gentili ante Idola. Sed tum adoratio illa, tum genuflexio ista ante Idolum, adhuc purificari possunt ab Idololatria formali, et sic purificatae licite exerceri, a Christianis. Ergo multo magis ieiunium Sinense purificari potest a sua superstitione vel errore et licite sic purificatum perpetuari a Sinico ieiunante.

De Spiritibus, quos Sinae vocant Tutelares [77r] Urbium, constat,

ex Responsione P. Francisci Bardi, et Iosephi de Augustino Societatis Iesu et aliis Theologis Universitatis Collegii Panormitani, qui interrogati a P. Francisco Brancato in hunc modum responderunt: Data prius notitia populis, quod Deus assignaverit cuilibet urbi, vel Regno Unum Angelum Sanctum custodem ac tutelarem cuiuslibet urbis vel Regni; et quod Christiani exhibentes reverentias vel adorantes illum Spiritum tutelarem Urbis, intendant adorare Angelum Sanctum Custodem illius urbis, sub hac formalitate et protestatione, possunt Christiani intervenire illis processionibus, et adorare illam imaginem, adorando in ea Angelum Tutelarem (decerpsi ex litteris originalibus datis 17 Maii 1642).

De Genuflexione vero famuli Christiani genuflectente Domino gentili ante Idola, constat ex decisione Theologorum Romanorum, qui ex mandato R.P. G. Claudii Aquavivae, dubio proposito a Patribus Iaponiae: an Christiano famulo liceat genua flectere ante Idolum, posito quod famulum stare, quando dominus gentilis genua flectit est maxima inurbanitas, et hanc praecipiat dominus genuflexionem non in contemptum nostrae fidei, sed ut alia servitia: In hunc modum responderunt: Licere, potest enim tunc famulus genuflectere praestando cultum suo soli Domino, sive aliqui sint praesentes sive non.

Sententiam meam sapientiori iudicio submitto.