

To Wear or Not to Wear a Hat During Mass? The Canton Conference and Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis SJ's Report of 1668

Thierry Meynard SJ* and Yang Hongfan**
*Sun Yat-sen University, Canton**
*KU Leuven***

During the Canton Conference, held from 18 December 1667 to 26 January 1668, Dominican, Franciscan, and Jesuit missionaries debated a great range of pastoral issues. We have already analysed their controversy about admitting to baptism the so-called fasters or vegetarians, and we have shown how this intersects with anthropological, cultural, religious, and political questions in the context of the Sino-Christian encounter in the early Qing.¹

Another controversy was about wearing a hat during Mass or not, a question, which also had cultural, religious and political dimensions. This bears also upon a philosophical question about a sign having opposite meanings in two cultures: wearing a hat as a sign of respect in China but a sign of disrespect in the West. In his study on the Chinese liturgy, François Bontinck (1920–2005) had already presented the issue of the hat, as well as six or seven related documents produced during the Canton Conference or just after.² Here we would like to make a further investigation of the issue, bringing to light documents that were overlooked by Bontinck, such as the two letters of Domenico Maria Sarpetri (1623–83), the

* Thierry Meynard is professor at the Philosophy department of Sun Yat-Sen University and executive 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-edited *A Brief Introduction to the Study of Human Nature* (Brill, 2020). This research has received the financial support of the Research program fund of Sun Yat-sen University for the project "Canton and early sinology".

** Yang Hongfan is a postdoctoral researcher at the department of Sinology, KU Leuven. She obtained her PhD on religious studies at Peking University in 2019. Her doctoral dissertation is a study of ritual interactions of the Catholic Church in China from 1583 to 1720.

1 Meynard, "Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized?", 3–74; "Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? Part 2", 285–342.

2 See Bontinck, *La Lutte autour de la liturgie chinoise*, 40–42.

treatise by Jacques Le Faure, and Prospero Intorcetta's answer to Adrien Grelon.³ Based on a dozen documents that we could identify, mostly unpublished, we shall first provide an outline on how the debate evolved, with several persons involved and documents being produced. The report by Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis stands out as very informative, and we present here its annotated translation with a transcription of the original Latin.⁴

The 42-Point Version of the *Practical Norms*

Because wearing a hat in China is a mark of respect, when the Flemish Jesuit Nicolas Trigault (1577–1628) returned to Europe, he made a special request to the Pope.⁵ On 27 June 1615, with the Brief *Romanæ Sedis Antistes*, Pope Paul V (r. 1605–21) authorized the missionaries in China to wear a hat, later called *jijin* 祭巾 in Chinese, during holy services. Some fifty years later, during the Canton conference, the question of the hat was extended to the faithful: should they wear a hat during Mass? It is important to notice the difference of names applying to different hats. In the documents by the missionaries, the hat for the priest is called *viretum* in Latin or *vireto* in Spanish, while the hat for the Chinese faithful is called *pileum* in Latin or *pileo* in Spanish.

The Canton Conference adopted the *Practical Norms discussed in the full assembly of twenty-three priests (Praxes quaedam discussae in pleno coetu 23 Patrum)*. Those norms were sent to Macao, addressed to Luis da Gama, who between 1664 and 1670 was the Jesuit Visitor for Japan and China.⁶ Da Gama had five sets of documents prepared, which were all authenticated by him on 10 December 1668, and sent to Rome through five different maritime routes.

Paul Rule pointed out that two different versions of the *Practical Norms* are found in the Roman Jesuit Archives, one in 41 points and another in 42 points, and the difference concerns precisely the issue

3 Jacques Le Faure * 20.III.1613, SJ 8.I.1630, + 20.I.1675, *DHCJ* III, 2302–03. Prospero Intorcetta, * 28.XII.1625 Piazza Armerina, SJ 31.XII.1642 Messina, + 3.X.1692 Hangzhou, *DHCJ* III, 2059–60. Adrien Grelon * 29.IV.1618 Aubeterre, SJ 1.VI.1643, + 3.III.1696 Jiangxi, *DHCJ* II, 1812.

4 Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis * 1609/1610 Cuneo, SJ 22.X.1624 Genova, + 1671 Anqing, *DHCJ* II, 1055.

5 Nicolas Trigault * 3.III.1577 Douai, SJ 9.XI.1594 Tournai, + 14.XI.1628 Hangzhou, *DHCJ* IV, 3838–39.

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

of wearing the hat or not during Mass; however, according to Rule, the differences between the two versions were not substantial. Indeed, he chose to focus his own analysis on the two major questions of funerals and the ritual to Confucius.⁷ Here, instead, we shall analyze in more detail the discrepancy between the two versions, which points to a substantial change.

In the 42-point version approved by Da Gama, there are two regulations, Numbers 20 and 22, specifically dealing with the hat, but it is important to read Numbers 20, 21, and 22 in sequence to understand their connection:

20. If the one serving the priest at the altar wears the surplice, he should serve with his head uncovered; but with the hat if he does not wear the surplice.

21. In the ministry of Mass, the use of surplice should not be abolished.

22. When neophytes receive communion, they should uncover their head. But when they attend Mass, they should wear a hat. However, if someone out of poverty does not have a hat, he should not be reproved because of this.⁸

Clearly, Numbers 20 and 21 determine the dress code of the altar server. It is presupposed that the foreign priest who is the main servant of Mass wears a hat all the time according to the papal authorization of 1615. Number 20 allows the altar server to wear a hat on condition that he does not wear at the same time the surplice, but Number 21 somehow cancels out the allowance of the hat since the altar server should preferably wear the surplice. In his report dated 9 April 1668, the Franciscan Antonio a Santa Maria Caballero (1602–69) gives an explanation for this seeming contradiction: the missionaries had first passed the resolution Number 20. However, shortly after (at least before the end of the conference on 26 January 1668), they found out that one of the previous Jesuit Visitors of Japan and China had decreed that lay people serving at the altar

7 Rule, *K'ung-tzu or Confucius?*, 290.

8 *Praxes quaedam* in 42 points; ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, f. 2v: "20. Qui Sacerdoti ad Altare operanti inservit, si sit superpelliceo indutus, inserviat capite discooperto; secus si sine superpelliceo. 21. In Missae ministerio non abrogetur usus superpellicei. 22. Accedentes ad Sacram Communionem neophyti caput discooperiant: in Missa autem pileati assistant. Si quis tamen ob inopiam pileo careret, non id illi exprobetur". Other manuscript: *Jap. Sin.* 162, ff. 259r–261v (tertia via); Printed version: Anonymous, *Acta Cantonensia Authentica*, [no place of publication], 1700, 26–27.

should always wear a surplice, so that Number 21 was added.⁹ While Number 20 intended to allow altar servers to wear a hat as a form of inculturation (but without wearing the surplice), Number 21 was now enforcing that altar servers should wear the surplice, thus their head automatically being uncovered.

Number 22 also has an internal flaw since it requires Chinese Catholics to wear a hat during Mass to express respect, except during the reception of Holy Communion, when they should remove the hat to show respect. In other words, respect is shown both by having a hat and by removing the hat. This brings an interesting case about the function of a sign. We may conceive that the same sign or gesture has opposite meanings according to different contexts, but in this case, the context bears a strong unity in terms of action (the liturgy of the whole Mass), unity of the place (a church or chapel) and unity of the participants (the priest, the altar server and the faithful). Therefore, it is difficult to imagine that wearing a hat could have an opposite meaning only during the reception of Holy Communion. Because the cultural traditions of China and the West assign opposite meanings to wearing a hat, it is in fact impossible to harmonize the two, as Number 22 attempts to do very clumsily.

It would seem that the regulations reflect a state of unstable balance between two factions: a majority supporting Chinese Catholics wearing a hat during Mass, and a significant push from a minority to restrict wearing the hat during the reception of Holy Communion, reverting to the Western practice.

The 41-Point Version of the *Practical Norms*

In fact, the contradictions between Numbers 20, 21, and 22 were not due to the missionaries, who could hardly have made such a gross mistake. De Ferrariis as secretary of the Conference had prepared the official document of the *Practical Norms*, and sent it to Macao, but he later discovered that Da Gama in Macao had changed Numbers 20 and 22. De Ferrariis sent a letter of complaint directly to the Superior General Giovanni Paolo Oliva (r. 1664–81):¹⁰

9 See Antonio a Santa Maria Caballero, “Tratado que se remito al mui R[everen]do P[adr]e Luis Da Gama de la Comp[añ]ia de Jesus sobre algunos puntos tocantes a esta mision de la gran China”, signed with seal, and dated 9 April 1668, Canton; complete original with signature and seal, including quotes in Chinese: APF, SRC Indie Orientali e Cina, vol 1 (1623–74), ff. 272r–299r (see f. 273v).

10 Giovanni Paolo Oliva * 4.X.1600 Genova, SJ 21.XII.1616 Rome, † 26.XI.1681 Rome, *DHCJ* II, 1633–42.

He [Da Gama], under the pressure of the writings of especially two or three of us, changed two points, without consulting the other religious [Dominicans and Franciscans], and against the will of the entire Vice-Province. Therefore, besides the copy that the Father Visitor is going to send to Your Paternity [Superior General], we are also sending this copy to Your Paternity in the name of the Vice-Province [...] Since Numbers 20 and 22 apparently bear some contradiction, we send those numbers reduced to a single point, consisting in a better practice with some persuasive reasons. We are sending this to Your Paternity with the names of the priests who have approved it, so that you may decide with care what is suitable to the Glory of God.¹¹

In reaction to the changes brought by Da Gama, the majority of the missionaries in Canton agreed now that the Chinese Christians, the priests celebrating Mass, and the altar servers were all to wear a hat during the whole Mass. The corrective document is still kept at ARSI:

Numbers 20 and 22 should be corrected this way: Since to remove the hat does not mean any mark of respect for the Chinese, but on the contrary, every external veneration towards a person and a real or believed divinity is always expressed by the Chinese with the head covered, and since the Christian mysteries request the highest respect to be marked by all the people being present, even the pagans, therefore the neophytes, either attending the Holy Sacrifice, or serving the priest officiating, or even approaching for Holy Communion, should always be covered with a hat out of respect for such a mystery.¹²

11 *Acta Cantonensia Authentica*, 44: "Qui duas ex iis (peculiaribus duorum, vel trium nostrorum scriptis impulsus, ex eorum sensu) mutavit, inconsultis aliorum Ordinum religiosus, & tota V. Provincia reluctantante. Ideo praeter illud earum exemplar, quod ipse Pater Visitor mittet ad Vestram Paternitatem, aliud V. Provinciae nomine ad eandem Vestram Paternitatem mittimus...Et quoniam numeri 20 & 22 vere aliquam dissonantiamftr praeseferre videntur, eos numeros ad unum redactos & in meliorem praxim compositos, cum rationibus, quae id persuadent, & eorum Patrum nominibus, qui idem censuerunt seorsim mittimus ad Vestram Paternitatem V. Provinciae nomine, ut pro sua prudentia id statuat quod ad majorem Dei Gloriam convenire judicabit". The letter is from 1668, but without more precise date.

12 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, f. 5r.

19. Via.
 Anno 1668. Numeri 20. et 22. sic debent emendari.
 cum 32
 Cum apud Sinos pileum è capite deponere nulla sit reverentia:
 quia in ipso omnis externa veneratio tam homini, quam vero,
 aut peccato Humani secto capite semper à Sinis exhibetur. Chri-
 stiana autem mysteria summam exigant reverentiam, quæ pro-
 sentibus etiam et hinc probetur. Hæretici sive tanto sacrificio
 assueti, sive sacerdoti sacris operanti insensentes, sive etiam
 ad sacram Communionem accedentes, ob tanti mysterii reveren-
 tiam semper caput pileo rectum gerant.

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Antonius à Souza | Felicius Laheo |
| Superior domus Sants- | V. Brovic Sincopij |
| niensis. | Prepositus Brovicij. |
| Petrus Canearius | Fr. Dominicus de |
| Franciscus Branatus | Naustrada Pizky. |
| Jacobus Nobel. | Stanislaus Terrons |
| Vincentius Herdrius. | Jacobus Le faure. |
| Philippus Couplet | Claudius motz |
| | Fr. Dominicus Maria de S. P. |
| | Franciscus Rougemont. |
| | Joannes Dominicus Labiani |
| | Joannes Franciscus Ferrarius. |

Este he o Anexo original de
 faco mencao no fim do S.º de da 6ª.
 Carta do marçõ de 1.ª Via - Macas
 10. de Dezembro de 1668.

Guiz da Gama

According to this correction, a revised version of the *Practical Norms* was produced, with only 41 regulations: the previous Number 20 was deleted entirely; the content of Number 21 was maintained and became Number 20; Number 22 was replaced with the correction mentioned above and became Number 21.¹³ This correction had the advantage of clarity, imposing the hat on all. All the previous considerations about the reception of communion, the surplice of the altar servers, and the faithful too poor to buy a hat were eliminated.

Unfortunately, we have not found traces of Numbers 20–21–22 which were initially voted before the changes made by Da Gama, but we can reconstruct them and compare them with the alteration by Da Gama and the correction by the majority of the missionaries in Canton:

13 See ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 162, f. 254r.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Reconstruction of Numbers 20–21–22, January 1668 | <i>Praxes quaedam</i> in 42 points; ARSI, <i>Jap. Sin.</i> 158, f. 2v (alteration by Da Gama in Macao, Spring 1668) | <i>Praxes quaedam</i> in 41 points; ARSI, <i>Jap. Sin.</i> 162, f. 254r (correction by the majority in Canton, September–October 1668) |
| 20. The one serving the priest at the altar should <u>serve with his head covered, even if he wears the surplice.</u> | 20. If the one serving the priest at the altar wears the surplice, he should <u>serve with his head uncovered</u> ; but with the hat if he does not wear the surplice. | — |
| 21. In the ministry of Mass, the use of surplice should not be abolished. | 21. In the ministry of Mass the use of surplice should not be abolished. | 20. In the ministry of Mass the use of surplice should not be abolished. |
| 22. <u>When neophytes attend Mass, they may cover their head, even during the reception of Holy Communion.</u> However, if someone out of poverty does not have a hat, he should not be reproved because of this. | 22. <u>When neophytes receive communion, they should uncover their head. However, when they attend Mass, they should wear a hat.</u> However, if someone out of poverty does not have a hat, he should not be reproved because of this. | 21. Since to remove the hat does not mean any mark of respect for the Chinese, but on the contrary, every external veneration towards a person and a real or believed divinity is always expressed by the Chinese with the head covered, and since the Christian mysteries request the highest respect to be marked by all the people being present, even the pagans, therefore <u>the neophytes, either attending the Holy Sacrifice, or serving the priest officiating, or even approaching for Holy Communion, should always be covered with a hat</u> out of respect for such a mystery. |

The correction of the missionaries in Canton is followed by the original signatures of fifteen priests, among whom were thirteen Jesuits: the vice-provincial Feliciano Pacheco, the superior of the house António de Gouvea, as well as another Portuguese Stanislaio Torrente, four Italians de Ferrariis, Pietro Canevari, Giovanni Domenico Gabiani, and Francesco Brancati, three French Claude Motel, Jacques Motel, and Jacques Le Faure, the Austrian Christian Herdrich, and two Flemish Philippe Couplet and François de Rougemont.¹⁴

This means that six Jesuits in Canton did not sign. Prospero Intorcetta, a strong advocate for inculturation, did not sign the corrective document probably because he had already left Canton, and this would mean that the correction was voted after August 1668.¹⁵ According to a letter of de Ferrariis, five Jesuits opposed wearing the hat: Adrien Grelon who wrote the treatise against the hat, two other French Jesuits Jean Valat and Humbert Augery, one Italian Andrea-Giovanni Lubelli, and one Portuguese Manuel Jorge.¹⁶ When Intorcetta left Canton, he was replaced there by the French Jesuit Germain Macret who stressed the undesirability of

14 Feliciano Pacheco * 1622 Braga, SJ 1636 Coimbra, † V.VI.1687, *DHCJ* III, 2939–40. António da Gouvea * 1592 Casal, SJ 2.V.1608–11 probably Coimbra, † 14.II.1677 Fuzhou, *DHCJ* II, 1792. Stanislaio Torrente * c. 1616 Orvieto, SJ 28.V.1633 Rome, † 30.III.1681 Haikou, *DHCJ* IV, 3817. Pietro Canevari * 1596 Genova, SJ 3.X.1622 Rome, † 1675 Nanchang, *DHCJ* I, 632–33. Giovanni Domenico Gabiani * 23.IV.1623 Niza, SJ 15.IX.1639 Rome, † 24.X.1694 Yangzhou, *DHCJ* II, 1545. Francesco Brancati * 1607 Palermo, SJ 14.VIII.1623 Naples, † 25.IV.1671 Canton, *DHCJ* I, 521–22. Claude Motel * 27.V.1618 Compiègne, SJ 8.XI.1638 Avignon, † 17.X.1671 Ganzhou, *DHCJ* III, 2752. Jacques Motel * 10.VIII.1619 Compiègne, SJ 8.XI.1638 Avignon, † 2.VIII.1692 Wuhan, *DHCJ* III, 2752. Christian Herdrich * 25.VI.1625 Peggau, SJ 27.X.1641 Vienna, † 17.VII.1684 Jiangzhou, *DHCJ* II, 1906. Philippe Couplet * 31.V.1623 Manilas, SJ 11.X.1640 Brussel, † 16.V.1693 Goa, *DHCJ* II, 986–87. François de Rougemont * 2.VIII.1624 Maastricht, SJ 29.IX.1641 Malinas, † 6.XI.1676 Changzhou, *DHCJ* IV, 3422.

15 The *Acta Cantoniensa Authentica* did mention that Intorcetta had signed, but this probably means that, when he was in Rome, he expressed his support for the correction; see p. 46.

16 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 162, ff. 211r–212v (2a via); 213r–214v (1a via) (Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis, Letter in Italian to Jesuit Superior General Oliva, Canton, 6 October 1668). Jean Valat * 16.IX.1614? Le Puy, SJ 22.IV.1632, † 7.X.1696 Jinan, Dehergne, *Répertoire des jésuites*, 278–79. Humbert Augery * 1618, SJ 20.IX.1634 Avignon, † 7.VII.1673 Hangzhou, *DHCJ* I, 269–70. Andrea-Giovanni Lubelli * 1611 Lecce, SJ 30.III.1628 Naples, † 2.XI.1685 Macao, *DHCJ* III, 2432. Manuel Jorge * 1621 Coimbra, SJ 1638 Coimbra, † 28.IX.1677 Nanjing, Dehergne, *Répertoire des jésuites*, 132.

variations in liturgical practice. Macret thus joined the minority group, making a total of six Jesuits against wearing the hat.¹⁷

On the side of the Dominicans, Domingo Navarrete (1618–89) quite surprisingly signed the correction (he was firmly against the rituals to Confucius and to the ancestors), as well as Domenico Maria Sarpetri, but not Filippo Leonardo Valentino OP (1627–77). Santa Maria did not sign either.

Da Gama had received from Canton the correction about Numbers 20 and 22 with the signatures, and he authenticated the original document and its copies on 10 December 1668, with the other documents to be sent to Rome. Yet, concerning the resolutions of the Conference, he sent to Rome the 42-point version, and he did not include the 41-point version, which truly represents the majority view. Quite understandably, the Jesuits in Canton had already lost confidence in Da Gama, and de Ferrariis, as secretary of the Conference, sent directly to the Superior General the correction about Numbers 20 and 22 and the version in 41-points, with a letter of complaint about Da Gama, as mentioned above.

The Franciscan Antonio a Santa Maria Caballero and His Opposition to the Hat

Besides the two versions of the *Practical Norms*, other documents were produced discussing specifically the question of the hat. In order to situate de Ferrariis's report, we are briefly presenting and discussing related documents: the reports and letters of two opponents to the hat, the Franciscan Santa Maria and the Jesuit Grelon; the letters and reports of the Dominicans Sarpetri and Navarrete, and of the Jesuits Le Faure, Rougemont and Intorcetta, all in favour of it.

At the end of the Conference on 26 January 1668, Santa Maria had refused to sign because of his disagreement about admitting fasters to baptism (Number 6), about wearing a hat while receiving communion (Numbers 20 and 22), and about practicing the rituals to Confucius and to ancestors (Number 41). He prepared for Da Gama a treatise in Spanish, dated 9 April 1668, to explain his position. Concerning his opposition to the hat, he lists 12 points:

(1) In the resolutions of the Canton Conference, Number 21 was

¹⁷ See Cummins, *A Question of Rites*, 148. In a letter dated 18 December 1668, Rougemont mentions that four Jesuits were against wearing the hat, but without giving names; ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 162, ff. 249r–250v; published in Bosmans, "Lettres inédites", 38–40. Germain Macret * 13.VIII.1620 Bourg-en-Bresse, SJ 3.IX.1637 Avignon, † 4.IX.1676 Fuzhou, Dehergne, *Répertoire des jésuites*, 160.

later added between 20 and 22. (2) He has always adhered to the view that wearing a hat may have been justified under the Ming dynasty, but this has become obsolete (*derogata*) under the Qing, which has adopted a different hat. (3) The practice of wearing a hat is not universal; youth before their graduation do not wear a hat in general, and when they attend Mass, this does not cause any scandal. (4) The Jesuit Adam Schall once brought a Christian painting to the Shunzhi emperor who paid respect to it by removing his hat.¹⁸ (5) Removing one's hat in the tribunal is not necessarily a recognition of guilt but a show of respect to the judge; he (Santa Maria) attended the ceremony of Holy Friday once in Beijing and saw Adam Schall removing his hat to pay respect to the Cross; from this, it could be deducted that it should be possible to pay respect to the Body of Christ by uncovering the head. (6) If there is any recognition of crime, it is not in front of a secular power but in front of God. (7) There is an incoherence between the head being covered during the Mass and being uncovered for Holy Communion, both as expressions of respect. (8) According to the current practice, Catholics go to Mass without any obligation pertaining to the hat. (9) The reasons for the papal authorization allowing priests to wear a hat have ceased to exist. (10) Catholic liturgy should be clearly distinguished from local pagan practices, and this has obliged the Church to abandon some vestments for the priests and bells for the churches. (11) Chinese Catholics can easily accept that priests take off their hat, as a Jesuit in Nanjing has done before being admonished by his confreres. (12) The hat of the priest is too similar to the hat used by Chinese during popular plays. Finally, Santa Maria declares that when he and the other Franciscans come back to their missions, they will say Mass with their head uncovered.¹⁹

As we can see, in reaction to promoting the hat for all Catholics, even during Holy Communion, Santa Maria goes in the opposite direction and affirms that, not only should Catholics uncover their heads during Mass, but also even the priests should take off their hats, even though permission to wear them had been granted by the Pope in 1615.

Perhaps Santa Maria doubted whether Da Gama would forward the aforementioned treatise to Superior General Oliva, and on

18 Adam Schall * 1.V.1592 Colonia, SJ 21.X.1611 Rome, + 15.VIII.1666 Beijing, *DHCJ* IV, 3514–16.

19 Santa Maria, "Tratado". APF, SRC Indie Orientali e Cina, vol 1 (1623–74), ", ff. 273v-276r.

14 November 1668, he wrote directly to Oliva, giving additional information. For example, Santa Maria saw altar servants not wearing a hat in Beijing. He mentions also that Intorcetta had told him in Canton that upon his arrival at Jianchang 建昌 in Jiangxi, some Catholics wore the hat and others did not, and Intorcetta asked them to determine for themselves the best uniform practice; he observes that the faithful opted for attending Mass with the head uncovered and have kept this practice since then. Yet, concerning the hat of the priest, Santa Maria notices that Intorcetta is one of the most attached to it. Santa Maria states that Da Gama and all the Jesuit Visitors before him have always judged it better that Chinese Catholics receive Holy Communion with their heads uncovered, but Santa Maria complains that Intorcetta and the other Jesuits are now attempting to have Chinese Catholics with their heads covered while receiving communion. Santa Maria here refers to the 41-point version, which indeed makes such an imposition. He also mentions that in November 1668, Da Gama had ordered all Jesuits in Canton to uncover their head during prayers before and after Mass, and while reciting the Litanies (Santa Maria himself never wore the hat). The majority of the Jesuits were attached to the hat and protested in writing three or four times to Da Gama, but the Visitor obliged them to obey.²⁰

As we can see, the question of the hat became more and more polarized, with now the majority of missionaries in Canton requesting that the Chinese faithful wear the hat at Mass at all times, even when receiving communion. On the opposite side, Santa Maria was pushing for the hat to be completely abolished, not only for Chinese Catholics, but also for the priests. Santa Maria was certainly satisfied to see that Da Gama was leaning towards his position by requesting Chinese Catholics to receive Holy Communion with their heads uncovered and forcing the Jesuits in Canton to take off their hats before and after Mass. This move could certainly be perceived as a direct threat to the very existence of the priest's hat, or *jijin*.

The Jesuit Adrien Grelon and His Opposition to the Hat

Grelon is the only Jesuit who wrote a treatise against the hat. Indeed, he was the one who brought the issue to Da Gama's attention after

20 Santa Maria, dated 9 December 1668, ff. 299v–312v, APF, SRC Indie Orientali e Cina, vol 1 (1623–74), ff. 272r–299r. For the transcription, see *Sinica Franciscana*, vol. 9 part. 2, 1019–30.

the Canton Conference and successfully convinced him to change the wording of Numbers 20 and 22. His treatise is titled “Whether it is correct and expedient that Chinese Christians attend Mass and serve the officiating priest with their head uncovered”.²¹

Grelon starts his treatise with four preliminary considerations: (1) before the Manchus came, male Chinese were wearing hats like women but now they shave their foreheads and leave a queue hanging; (2) though Chinese have kept their ancestral customs, they have relaxed their severity, and many have their head uncovered; (3) the first missionaries decided that Chinese should come to Mass with head uncovered and this holy practice was observed until some missionaries obliged them to wear the hat; (4) Chinese do not disdain removing the hat during Mass. The third consideration is quite controversial because Grelon claims that Chinese were forced by the priests to wear the hat, while de Ferrariis claims that they themselves were eager to wear the hat.

Grelon insists with four arguments that Chinese should uncover their head during Mass: (1) in 1 Corinthians 11:4, Saint Paul requested males to uncover their heads while praying to God; (2) the practice of the universal church is to uncover the head; (3) all the images in the churches of China show the saints and apostles with head uncovered; (4) according to the earliest regulations set down by the first missionaries, Chinese Catholics should make Confession and receive Holy Communion with their heads uncovered, and this rule was recently confirmed by the Conference of twenty-three priests. In fact, Grelon does not tell all the truth. According to the initial formulation of Number 22, Chinese Catholics should uncover their heads while receiving communion, but Grelon hides the fact that they should wear the hat during the rest of the Mass.

Grelon continues with three objections and their refutations. The first objection is the authority of Ricci, who had mandated the practice of the hat. In response, Grelon argues that China’s political and social environment had changed, along with the status of the Catholic Church in China since Ricci’s time. The second objection is that not wearing a hat is perceived in China as disrespectful, however, Grelon rejects the resolutions of the twenty-three priests, which he had initially signed, instead stating that the liturgical forms of respect towards God in the Church overrides all other

21 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, ff. 25r–28v (1a via), 29r–32v (2a via) and 33r–36v (5a via); BNCR Mss. *Fondo Gesuitico* 1257/18 (Adrien Grelon, “An deceat et expedit Christianos Sinas aperto capite Sacro interesse et Sacerdoti sacris operanti ministrare”).

considerations. Grelon finds support in the case of the Muslims in China who have kept their faith immune from external customs. The third objection is that it is much easier to obtain a uniformity of practice by requesting that all Catholics wear a hat at Mass rather than by requesting that none of them wear a hat. Grelon answers that if the Chinese were free to choose, they would decide unanimously for not wearing the hat. Here Grelon does not mention Intorcetta but, certainly, this refers to the experiment at Jianchang, as mentioned by Santa Maria in his letter. As we shall see below, Intorcetta felt later the need to reply.

Grelon ends with a corollary explaining that the missionaries who defend the hat for the faithful are in fact defending the papal authorization of the *jijin* for the priest. Yet Grelon refrains from saying that the papal authorization should be cancelled.

Grelon wrote also an "Appendix to the treatise on the Chinese using or not the hat in the church."²² The appendix is almost as long as the treatise itself. Both documents are undated and were authenticated by Da Gama on 10 December 1668. In the Appendix, Grelon answers a few points of the treatise of de Ferrariis (1, 12, 22, 23, 24), therefore we can infer that the Appendix was written between 10 October and 10 December 1668. Grelon first questions the importance given to Chinese culture since Chinese themselves have already adopted many customs from the Manchu. Second, Grelon returns to the command of Saint Paul to the Corinthians and sees this command as a divine law valid everywhere and overriding all local customs. In contrast, Saint Paul's statement "I have become all things to all" (*omnibus omnia factus sum*; 1 Corinthians 9:22) is not absolute but has limits and restrictions, otherwise absurd conclusions should follow, such as missionaries have to smoke tobacco and grow long nails like the Chinese. Some missionaries argue that the papal authorization for the priest to wear a hat logically implies that the Chinese faithful can also wear a hat, but Grelon refutes this conclusion, since the papal allowance was given to priests alone. Grelon mentions that the practice of wearing a hat to show respect is not universally followed in China, and he mentions an event which he recently saw from the window of the Jesuit residence in Canton. He witnessed a neighbour welcome some Buddhist monks in front of his house, by making some offerings and touching the

22 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, ff. 37r–40v (5a via), 41r–43v (1a via), and 45r–47v (2a via) (Grelon, "Appendix dissertationis de pileo sinico in templo a Christianis gestando vel non gestando").

ground with his head while the monks were singing prayers. Then, the neighbor and all the people around removed their hat. All of the missionaries who were present could see this. In light of the scene just described, Grelon asks if there is a problem in allowing Chinese Catholics to remove their hats during Mass. Grelon mentions also that tea (*cha*) according to the Manchu ritual should be consumed with head uncovered. Similarly, when the Jesuits in Beijing meet a Manchu prince with his head uncovered, they remove their hat to show him respect. Finally, he argues, just because some bishops in Europe may celebrate with their mitre, it does not follow that the priests and faithful are allowed to wear a hat. This refers obviously to bishops of non-Latin rite.

The Dominicans Domenico Maria Sarpetri and Domingo Navarrete in Support of the Hat

After Intorcetta had left Canton for Macao in August 1668, Sarpetri sent him two letters, with the surprising address: “Mi P.R. Procurador”. The two letters are written in Spanish, a language that was familiar to Sarpetri and Intorcetta, both Sicilian under the Spanish crown. The first letter is dated 25 September 1668. Sarpetri expresses great sadness about Visitor Da Gama’s move against hat wearing, and warns that if Da Gama does not recognize the decisions of the Conference in its entirety, this may destroy the commitment of the participating friars as well. Sarpetri informs Intorcetta that the majority of the missionaries had voted in favour of Chinese wearing the hat even for Holy Communion. This refers to the correction that we mentioned above. Finally, Sarpetri notes that Navarrete is writing a paper in favour of the hat.²³

The second letter by Sarpetri is dated 2 November 1668, also in Spanish, and requests Intorcetta to confirm the decisions of the Canton conference, a conference that Sarpetri calls *Concilio Nacional*, until the final decision of Rome.²⁴ As we can see, Sarpetri presses upon Intorcetta the necessity of maintaining the use of the hat to salvage the decisions of the Canton Conference, because without the hat, the entire agreement of January 1668 may collapse. If indeed the resolutions about the hat were now invalidated, for example,

23 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, f. 8rv (Domenico Maria Sarpetri, Letter to Prospero Intorcetta, 25 September 1668).

24 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 150, ff. 34r–34v (Sarpetri, Letter to Intorcetta, 2 November 1668). Excerpts quoted in *Acta cantoniensia* in original Spanish (55–56) with Latin translation (57–58).

Navarrete could claim no longer to be bound by the other resolutions, especially about the rituals to Confucius and to ancestors.

Meanwhile Navarrete had sent a report to Da Gama dated 9 October 1668, titled, “Whether it is fitting that Christians in China attend Mass with the head covered.”²⁵ As Cummins remarks, Navarrete was “in the exhilarating position of spokesman for the majority of the Jesuits and friars”.²⁶ In his *Controversias* (1679), Navarrete mostly reproduces his report of 1668. Like in many of his other writings, the composition is not well structured and full of repetitions. He is strongly opposed to Chinese Catholics practising the rituals to Confucius and to ancestors and he is also opposed to the baptism of fasters, but on the question of the hat, he accepts the Chinese custom of wearing the hat. He quotes Numbers 20, 21 and 22 from the 42-point version of the *Practical Norms* approved by Da Gama according to which Chinese Catholics should wear the hat during Mass except when they receive communion; in fact, he defends the 41-point version, which prescribes wearing the hat at Mass, even during communion.²⁷

This is consistent with the correction that Navarrete and Sarpetri had signed, as discussed above. Navarrete mentions that he himself saw the Chinese practice of wearing a hat being observed in provinces as well as in the capital. Since the Jesuits had received from Paul V permission to wear a hat during Mass, the Dominicans in China have always adopted the policy of having the priest and all the Chinese Catholics wearing a hat during religious services (except confession). In support of this policy, Navarrete quotes the Church Fathers such as Saint Augustin and other theologians.²⁸ Without mentioning the name of Santa Maria, Navarrete rejects the argument that the hat worn by Catholics is too similar to the hat used during popular plays. For him, any such similarity between them does not call for changing the shape of the hat, even less for discarding the hat altogether. For Navarrete, the most important issue was the rituals to Confucius and to ancestors, and he saw no reason for changing the practice of the hat, which he considered a minor issue.

25 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 150, ff. 20r–27v; copy: *Jap. Sin.* 150, ff. 28r–33v (Domingo Navarrete, “Dudase si en China es conveniente que assistan los Christianos a la missa cubierta la cabeza”).

26 Cummins, *A Question of Rites*, 149.

27 Perhaps Navarrete did not have with him in Spain the 41-point version when he was writing from 1675 to 1677 the *Controversias*, partially published in 1679.

28 Navarrete, *Controversias*, Madrid, 219–227.

François de Rougemont's Recriminations against Luis Da Gama

On 18 December 1668, Rougemont wrote a letter in his capacity of consultor of the Vice-Province, addressed to the Superior General. Like de Ferrariis, he complained about Da Gama's unilateral change of position on hat wearing. Rougemont is quite severe about Da Gama, who he describes as having taken a decision on an issue "about which he has no practice or expertise".²⁹ He explains that Da Gama was influenced by the advice of four Jesuits, one Dominican (i.e., Leonardo) and one Franciscan (i.e., Santa Maria). In addition, Rougemont warned that Da Gama's interference might destroy any hope of reconciliation with the friars since Navarrete had declared himself not bound anymore by the terms of the conference. Sarpetri had expressed similar concerns, as discussed above.³⁰

Rougemont also complains that Da Gama had instructed the missionaries in Canton to recite the Litanies and the prayers before and after Mass with the head uncovered on the fallacious ground that wearing a hat is not a Catholic rite or pious behaviour.³¹ Da Gama requested absolute obedience from all, including Gouvea, the superior of the Jesuit community. As Bontinck remarks, the missionaries were worried that Da Gama would next invalidate the papal authorization for priests to celebrate Mass with a hat, and therefore they deemed it necessary to write directly to the Superior General.³²

Jacques Le Faure's Theological Analysis in Favour of the Hat

Le Faure completed his *On Chinese Rites (De sinensium ritibus)* in July 1669, which was approved by Gouvea on 4 March 1670, but published only in 1700 in Paris. It is written as a treatise of theology and history (*Dissertatio Theologico-historica*) and comprises five chapters. After some preliminary theological considerations (chapter 1, pp. 49–84), the object of Chinese piety is explained as *Shangdi* 上帝, *zhuzai* 主宰, *guishen* 鬼神, *shen* 神, etc. (chapter 2, pp. 85–190), and its practical forms (chapter 3, pp. 191–266), including the circumstances of place and manners (chapter 4, pp. 267–351). The final chapter is dedicated exclusively to the rituals to Confucius (chapter 5, pp. 352–428).

29 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 162, ff. 249r–250v; published in Bosmans, "Lettres inédites", 38–40.

30 See also Cummins, *A Question of Rites*, 157.

31 Bontinck, *La Lutte autour de la liturgie chinoise*, 125.

32 Bontinck, *La Lutte autour de la liturgie chinoise*, 126.

In Chapter 3, the question of the hat is the first item to be dealt with, before the subjects of bowing, kneeling, candles, animal killing, etc.³³ Le Faure starts by stressing the cultural importance of the hat in Chinese culture and quotes the historian Sima Guang 司馬光 (1019–86) about the capping ritual of young males (*guanli* 冠禮), as well as the *Summa of the Book of Rites* (*Liji daquan* 禮記大全), composed by Chen Hao 陳澹 (1260–1341), about the importance of the hat. He stresses that the Pope gave the authorization to change the Latin rite, allowing priests to wear a hat so that the highest respect may be shown during Mass. On the contrary, taking off the hat is a disgrace, a sign of culpability. Le Faure mentions that Armenians, Maronites, and Greek Orthodox during the Council of Florence (1431–49) were celebrating Mass covered with a hat under the eyes of the Pope.³⁴

Prospero Intorcetta's Late Response to Adrien Grelon

Intorcetta participated in the early debates about the hat, but he left Canton in August 1668 and was not directly involved in the debates between Santa Maria and Grelon on one side, and Sarpetri, Navarrete, Rougemont and Le Faure on the other side. Grelon's treatise against the hat was known by the other missionaries in Canton, so that Navarrete and Le Faure wrote partly in response to it. However, Grelon's Appendix was sent to Da Gama and not known by the other missionaries in Canton. In January 1669, Intorcetta in his role of procurator went to Europe with a set of documents of the Canton Conference, and he could surely read all the available documents. Intorcetta arrived in Rome at the end of 1670, and on 15 April 1671, he wrote a formal answer to Grelon's Appendix since the others in Canton could not do so.³⁵ As we shall see, there were also personal reasons for Intorcetta to write a formal answer.

In the beginning, Intorcetta makes three clarifications. First, he

33 There is a short document in two folios by Le Faure titled, *Caput discopertum non est reverentia apud Sinas, ex sententia P. Jacobi Le Faure; Jap. Sin.* 150: 56rv. The same ideas are found in the printed text.

34 Jacques Le Faure, *De Sinensium ritibus politicis acta...Dissertatio Theologico-historica de avita Sinarum pietate praesertim erga defunctos & eximia erga Confucium magistrum suum observantia*, Paris: Pépie, 1700; caput 3, numerus 1, 193–201.

35 *Jap. Sin.* 150, ff. 92r–95v (Prospero Intorcetta, "Responsio ad Appendicem Patris Adriani Grelon de Pileo Sinico a Christianis sinensibus gestando vel non gestando in Templis", Rome, 15 April 1671).

has never doubted whether the practice of assisting Mass with head uncovered could be introduced in China, because the Dominicans and Franciscans have, de facto, introduced changes in rituals contrary to the opinion of the Jesuits, but he doubted whether this practice could be introduced without causing inconvenience, irreverence, and scandal. Here Intorcetta not only replies to Grelon's Appendix but also to Santa Maria's letter which mentioned precisely how Intorcetta handled the question when he arrived in Jiangxi. Second, there is a consensus among the missionaries, including two Dominicans (i.e., Navarrete and Sarpetri) about the fact that an uncovered head is a sign of disrespect in China, and Intorcetta gives an excerpt of the decree of 1615 by Paul V, underlining two sentences: "In this region [China], to remain uncovered is not a sign of respect but of disrespect, and this would create not devotion but scandal", and "The Pope intends and declares this concession to last until something different is declared by the Holy See."³⁶ Intorcetta claims that it is not true that the priests first wore the hat and then the faithful imitated; in fact, it is because the Chinese were already wearing hats at Mass that the priest had to take up wearing a hat as well.³⁷ Third, Intorcetta dismisses Grelon's Appendix as bringing almost nothing new to the question, but he still wants to respond to it.

First, the key point for Intorcetta is that the Chinese, even under the Manchus' reign, consider wearing a hat as a sign of respect, and this point is confirmed by all except a few, such as Grelon, who lacked experience and had only recently arrived in China.

Second, even if the Manchus remove their hat while drinking tea, this does not mean that taking off the hat is a usual practice among the Chinese or Manchus.

Third, the non-Christian Chinese and Manchus always enter churches with covered heads, and Intorcetta mentions that while he was in Macao (i.e., in the second-half of 1668) he made the Chinese and Manchu officers visit the church (probably the Church of Saint Paul) and they paid respect to the Holy Images with their heads covered, in the presence of Da Gama. On this occasion, Intorcetta

36 *Jap. Sin.* 150, f. 92r (Intorcetta, "Responsio ad Appendicem"): "In illa Regione detecto capite manere vel operari non sit reverentia, sed irreverantia, et scandalum generet non devotionem...Quam concessionem idem S.D.N.P.P. intendit et declarat durare donec aliter non fuerit declaratum a Santa Sede".

37 Intorcetta wants to show that the hat was not something imposed by the priests, but his claim that the Chinese were wearing the hat before the Brief of Paul V contradicts what de Ferrariis says in his treatise.

confronted Da Gama and asked him why he would not allow Chinese cristian to wear the hat, but Da Gama did not want to listen to him. The next day, Intorcetta received instructions that the Chinese cristian who accompanied him, Paul Banhes (Wan Qiyuan), should not enter the church with a hat anymore.³⁸ He reported that after having delivered this directive to Banhes, Intorecetta perceived a great pain and sadness in his fellow cristian. Indeed, he wrote, Banhes could not sleep during the whole night and, in the early morning, he went to see Intorcetta without wearing a hat, though it was in winter. Almost weeping he asked if Intorcetta could help him to buy a European hat so that he could attend Mass with dignity. Further, Banhes could not salute Intorcetta in the Chinese way, telling him: “Without a hat, I cannot show my reverence” (*non est mihi pileum, ideo non audio exhibere solitam reverentiam*).³⁹ As we can see from the story of Paul Banhes/Wan Qiyuan, the hat was an essential element of Christian worship, regardless of whether the hat was Chinese or Western.

Intorcetta concedes that an objection may be raised: since Chinese Muslims remove shoes when entering the mosques, what is the problem for Chinese Catholics to take off their hat in church? Intorcetta replies that, because the Muslims abstain from pork and wine, no Chinese ever converts to Islam, although there are a few Muslims who leave their religion and join the Chinese literati; when they do so, they perform the rituals wearing a hat.

There is a second objection: the Chinese Catholics would unanimously choose, independently of any directives, to uncover their heads at Mass. This refers again to Intorcetta’s experiment at Jianchang, a point made by both Santa Maria and Grelon. Intorcetta acknowledges that he had wanted the Christians at Jianchang to achieve uniformity of practice and proposed that they adopt the European practice of attending Mass with uncovered heads. The majority of the faithful chose to attend Mass with their heads uncovered – as a sign of repentance for their sins towards God – while some continued to attend wearing their hats, and Intorcetta turned a blind eye. Intorcetta acknowledges that Grelon’s account of the experiment at Jianchang is true; however, he cautions, one should not make a general statement from this single case as Grelon did.

38 Paul Banhes, Wan Qiyuan 萬其淵 * 1631 Jianchang, SJ 1678 Hangzhou, † 8.X.1700 Shanghai, Dehergne, *Répertoire des jésuites*, 23.

39 *Jap. Sin.* 150, f. 93r (Intorcetta, “Responso ad Appendicem”).

The third objection deals with Saint Paul's precept about males having to wear a hat in the assembly, a point also mentioned by Grelon in his treatise. As Intorcetta points out, Saint Paul said that women should have the head covered, but Grelon did not say a word about women. For him, one should not understand Saint Paul's precept as absolute but should take into consideration circumstances. Grelon requests the strict application of a precept which is not even followed in Europe, where members of some religious congregations and elderly people wear the hat at Mass. Intorcetta quotes in Spanish a passage from the Life of Saint Gregory, where Pope Gregory the Great (c. 540–604) advises Saint Augustine of Canterbury (?–604) in the following terms: "Do not attach yourself to the customs you saw in the Roman church, but take from all parts what suits the situation and determine from England's needs what could benefit her more."⁴⁰ Since wearing a hat in China is a sign of respect, this should be adopted despite the Roman usage.

Finally, Intorcetta explains the reason why they decided to vote for a corrected version of the resolution on the hat (though he himself was not present): "to use uniformly the sign of reverence in all the sacred services which are to be done publicly."⁴¹ This means that people should attend Mass with the hat at all times, even when they receive communion. Finally, Intorcetta refers to the treatise written by the Vice-provincial (i.e., Le Faure) and another written by Navarrete. He adds a short corollary to explain that, since Da Gama followed the advice of Grelon and had changed the resolution on the hat, the Dominicans who were left uninformed decided to reject all the resolutions altogether. In the chapel of the Jesuit Residence, the Dominicans were attending Mass every day, always wearing the hat, and when Da Gama commended the Jesuits not to wear it, the Dominicans kept wearing the hat, so that the unseemliness (*diformitas*) of the liturgy was very apparent.

40 Pedro de Ribadeneira, "Vita Sancti Gregorii", in *Flos sanctorum de las vidas de los santos*, Rome, 1601, 246: "Que no se atasse a los usos que havia visto en la Iglesia Romana sino que tomasse de todas partes lo que conforme a la disposicion y necesidad de Inglaterra jusgasse que mas le podia aprovechar". For other mentions of the same passage, see also Prospero Intorcetta, *Disputatio apologetica de officiis et ritibus* (1668), BnF 409, f. 236; Prospero Intorcetta, *Testimonium de Cultu Sinensi*, 1668, Paris: Pépie, 1700, 270; Le Faure, *De Sinensium ritibus politicis acta*, 272.

41 *Jap. Sin.* 150, f. 95v (Intorcetta, "Responsio ad Appendicem"): "uniformiter usi signo reverentiae in illis omnibus sacris functionibus quae cum aliqua publicitate fieri assueverunt in Sinis."

Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis's Report and Correction of the Resolutions on the Hat

As we saw, the missionaries in Canton initially decided that Chinese Catholics should wear the hat during Mass, but that they should remove it while receiving communion. Following the advice of Grelon, Da Gama changed the resolution and requested the faithful to uncover their head during the entire Mass. The missionaries in Canton went to another extreme: Chinese Catholics should wear the hat during the entire Mass, even during communion. As secretary of the conference, de Ferrariis had redacted the *Practical Norms* in 42 points, and later the corrected version in 41 points. His role did not finish there and he took the step of composing a treatise about the hat. His overlooked treatise provides important historical information about the Catholic practice of wearing the hat during the Ming-Qing transition in terms of its political, cultural, and religious context.

At this point, a basic biography of the author is in order. Giovanni Francesco (also Gianfrancesco) de Ferrariis was from Cuneo in Piedmont, where he was born in 1609 or 1619.⁴² He was from nobility, as the son of the senator Giovanni Raffaele. When his mother passed away, he joined the Society of Jesus. On 22 October 1624, he entered the Society in Milan, being only around fifteen years old. Right after the two-year novitiate, on 23 May 1627, he sent the first of several letters to the Superior General in Rome, asking to be sent to the missions.⁴³ Permission was not immediately granted, and he studied philosophy and theology, probably in Milan. He sailed from Lisbon on 13 April 1635, together with Brancati. As he points out in his report, he had arrived in China during the Ming dynasty (in 1640) so he could witness the practices of the church before the Manchu rule. His Chinese name was Li Fangxi 李方西. Before the Canton exile, he was mostly active in Shaanxi 陝西 province where he was arrested in 1665, and after incarceration in Beijing, he arrived with the other missionaries in Canton on 25 March 1666. He was elected as secretary for the Canton Conference probably because of his mature age (59 years old), his long experience in China (28

42 Dehergne, *Répertoire des jésuites*, 71.

43 ARSI, *Fondo Gesuitico* 738, n. 58, 154; 739, n. 268. See Giuliano Bertuccioli, "Ferrariis Giovanni Francesco", *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani (DBI)*, Treccani/Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana fondata da Giovanni Treccani, vol. 46, 1996, 600–02. https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giovanni-francesco-ferrariis_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/

years), and his personality and writing skills. On 8 September 1671, the missionaries were finally allowed to return to their mission, but on his way to Shaanxi, Ferrariis died in Anqing 安慶, Anhui province, at the end of 1671. Later, his body was brought to Xi'an 西安. Apparently, he did not leave any writing in Chinese, but as secretary of the Canton Conference and the socius (assistant) of the vice-provincial, he penned the *Practical Norms* and wrote several letters to the Superior General.⁴⁴

His treatise in favour of the hat is called "Covering the head as a sign of respect in China" (*Apud Sinas in signum reverentiae tegendum esse caput*). The document was approved by Feliciano Pacheco, the vice-provincial on 10 October 1668, and it was followed by the correction of Numbers 20 and 22 of the *Practical Norms*, with the signature of thirteen Jesuits and two Dominicans, but without a date. Fortunately, the five copies of the treatise, authenticated by Da Gama on 10 December 1668 and sent from Macau are all present in the Roman Jesuit Archive.⁴⁵

The treatise consists of twenty-four points. The first part describes how wearing hats for the priest and the faithful came to be the normal practice in China (points 1 to 14). The second part describes five reasons, which gave rise to the controversy on the hat (points 15 to 20). The third part explains the reason for maintaining the ancient practice (points 21 to 23).

The first part explains the need for the missionaries to adapt to local cultures for the success of the mission, and especially in China, which is more isolated from the rest of the world (points 1 to 5). External veneration has no meaning by themselves but are conventions bound to particular cultures (point 6). In China, wearing a hat is the most important sign of respect (point 8), and even the Manchus have gradually accepted and followed this practice (point 9). Then, de Ferrariis explains the practice before and after the Brief of Paul V. Before the Brief, the liturgies were discrete, and the missionaries requested the faithful to uncover their heads

44 ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 162, ff. 207r–208v (2a via); 209r–210v (1a via) (Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis, 5 October 1668); ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 162, ff. 211r–212v (2a via); 213r–214v (1a via) (6 October 1668); ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 162, ff. 227r–229v (8 November 1668); ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 162, ff. 251r–252v (1a via) (29 December 1668); *Fondo Gesuitico* 730, ff. 103r–105v (20 February 1670).

45 ARSI *Jap. Sin.* 150, ff. 38r–41v (1a via); copies 42r–45v (3a via); 46r–49v (signed by Feliciano Pacheco with seal); *Jap. Sin.* 158, ff. 10r–17v (2a via) and 18r–24v (5a via). There is also another copy: BNCR Mss. *Fondo Gesuitico* 3386/1257/18, ff. 149r–154v, 163rv.

at Mass. After the Brief, the liturgies became more public, with the priests and the faithful both wearing hats (point 13 and 14).

In the second part, de Ferrariis analyses five reasons for the controversy, which are not grounded on any decision from the superiors, but on different personal views, which have progressively emerged. The first reason is the “nationalistic feeling” among newly arrived missionaries (point 15). The second reason is closely linked to this feeling: a zeal to impose European culture on the Chinese (point 16). The third reason is a mistaken appreciation of Adam Schall, who too hastily thought that the Manchus had abolished the custom of the hat and requested the faithful in Beijing and Northern China no longer to wear a hat during Mass (points 17 and 18). The fourth reason is a failure of the Chinese Vice-Province to properly train the newly arrived missionaries in understanding Chinese culture (point 19). The fifth reason is the docility of the faithful, especially in rural and poor areas, who do not dare to reject changes imposed by the priests (point 20).

The third part is the shortest, arguing for maintaining the ancient practice of the hat. First, the ethnocentric feelings of the missionaries should be abandoned for the sake of the salvation of all. Second, Catholic liturgy allows flexibility and it is not true that each rubric should be universally followed. Here de Ferrariis quotes a passage of Saint Augustine in support (points 21–23).

We can notice a strong anti-Manchu feeling in the treatise. This is easily explained by the anti-Christian campaign launched in the Manchu court in 1665, which led to the exile of almost all the missionaries in Canton. De Ferrariis suggests that the responsibility falls upon Adam Schall who became too close to the Manchus, giving an opportunity for the opponents to attack Christianity.

Finally, the treatise gives the correction brought to the resolutions on the hat, as we discussed above.

Conclusion

The treatise by de Ferrariis has been overlooked but it is an important document to understand the evolution of the liturgical practice in the Ming-Qing transition. It attests that before the Canton Conference, there was a diversity of practice, with some Chinese Catholics wearing the hat and others not during Mass. De Ferrariis provides five important explanations for the liturgical differences, some being cultural, others political or institutional. The Canton Conference is an important testimony about the radicalization of liturgical practices, with dividing lines opening up over whether

to wear the hat during the entire Mass – which was the view of the majority of the missionaries, including de Ferrariis – or whether to impose its total disappearance, according to the view of Da Gama, Grelon, Santa Maria, and others. The stakes were very high, since this question was not only determining rules for a particular community or area, but for all the Christian communities in China. With the occasion of Intorcetta's visit to Rome, on 30 July 1673, the authorization to attend Mass with the hat, both for the priests and the faithful, was confirmed.⁴⁶ The practice of hat wearing in the Christian religious context in China continued well into the nineteenth century, but then it abruptly disappeared when Western liturgical practices were uniformly applied.⁴⁷

Summary

The Chinese Rites Controversy has received a great deal of scholarly attention but other issues discussed at that time about how to adapt Christianity also merit further research. In this journal, we have already presented critically appraised transcriptions, with English translations, of texts concerning the little-known controversy over the baptism of fasters (or vegetarians), which erupted in 1688 at the Canton Conference. We present here a parallel debate about Chinese liturgy and, more specifically, about whether the Chinese faithful should follow their custom to wear a hat at Mass as a sign of respect towards God or remove it according to European practice. First, we review some twelve documents produced on both sides of the debate. These were written by Franciscan Antonio a Santa Maria Caballero and the French Jesuit Adrien Grelon, who argued against the Chinese hat. Writing in favor of wearing hats in Christian practice were the two Dominicans, Domingo Navarrete and Domenico Maria Sarpetri; the Jesuits François de Rougemont, Jacques Le Faure, Prospero Intorcetta, and – the focus of this article – Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis. The second part of this contribution reproduces in full the longest and most informative document on the subject, the text by de Ferrariis, who wrote

46 On 30 July 1673, the cardinals in the particular congregation approved the privilege granted by Paul V, i.e., head covered in the celebration of Mass (*Quoad caput coopertum in celebratione Missarum: annuerunt ad formam Brevis Pauli V, et supplicetur Sanctissimo. In reliquis: nihil*). On 23 December 1673, their decision was confirmed by the Pope. See Bontinck, *La Lutte autour de la liturgie chinoise*, 146–47.

47 Concerning Chinese descriptions of the hat for the priests, see Yang, “Laihua chuanjiaoshi”, 115–20.

in favour of wearing the hat. An English annotated translation of the treatise is followed by the Latin transcription. Although apparently a minor issue, the question of the hat brings a wealth of anthropological, cultural and political considerations to light, helping us better understand, through the European missionaries' lens, many aspects of the conversionary experience of Chinese Christians, of the missionaries' own responses to these, and of Chinese society and culture more generally during the Ming-Qing transition.

Résumé

La Querelle des Rites Chinois a fait l'objet d'une intense recherche académique mais d'autres questions sur l'adaptation du christianisme qui furent débattues en ce temps-là méritent aussi notre attention. Nous avons déjà présenté dans ce journal la querelle, peu connue, sur le baptême des végétariens, telle qu'elle fut discutée à Canton en 1688. Nous présentons ici une querelle parallèle sur la liturgie chinoise, et plus spécifiquement si les fidèles Chinois doivent ou non porter un chapeau en signe de respect envers Dieu pendant la messe. Dans la première partie, nous passons en revue une douzaine de documents de l'époque, comme ceux contre le chapeau chinois écrits par le franciscain Antonio Santa Maria et par le jésuite français Adrien Grelon. Sont présentés aussi des documents en faveur du chapeau par deux dominicains, Domingo Navarrete et Domenico Maria Sarpetri, ainsi que par les jésuites François de Rougemont, Jacques Le Faure et Prospero Intorcetta. Nous présentons de manière plus détaillée le document qui est le plus long et le plus informatif, écrit par le jésuite italien Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis. Dans la seconde partie nous proposons une traduction annotée en Anglais du traité, suivi par la transcription latine. Bien que mineure, la question du chapeau touche à des considérations anthropologiques, culturelles et politiques, et nous aide à mieux comprendre la société et culture chinoises lors de la transition de la dynastie Ming à la dynastie Qing.

Cited Works

Manuscript Sources

Rome. Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI)

Jap. Sin. 150, ff. 20r–27v; 28r–33v; 34r–34v; 38r–41v; 42r–45v; 46r–49v; 56rv; 92r–95v

Jap. Sin. 158, ff. 8rv; 10r–17v; 18r–24v; 25r–28v; 29r–32v; 33r–36v; 37r–40v; 41r–43v; 45r–47v.

Jap. Sin. 162, ff. 207r–208v; 209r–210v; 211r–212v; 213r–214v; 227r–229v; 249r–250v; 251r–252v; 259r–261v.

Fondo Gesuitico 730, ff. 103r–105v.

Fondo Gesuitico 738, n. 58, 154.

Fondo Gesuitico 739, n. 268.

Rome. Archivum Propaganda Fide (APF)

SRC Indie Orientali e Cina, vol 1 (1623–1674), ff. 272r–299r.

Rome. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele (BNCR)

BNCR 3386/1257/18, ff. 149r–154v, 163rv.

Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BnF)

Espagnol 409, ff. 193r–209v, 214r–242v.

Published Primary Sources

Acta Cantonensia Authentica [no place of publication], 1700.

Bosmans, Henri. “Lettres inédites de François de Rougemont”, *Annales pour servir à l’histoire ecclésiastique de la Belgique* 3.9 (1913): 38–40.

Bertuccioli, Giuliano. “Ferrari Giovanni Francesco”, *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani (DBI)*. Treccani/ Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana fondata da Giovanni Treccani, vol. 46, 1996, 600–02.

De Ribadeneira, Pedro. *Flos sanctorum de las vidas de los santos*. Madrid: Luis Sánchez, 1601.

Intorcetta, Prospero. *Testimonium de Cultu Sinensi, 1668*. Paris: Pépie, 1700.

Le Faure, Jacques. *De Sinensium ritibus politicis acta*. Paris: Pépie, 1700.

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

Sinica Franciscana. Rome: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1933, vol. II.

Secondary Sources

- Bontinck, François. *La Lutte autour de la liturgie chinoise aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*. Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1962.
- Cummins, J.S. *A Question of Rites: Friar Domingo Navarrete and the Jesuits in China*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1993.
- Dehergne, Joseph. *Répertoire des jésuites de Chine de 1552 à 1800*. Rome: IHSI, 1973.
- Meynard, Thierry, SJ. “Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? The Canton Conference and Adrien Grelon SJ’s Report of 1668”. *AHSI* LXXXVII, fasc. 173 (2018–I): 3–74; “Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? Part 2: The Canton Conference and Prospero Intorcetta’s Report of 1668”. *AHSI* LXXXVIII, fasc. 176 (2019–II): 285–342.
- Rule, Paul. “K’ung-tzu or Confucius? The Jesuit Interpretation of Confucianism”. Australian National University, Doctoral thesis, 1972.
- Standaert, Nicolas, ed., *Handbook of Christianity in China; Volume One: 635–1800*, Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Yang Hongfan 楊虹帆. “Laihua chuanjiaoshi de jijin wenti” 來華傳教士的祭巾問題. *Guoji hanxue* 國際漢學 26.1 (2021): 115–20.

ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, “*Controversiae variae: 1668–1698*”, ff. 10r–17v;
 P. Francesco de Ferrariis SJ. 2^a via *Cum nota authent.* P. Lud. Da
 Gama, 10 Dec. 1668

On the need to cover the head as sign of respect in China⁴⁸

Giovanni Francesco de Ferrariis SJ

1. Almost all nations are so devoted to their own rites and customs that they are amazed at how the customs of other nations appear different, while frequently reproaching them and calling them barbarian. This occurs especially among those nations which have little trade and contact with others. Unless this feeling (which can be called nationalistic) is restrained by the strength of Christian charity, it can greatly hinder the proclamation of the Gospel. On the contrary, if tamed through Christian moderation (so to speak), this disposition does much for the proclamation of God’s most holy law.
2. The first Fathers of the Chinese Mission understood this very well. They sought to submit to Christ’s sweet yoke this people, who are the most urbane and civilized of all the Asians, and they themselves most diligently and assiduously strove to imitate and enact their customs and rites, which are not at all in conflict with Christian laws. They also recommended their successors to do the same in earnest.
3. Among their pleas and rules which have come down to us as if by right of inheritance, we find nothing more frequently and strictly repeated that, after having left aside “Europeans customs” (as even the people of Macao call them), we should arrange all things at home, outside, in the church, as well as in all public and private actions, according to Chinese norms and ritual. In this way, not even domestic helpers would be able to notice in us anything which does not reflect the ideal of the perfect Chinese man.
4. This may seem unremarkable to someone examining the European Society [of Jesus] which exhibits a harmonious diversity of external rituals on account of the diversity of regions and peoples among whom they reside.
5. In China (more than in other nations of the world), we need to

⁴⁸ Translation by Thierry Meynard and Yang Hongfan, Revised by Daniel Canaris
 Annotation by Thierry Meynard.

conform to their external civilities, as well as their political and civil customs. There are many very persuasive reasons for this. First, this vast empire is separated and isolated from the rest of the world, on one side by an immense ocean, and on the other side by almost insuperable mountain chains. For this reason, they have learned nothing at all about the customs and rules of faraway kingdoms. Second, the fact that this country is surrounded by other smaller nations (all of which it calls barbarian) gives it an arrogant temperament, which is satisfied with its own laws and rituals, and scorns and rejects all foreign customs and civility. Third, there is the antiquity of its laws and rituals, which were established at the beginning of the Chinese Empire and remain to this day without any notable change. They have planted roots so firm that if it seems difficult to uproot aged oak trees, it would be even more difficult to eradicate or overthrow Chinese customs. Fourth, nobody would deny that new laws may be given and new customs proclaimed to nations (especially barbarian) which are subject to Christian rulers because of either military subjugation or right of succession. But everyone with experience will agree that it is useless to try to introduce the customs, civility and rituals of foreign nations into the Chinese Empire, which places itself above all the other countries and looks down on everyone.

6. Customs and rituals concerning external civility, that is, denoting veneration and respect (be they political and civil, or religious), are seen everywhere and very frequently used. No one doubts that they borrow their proper meaning from a pure human convention. The external actions by which we express veneration do not have any meaning by themselves, but with the growing agreement of many people, they start acquiring the decided meaning. From this it follows that, first, the same action does not have the same meaning among all peoples; second, the same external civility and veneration is not represented through the same actions everywhere. Certainly, the internal reverence, which is given to God, who alone is the witness of hearts, is known to Him alone, and this reverence is the same in all human beings, though it may be sometimes neglected and sometimes intense. External reverence is known only to those among whom it had been established: this reverence is recognized by them alone, but not by people ignorant of the convention. Different nations have expressed their reverence towards some people, as well as towards the truth, or what they consider as a divinity, through very different external actions.

No one can justly condemn this difference (unless it is offensive towards the true divinity).

7. The reason (I think) is because Holy Mother Church gradually seeks to introduce ecclesiastical and positive laws among people who have recently converted to the Christian faith, and she strives not to change anything in the rites of those people concerning external signs of respect. For we see Greeks [Orthodox], Maronites, Turks and Persians standing in the temple of God with their head covered (which is considered solemn in almost all Asia), participating in sacrifices, praying, and performing all sacred functions with their head always covered, according to the custom and ritual of those pagan regions.⁴⁹ We also see that even in Rome they are not forbidden from worshipping in this way by the Pope, and there is no reason but the aforementioned one, namely that the external signs of reverence undoubtedly depend on human convention. Only once the rites are known among each people do they signify among them that for which they were established in earliest antiquity. The rites of another nation frequently have the opposite meaning.⁵⁰

8. Among the Chinese (no nation is more numerous in the whole world, and no empire more vast), there is an ancient custom, unchanged by anyone until now, of covering the head when performing all the civilities through which they customarily show veneration. Every external civility and respect of sons towards parents, students towards teachers, vassals towards princes and kings, human beings of any station towards idols, starts with the head covered. In their books, they even call this “*li zhi shi*” (禮之始), which means “the beginning and foundation of urbanity and public service.”⁵¹ The covering of the head with a hat is the most important sign of respect in China, and it is the source and foundation of all reverence. To lift hands on high with the fingers entwined, then to lower them together with the head, to kneel down, to fall on the

49 De Ferrariis seems to refer to Greek orthodox and Syriac Christians as well as Christian communities in Turkey and Persia, who complied to the customs of the non-Christian majority of covering the head. The copyist of the 5th copy (5^a via) replaces *gentiles* with *gentes*.

50 As Le Faure mentions, during the Council of Florence (1431–1449), Armenians, Maronites and Greek Orthodox were celebrating mass covered with a hat under the eyes of the Pope: Jacques Le Faure, *De Sinensium ritibus politicis acta*, 193–201.

51 See chapter “Guanyi 冠義” in the *Book of Rites* (*Liji* 禮記): “冠者，禮之始也。”

ground, and to hit the ground with the head (which are signs of the greatest respect in this empire) are not considered reverential unless done with the head covered. Even if you express all signs of respect to an honorable person, you will commit a very grave offense if your head is uncovered.

9. The transfer of power to the Tartars did not alter this ritual of most ancient Chinese custom, or weakened it only very little. In fact, the Tartars could by military force and fear cut down the unnecessary length of the Chinese gown to the size of the Tartar cloak,⁵² and they could shave off the effeminate hair of the Chinese, but only after they decapitated many thousand people.⁵³ However, they have never thought of changing the ritual of covering the head as a sign of respect. Even though the Tartars (who are a barbarian, vulgar, arrogant and insolent people) sometimes receive their Chinese guests without a hat, this is not the custom of all the Tartars, and they do not do this with everybody, except those whom they despise. Indeed, the Tartars are more motivated by self-interest than by urbanity.⁵⁴ But let us suppose [not having the head covered to show respect] is the custom of all Tartars. Considering their miniscule population in this country compared to the Chinese, how could their abuse prevail over this most ancient Chinese custom? Not even one Tartar can be found among one thousand Chinese; the Christian Chinese are ten times more numerous than the Tartars.⁵⁵ And yet this abuse [of not having the head covered] did not grow strong among the Tartars. On the contrary, they themselves require the Chinese to practice the Chinese reverence, such that everyone is afraid of a serious danger from the Tartars if he does otherwise. From this it is easily concluded that, if some Tartars receive Chinese guests with their head uncovered,

52 The Manchu had a traditional robe or *changshan* 長衫, and court robes or *chaopao* 朝袍, which were shorter than the clothes worn in the Ming dynasty.

53 In 1645, the Manchus proclaimed an order requiring all males to shave their forehead. That year, the Chinese who refused were killed by the Manchus in the ten thousand or hundreds of thousands.

54 Since the Manchu conquest of China in 1644, most Jesuits had a low opinion of the Manchus, and this was accentuated further by the Calendar case and the Canton exile. Only during the Kangxi reign did the Jesuits form a positive impression of the Manchus.

55 In fact, the ratio may have been three Manchus for one thousand Han Chinese. In 1663, the number of Christians was estimated between 70 to 80,000; see Standaert, ed., *Handbook of Christianity*, 382. The Mandchu population was at that time around 350,000.

this is born out of their contempt towards the Chinese, since those barbarians are used to calling the Chinese barbarian. The Tartars themselves, when they are with more honorable men, either of higher rank or their equals, always observe the Chinese custom with both Tartars and Chinese.

10. Thus, since the most ancient Chinese rite of covering the head to show respect (just as Europeans uncover their head) has maintained the character of an inviolable law, it would be just as difficult to persuade Europeans to wear a hat to show greater respect as to persuade Chinese to take off the hat. To the Europeans who are accustomed to taking off the hat (as if the custom is turned into something natural), the ritual of covering the head appears completely uncouth because of its novelty. But much more in China, the rule of uncovering the head would appear to go not only against the most ancient laws of Chinese etiquette, but also almost against nature.

11. Now, if we talk about the Christian Law, it strictly declares with the first three precepts of the Decalogue that the highest inner and outer veneration is due to the Greatest and Most Excellent God. Regarding the external rites by which reverence is usually expressed (especially those which do not differ from civic rites), it has not stipulated anything which ought to be universally observed by all nations, but it urges and orders each nation to show the greatest possible veneration to the supreme divinity with its own ritual. Otherwise, it would seem to urge and command opposite things to different peoples: if the Holy Church prescribes the same norm for external veneration all over the world, it would order through this unique law that the Supreme God is worshipped here, and disdained there; obviously the Chinese with the head uncovered would esteem God lightly, and the Europeans [with the head uncovered] would pay homage to Him.⁵⁶

12. This most ancient Chinese custom was certainly not unknown to the first Fathers of the Mission. After careful examination they determined that in China it was not reverential to remove the hat. Through many laws, they commanded their successors to perform

⁵⁶ Here an important ecclesiological principle is stated: the universal church refrains from proclaiming a common norm for the external worship, since this would harm the complete expression of God's worship through particular cultures, which have different ways of expression.

all public activities, both at home and outside, and in the sacred temple, always with their heads covered. During the holy sacrifice of the Mass, because of its excellence over all the other mysteries of the Christian Church, the signs of the highest reverence are required. The Latin rite which European priests always follow does not allow the head to be covered. Lest the [priests] among the Chinese appear to be despising instead of venerating such majesty, they obtained through petitions from the Supreme Pontiff permission to use the hat in the Latin rite. It was not at all necessary to obtain a dispensation from the Supreme Pontiff so that neophytes could much more venerably participate in the sacred services of the church with their ancient custom of covering the head since it had been conceded to the priests as a favor.⁵⁷

13. Before the Pontifical indulgence [had been granted] to the European priests, there were neither public churches nor many Christians, and the sacraments were seldom frequented, being administered in secret and without witnesses. Since the Fathers at that time paid less attention to decorum, a neophyte with the head covered may have approached a sacred assembly led by a priest who was not wearing a hat. Then, they [i.e., the Jesuit priests] considered it less improper for Christians to receive the sacred body of our Lord Christ according to the European (and not Chinese) custom by removing their hat. But this kind of rule fell into disuse and lost all its force, like a block being removed, after a Pontifical concession had authorized the priests at the Sacred Altar to cover their head. After that, Christianity was more deeply established and spread much more widely. Temples for the worship to the true God were erected in the Chinese empire, no longer secretly, but publicly, and even at the court, with the knowledge of the emperor. The Chinese people, who are so devoted to these external rituals, would have found it rather incongruous (if not barbarous) if the Europeans (who want to prove themselves as literati and urbane men) lacked the source and foundation of veneration in a matter which requires the highest veneration. The Chinese would have found it even more absurd that the Europeans wanted to teach them this same rule and law of veneration.⁵⁸

57 This refers to the Brief *Romanae Sedis Antistes* of Pope Paul V. See our introduction.

58 The Brief deals only with the hat of the priest, but according to de Ferrariis, there was an evolution in two steps for the faithful: first they were asked to be uncover their heads at mass; only when the Brief was promulgated in China, they were wearing a hat.

14. Therefore, for many years after the Pontifical concession up to the beginnings of the Tartar empire, Chinese Christians venerated with distinction the Highest and Most Excellent God in all the services of the Christian religion (except during the Creed) and even in the mystery of a sacred assembly [Eucharist]. This was witnessed not only by me, the author of this text, but also by Father Antonio de Gouvea, superior of this house, Father Petro Canevari, Father Francesco Brancati, who have been in China for 33, 35 and 38 years respectively. I myself have lived here for more than 28 years. We are the only ones among the ours of the Society in the Canton exile who reached China during the Chinese empire [Ming dynasty]. All the others have entered the Chinese mission after us, when the empire was already occupied by the Tartars.⁵⁹

15. If in recent times there has been a different opinion on this question (which we cannot deny), it is not due to an order of the superiors, a consultation, or a consensus among the companions, but each person's individual view, which results from specific causes and circumstances. In my opinion, the first cause is what I have called at the beginning of this manuscript "the nationalistic feeling". Europeans are raised from youth to adulthood in European urbanity and society. They find European rituals so pleasing that they despise, almost with nausea and horror, the rites of another nation as contrary to nature itself. What is more fitting for a European and his natural feeling than paying respect to an honorable man by removing his hat? What is more absurd than meeting an upright man with the head covered? Nevertheless, all the Chinese defend "for their altars and for their hearths" the contrary opinion as conforming to reason and even more to nature. Indeed, the pagans have even greater affection towards their ancient rituals than the Christians, and are much more inclined to reject foreign customs that are unlike their own.⁶⁰

59 De Ferrariis makes the point that four of them had witnessed the practice of Chinese wearing hat during services in the Ming dynasty. Antonio de Gouvea arrived China around 1635, was the superior of the Jesuit community since March 1666, and he became the vice-provincial of the Chinese vice-province from 1669 to 1672. Francesco Brancati arrived China around 1636. Pietro Canevari arrived China in 1630. De Ferrariis arrived China in 1640. Except for himself, de Ferrariis is not very accurate about the number of years the three other Jesuits spent in China, but the point he wants to make is that they all arrived during the Ming dynasty, which is correct.

60 De Ferrariis criticizes the ethnocentrism of some missionaries, but without naming them. See our introduction.

16. In their affection towards their own things, they [the European priests] place first a certain zeal for habituating the Chinese people to all the Christian rites (this is the second reason for different view mentioned above), so that the Chinese may accept at the same time rites and customs of the Christians together with the Divine Law. But taking off the hat is a custom that has no necessary connection with Christianity. It is in fact a pagan rite, and it varies among the nations. The reason (which they raised in the public meeting as the strongest argument to prove their opinion) is more likely to turn away the Chinese from Christianity than to attract or draw them to it.⁶¹ If this is right, why do we not compel Chinese Christians to learn Latin and European languages? Why do we not teach them to wear shoes, hat and the whole garment (just as the Tartars have done) in the European way? (Indeed, language and literature are characteristics of Christianity; garments and ornaments are certainly characteristic of Christianity). So why not make Chinese people not only Christians but also Europeans?

17. The third cause of change must be ascribed to the Tartars, who are used to spending their life hunting in the forests and mountains. They do not have cities or houses. They carry around tents sewn from raw deer skins, while looking for fertile grass lands to feed their herds of horses (with which that area abounds). When they first entered the Royal city of Peking, they produced a new and shocking spectacle for the Court and the Chinese people: these Tartars were very poor, rude, uncivilized, rough, awkward, mostly barefoot; they did not wear hats and were not clothed but barely covered with their badly sewn skins. They began to go to all the shrines of the idols, and out of curiosity, to enter frequently in the sacred temple of God to worship Him somehow.⁶² When the Tartars, swelling with pride from their victory (even though they did not fight!), did this,⁶³ they offered to

61 This makes reference to the formal conference held by the missionaries from 18 December 1667 to 26 January 1668. While the first cause of change was the nationalistic feeling of the missionaries, the second cause of change is the idea to offer China a complete cultural and religious package.

62 For de Ferrariis, the third reason for Chinese Christians not wearing the hat anymore is related to historical circumstances going back to the entry of the Manchus in Beijing in 1644. Here de Ferrariis seems to make reference to the visits of Manchu princes to Adam Schall in the church after 1644.

63 After Li Zicheng and his army left Beijing, the Manchus could enter the capital without a fight on 6 June 1644. Instead of “without a fight”, the fifth copy (5^a via) has “without a hat” (*sine pileo*)!

Chinese Christians the opportunity of not only supposing but also of concluding for themselves that it was a Tartar rite and custom to uncover the head for religious reason and that they themselves ought to accept and imitate this custom because it was praised by their European teacher.⁶⁴ An extreme heatwave, which was stronger than usual during the month of June (when the Tartars had penetrated the Peking Court) provided support for this opinion. The Christians were completely convinced that they should take off their hats for the sake of cooler air, and at the same time to perform worship according to a new rite. Furthermore, the same spectacle is offered in all the other cities and provinces, wherever that plague [the Tartar occupation] was pervading, striving to occupy the empire.

18. This was the cause of an error made by Father Johann Adam (as he himself and Father Francisco Furtado, who was superior at that time, told me the year after I returned from Shandong province to Peking).⁶⁵ Schall saw that the new rulers were conducting their affairs with a new ritual (or rather without ritual) in the Court and in the main city of the whole Empire, and he thought that all Chinese civility and urbanity (such as clothing and hair style) had been completely proscribed. He permitted his Christians to attend the sacred mysteries in the church, in the European way, without a hat. Some of the Fathers in their own residence followed his example.⁶⁶ However, as it emerged from what followed, it was not that there was some ancient Tartar rite or custom opposed to the Chinese rites, but that the uncouthness and barbarity of the

64 Perhaps a reference to Adam Schall.

65 Francisco Furtado * 1589 Isla de Faial, SJ 1610 Coimbra, † 21.XI.1653 Macao, *DHCJ* II, 1544. From 1641 to 1645, he was the superior of the six residences of North China, and de Ferrariis was during this period working in Shandong and Shaanxi. While de Ferrariis and the other missionaries were under house of arrest in Beijing in 1667, Schall may have directly told him the story of the hat as it happened in Beijing in 1644. According to de Ferrariis, Adam Schall admitted he made an error in 1644 by dropping the hat. When the Jesuits discussed the issue of the hat during the Canton conference on December 1667 and January 1668, Schall had been dead for more than two years (15 August 1666). In Canton the Jesuits wrote many reports about the persecution and death of Schall, presenting him as a martyr. However, de Ferrariis points out here the error of Schall on the hat, probably as a way of criticizing the closeness of Schall to the Manchus and the Qing court, which gave the opportunity for the opponents to Christianity to launch an anti-Christian campaign.

66 This means other Jesuits in northern China allowed the Christians not to wear the hat.

Tartars themselves, who were born in the woods and raised among wild beasts, could not bring any kind of civilization or urbanity from their own region to the Chinese Empire. After they had taken possession of China, they started to marry Chinese women, to own houses and land, to become rich through debts, to appear clothed in full-silk cloths, to hold public functions and prefectures; then the face of things changed completely. Indeed, the same Tartars became polite and civilized. After adapting to urbanity, they changed everything except their clothing and hair, and embraced all the Chinese customs and rites, by which they wanted to be honored by the Chinese and to respond to the Chinese with mutual respect. In reciprocal greetings (when they met each other), conversations, banquets, meetings and also in their shrines of idols (while perhaps more relaxed in other ceremonies), they are certainly not lazy in observing the most ancient Chinese custom of covering their head. In summer and winter, they even add a silk ribbon, with which they usually tie the hat under the chin to stop the hat from falling off.

19. The fourth cause of error was at the same time one and multiple. New missionaries who had just arrived from Europe to China were as much unaware of the rules of the China mission as they were burning with zeal for God's glory. After each one had been assigned to an individual residence (because of the small number of companions), what else could they do but organize everything according to European norms? Especially with the new crop of Christians growing everywhere, one Father alone was forced to study Chinese language, to train existing Christians, to establish new Christian communities in the same province and build new churches, to supervise catechism, to administer Holy Baptism and other sacraments, and to perform all the ministries of the Society [of Jesus]! Moreover, in recent years as the number of churches increased everywhere, all the missionaries were more overwhelmed than busy with frequent trips to different towns and villages, repeated visits to the sick, necessary assistance to the dying and other labors most urgently needed for the salvation of the souls. Hence they could not even think about things of lesser importance, such as merely external rituals would appear to be. Although Father Vice-Provincial Inácio da Costa had the rules and statutes of the China mission (which we call the regulations of the superiors) transcribed, and had some copies distributed among the newly arrived Fathers, his efforts came too late and, having failed to anticipate the previous error, he was unable to forestall

it. Moreover, his efforts were of no benefit in the future because of the general detention and exile of the missionaries which soon followed.⁶⁷

20. The last and not insignificant reason for this mistake was the willingness of new converts to obey their spiritual teachers, at least outwardly.⁶⁸ This willingness could easily persuade Europeans who were not sufficiently instructed in Chinese customs that the Chinese themselves were not so devoted to their own external rites that they would willingly accept instruction in better rituals (namely European). Two reasons can explain their alleged willingness: one reason comes from the condition and status of the Christians themselves, the other is taken from the authority of the Evangelical ministers. In regard to the first reason, what happened in the Chinese empire was undeniably the same as what everybody knows has occurred since the gospel was first preached throughout the world: there were many more common and poor people who moved from the slavery of the demons to Christ's camps than rich and noble people. Indeed, someone was sent to John [the Baptist] by Christ himself, the Supreme God and the Law-Giver of all the kingdoms, to proclaim that "the poor, not the rich are evangelized."⁶⁹

By God's grace, in China we have seen many nobles, literati, and people famous for their wealth and distinguished with prefectures who have willingly subjected themselves to the sweet yoke of Christ; but there are many more people from lower society [who have entered the Church]. Moreover, the ratio [between rich and poor] differs in each province. For instance, in some provinces, there are 100 plebeians for each "togatus" [prominent literatus], but in the southern provinces prominent people and literati are more frequently seen to have devoted themselves to God than in the northern provinces. And we know that in one of the northern provinces thousands of people had finally embraced the Christian faith before the time of the persecution [i.e. 1665]; they are all very

67 Inácio da Costa * c. 1604 Isla de Faial, SJ 1621 Lisbon, † 11.V.1666 Canton, *DHCJ* I, 977. He was vice-provincial of the vice-province from 1658 to 1661. According to de Ferrariis, the rules approved by da Costa did not have time to make a lasting effect in correcting the "error" introduced by Schall in 1644.

68 This fifth cause for the change is in fact the longest.

69 Luke 7:22: "Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind regain their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have the good news proclaimed to them."

poor soldiers, low-class peasants, mountain dwellers, with barely anyone who can be considered as belonging to the literati or some more noble family. From this one can infer that the political rites have little or nothing to do with these Chinese Christians. Who indeed in the countryside or in the mountains needs the etiquette of the cities? Who would expect civil courtesy from farmers? Thus the people without their own rites could and should be taught European rites.

Nonetheless, this inference that we should insert something in other nations has no place among Chinese people which in this respect (I boldly say) surpasses all other nations, for every Chinese, no matter how illiterate, crude, rustic and poor, considers it a crime to make even a trivial mistake in these ceremonies. During Chinese New Year, it is an inviolable custom that friends visit each other and that out of respect children greet their parents and students greet their teachers. How could any Chinese person, even from the lowest rank, not fulfill his duty towards his friends, teachers, neighbors, or relatives, by wearing new or at least clean and decently arranged garments? On someone's birthday, does not everybody, including both those connected to him by some bond and the whole neighborhood, wear their best clothes to congratulate him? When mourning the deceased, who does come to comfort a friend or relative without having mourning dress or at least a hat? Would not even a farmer wear shoes or a hat and dress with every propriety when praying, burning incense, and adoring or venerating his idols at the appointed time in the shrines of the idols or even in his own house? For even the poorest of the Chinese have a house altar or a table dedicated to the idle gods.

All Chinese, including the poor, are engaged in the scrupulous observation of these rites. They cannot omit these rites or incorrectly perform any part of them without causing serious scandal or offending others. Therefore, the aforementioned willingness of the newly baptized to obey to their teachers should be ascribed not to their humble condition, but to the authority of the evangelical ministers (who are very much revered by the Christians). Indeed, they accept not only precepts, but also advices and warnings like laws, from those who are striving to teach them the way to eternal Salvation, and whom it would be sinful for them not to obey strictly.

However, the obedience of the Christians does not absolutely remove the offense of the Chinese pagans, who are immersed in an opposite ritual and will think that the Christians themselves care little about their God. Even the Christians obey quite reluctantly

since they correctly understand that their own rites are not opposed to the Christian Laws. Hence, they do not cease to argue for them as their own ritual. However, the greater the minister's authority is, the more ardent is their desire to obey him, or certainly the smaller their intention to contradict him.

Hence in the very Court where Father Johannes Adam Schall enjoyed the favor of the Chinese-Tartar emperor [Shunzhi], and managed many noble Christians for the sake of mathematical science, zealous mathematicians did not dare to speak against him since he was supervising both secular matters and the direction of their soul. Other Christians at the Court and in the other residences followed their example; only when they were forced by the authority of teachers would they do something different.

21. All the causes or occasions that I have recounted above did not persuade all the China missionaries of our Society to change anything, except a very few; by far the majority of them did not deviate by any means from the rites of the ancient tradition. Indeed, among recent arrivals in the China mission, those who visited most of the provinces of the empire, had freer access to prominent people and were sufficiently instructed in Chinese traditions never deviated an inch from the opinion of the ancient missionaries.⁷⁰

22. There were two other views among a few missionaries. One was the opinion of those so strongly attached to European rites and traditions that they could not but be displeased by aspects among the Chinese which are different from them, and they thought they should be replaced by European rites. The other was the opinion of those who consider that some rubrics of the Latin rite or church laws must be observed everywhere on earth, and must not be violated without papal dispensation and indulgence. The contrary practices of other nations (mentioned above) clearly demonstrate how far this last opinion deviates from the truth.⁷¹ However, not even the former opinion should be considered as worthy for the preachers of the Most Holy Law, who ought to become all things to all men so that they may win everybody for Christ, according

70 De Ferrariis who had arrived China in 1640 seems here to make a personal testimony of the situation within the Society of Jesus just after 1644 on the question of the hat. He does not say much about other religious congregations.

71 See n.7 above.

to the testimony of the Apostle and his example.⁷² St. Augustine divides the customs of the church into three categories in chapter 9 of his 18th Letter, which is quoted by Father Suárez, in the Second Book of his *Against the English King* (number 9, chapter 8): “He [Saint Augustine] puts in the first category those things ‘that the authority of divine Scripture prescribes.’ He says that ‘these things are not to be doubted and that we should do as we read.’ In the middle category he puts those things ‘which the Church keeps in the whole world.’ ‘It would,’ he says, ‘be the mark of the most insolent insanity to question whether these things ought to be done or not.’ In the third category he puts those things ‘which are subject to local and regional variation.’ He says in relation to these things, ‘In each province those customs which do not contravene the faith or good morals ought to be kept.’”⁷³ These words taken by Father Suárez from St. Augustine very suitably support our case. Indeed, the Chinese custom neither conflicts with our Christian Faith, nor corrupts good morals.

23. To these reasons must be added the very powerful argument derived from the Papal dispensation. The Supreme Pontiff himself had indeed permitted European priests in China to celebrate mass in the Latin rite with the head covered for the sake of the Chinese, who he assumes would always attend [Mass] with the head covered. Otherwise, he would never have granted this dispensation. Therefore, he approved with the same dispensation the Chinese ritual which he wanted to be kept inviolable and not to be changed into a European rite (since it was not at all contrary to Christian decrees).⁷⁴ But what a reversal of the logical order (*hysteron proteron*)! A European priest abandons the European ritual and adopts the Chinese ritual to bring more easily the Chinese to Christianity, and

72 Saint Paul, 1 Corinthians 9:22.

73 Francisco Suárez, *Defensio fidei catholicae* (A defense of the catholic and apostolic faith, 1613), Book II, chapter 8, number 9. Augustine’s letter is mentioned here as Letter 18, but in the modern editions, it is referred to as Letter 54, to Januarius (around the year 400). This book of Suárez was in the library of the Jesuit residence in Canton and it is often quoted. Other occurrences are: “De Ang. Reg.”: Navarrete, *Controversias*, 296; Navarrete, *Sentir sobre algun puntos*, Ajuda 49-IV-62, f. 10v; Intorcetta, *Testimonium*, 7.

74 This refers again to the Brief *Romanae Sedis Antistes* as mentioned above in n. 12. de Ferrariis interprets the Brief as implying the authorization for the faithful to attend mass with the hat. See n. 13. The proposition to discard the Chinese hat for the priests is purely rhetorical.

at the same time he compels the Chinese Christians to abandon their own rite and to get used to the European rite? Would it not make better sense for the Chinese if the European priest leaves the Chinese ritual for the Chinese and keeps his European rituals in China, than – on the reverse – to deprive the Chinese of their most ancient rite and to transfer it to the European priest, while forcing the Chinese themselves to adopt the European ritual?⁷⁵

24. After duly and seriously weighing up all these arguments, the Fathers decided to temper all the inconsistencies in our praxis – which emerges in numbers 20 and 22 – with a consistent new practice, which we will describe separately, together with the names of the Fathers.

⁷⁵ De Ferrariis expresses here a contradiction in having the foreign priests to be enculturated by wearing the hat while Chinese Catholics are forced into a practice at odd with their culture since they cannot wear the hat.

ARSI Jap. Sin. 158, f. 5r⁷⁶

Numbers 20 and 22 [of the *Praxes quaedam*] should be corrected as follows: Since to remove the hat does not mean any mark of respect for the Chinese, but on the contrary, every external veneration towards a person and a real or believed divinity is always expressed by the Chinese with the head covered, and since the Christian mysteries request the highest respect to be marked by all the people being present, even the pagans, therefore the neophytes, either attending the Holy Sacrifice, or serving the priest officiating, or even approaching for Holy Communion, should always be covered with a hat out of respect for such a mystery.

Antonio a Gouvea, superior of the Canton residence

Feliciano Pacheco, Vice-Provincial of Chinese V.Pr.

Petro Canevari

Friar Domingo Navarrete, President

Francesco Brancati

Stanislao Torrens

Jacques Motel

Jacques Le Faure

Christian Herdrich

Claude Motel

Philippe Couplet

Friar Domenico Maria de San Pedro [Sarpetri]

François de Rougemont

Giovanni Domenico Gabiani

Giovanni Francesco Ferrariis

76 See image 1, page 10 above.

ARSI, *Jap. Sin.* 158, "Controversiae variae: 1668–1698", ff. 10r–17v
(Tractatus editus a / P Franciscus F / 2 legenda)

P. Francesco de Ferrariis SJ. 2^a via *Cum nota authent.* P. Lud. Da Gama, 10 Dec. 1668

Apud Sinas in signum reverentiae tegendum esse caput⁷⁷

[10^r]

1. Iam addictae sunt omnes fere nationes suis ritibus et consuetudinibus, ut eas, quae in aliis diversae apparent, ut plurimum unaquaeque miretur, saepe reprehendat ac non raro barbaras appellat. Quod inter eas gentes maxime usuvenit quae cum aliis minus habent commercii, et communicationis. Ea affectio (quam hic nationalem libet appellare) nisi Christianae charitatis vi coerceatur, evangelii praedicationem plurimum potest impedire. Sicuti e contra per charitatis moderationem cicurata (ut sic loquar) ad Dei sanctissimam legem promulgandam plurimum affert momenti.

2. Hoc optime cognovere primi huius Sinicae Missionis Patres, qui gentem hanc inter omnes Asiaticas satis politicam ac civilem suavissimo Christi iugo subdere in animo habentes, eorum mores ac ritus (eos scilicet, qui minime cum Christianis legibus pugnant) et ipsi per se summa diligentia ac studio imitari ac exprimere conati sunt; et suis successoribus, ut idem facerent serio indixerunt.

3. Hinc factum est, ut in eorum placitis ac statutis, quae ad nos haereditario quasi iure pervenerunt, nihil frequentius ac severius repetitum inveniamus, quam ut Europaeis consuetudinibus (etiam Macaenses expresse nominando) abiectis, omnia domi ac foris, in Templo, atque adeo in omnibus publicis ac privatis actionibus, ita ad Sinicam normam ac ritum componamus, ut ne ipsi quidem

⁷⁷ Transcription by Thierry Meynard and Yang Hongfan, Revised by Daniel Canaris.

The transcription of this text contains only necessary minor adjustments to assist the comprehensibility of its content: 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 letters "h", "y", and double letters have not been adapted. The numbering system is shown in square brackets.

domestici famuli quippiam in nobis notare valeat quod Sinicum hominem non perfectissime repraesentet.

4. Quod minus mirum videatur ipsam etiam Europaeam Societatem consideranti, in qua pro diversitate Regionum ac populorum, inter [10^v] quos degit, rituum externorum non incongrua varietas observari potest.

5. Iam vero apud Sinas (prae caeteris orbis universi nationibus) necessarium nobis esse istam externi cultus, ac morum politicorum, civiliumque cum ipsis conformitatem. Multa fortissime suadent. Primo, amplissimi Imperii hinc per vastissimi maris interiectionem, inde per insuperabiles prope modum montium aggeres, ab orbe reliquo divisio ac separatio, quae causa est, ut nihil omnino de longissime distantium regnorum moribus atque institutis cognoverint. Secundo, superbia ac humor huius nationis quae minorum aliquarum gentium (quae ipsam circumstant, et quas omnes ipsa barbaras vocat) in medio posita suis contenta legibus, ritibusque externam omnem consuetudinem cultumque spernit et aversatur. Tertio, legum ipsarum rituumque antiquitas, qui cum ab ipsius Imperii Sinensis initiis instituti ad haec usque tempora sine ulla notabili mutatione perseverent; tam firmes iecere radices, ut si annosas quercus eradicare difficile videtur, Sinicas consuetudines convellere aut labefactare multo sit operosius. Quarto, aliis quidem nationibus (quamvis barbaris) quae vel armis subactae, vel haereditario iure ad Christianos Principes spectant, nova posse dari iura, novas consuetudines indici, nemo negat. At in Sinicum Imperium (quod se caeteris omnibus nationibus praecellere putat, omnesque prae se despicit) exterarum gentium mores, cultum, ac ritus inducere velle, irritum esse conatum, nemo prudens non iudicabit.

6. Inter caeteros mores ac ritus ii, qui ad externum cultum, seu venerationis ac reverentiae significationem pertinent (sive politica illa sit, ac civilis, sive religiosa) passim obvii sunt ac frequentissime usurpantur. Quos quidem suam qualemcumque significationem [11^r] ex mera hominum institutione mutuari dubitat nemo. Nam cum actiones externae, quibus venerationem solemus exhibere, ex sua natura nihil tale significant; accedente multorum hominum consensu id significare incipiunt, quod illis placitum fuit. Hinc fit primo, ut non una eademque sit earundem actionum apud omnes gentes significatio. Secundo, ut idem cultus externus ac veneratio

non ubique terrarum per similes actiones repraesentetur. Atque interna quidem reverentia quae soli servatori cordium Deo defertur eique soli innotescit; una eademque est apud omnes mortales, quamvis in gradu nunc remittatur nunc intendatur. Externa vero illis solis nota apud quos institutum fuit, ab iis solis tanquam reverentia admittitur, ab eius institutionis ignaris reverentia non iudicatur. Diversae gentes suam reverentiam tam erga homines, quam erga verum, aut putatum numen dissimillimis actionibus externis expresserunt, quam tamen dissimilitudinem (nisi forte cum veri numinis offensa coniungatur) nemo iuste damnare possit.

7. Quae causa (opinor) est, ut Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cum apud populos recens ad Christi fidem conversos ecclesiasticas leges ac ius positivum paulatim introducere conetur, circa venerationis indices externos eorundem populorum ritus nihil immutare satagat. Videmus enim Graecos, Maronitas, Turcas, Persas operto capite (quod est fere toti Asiae solemne) in Dei templis assistere, sacris operari, preces fundere, omnesque sacras functiones operto semper capite peragere, iuxta regionum suarum gentilitium morem ac ritum: quod etiam Romana ipsa in Urbe a conscio Summo Pontifice servare nullo modo prohibentur, cuius rei non est alia ratio praeter eam, quam supra inuimus, externa nimirum reverentiae signa ab institutione hominum pendere. Cogniti autem apud unamquamque gentem ritus id apud illam significant, ad quod significandum ab ipsius antiquitate instituti sunt: alterius gentis ritus frequenter [11^v] apud alteram oppositam habent significationem.

8. Apud Sinas certe (qua gente in Universis Regnis nulla fere numerosior, cuius imperio nullum prope vastius) antiquissimus est mos, et ab omni quo ad haec usque tempora immutatus, omnes honestas actiones, quibus venerationem prae se ferre solent, tecto capite perficere. Filiorum erga parentes, discipulorum erga magistros, subditorum erga suos Principes ac Reges, cuiuscumque conditionis hominum erga sua Idola cultus omnis externus ac reverentia, a tecto capite initium ducit. Ipsi in suis Libris (Li Chi Xi) appellant, id est Urbanitatis, seu civilium officiorum principium, et fundamentum. Pileo suo tectum caput praecipua est inter Sinas veneratio, omnisque venerationis caput, et veluti basis. Iunctas implexis digitis manus in altum attollere, deinde una cum capite inclinare, poplites flectere, corpus humo defigere, fronteque terram percutere (quae sunt in hoc imperio supremae reverentiae signa) nisi tecto fiat capite nulla reverentia, existimatur. Quin imo si cuiquam

honesto homini caeterae signa omnia venerationis exhibeas, detecto tamen capite certissimam eius offensionem incurres.

9. Nec huius antiquissimi moris ritum Sinici ad Tartaros Imperii devolutio, vel immutavit, vel tantillum labefactavit. Potuere illi quidem armorum vi ac metu Sinicae togae supervacaneam redundantiam ad Tartarici Sagi mensuram restringere, potuere muliebri Sinarum capillitium abradere, sed post demissa multa capitum millia. At de immutando ritu tegendi honoris gratia capitis ne cogitarunt quidem. Et quamvis ipsi (barbara et inurbana gens, simulque tumida et superba) venientes ad se hospites Sinas aliquando excipiant sine pileo, is tamen nec omnium Tartarorum est mos, nec id cum omnibus faciunt, nisi quos ipsi prae se despiciunt. Sunt enim Tartari proprii commodi, quam urbanitatis studiosiores. Sed esto, sit ista Tartarorum omnium consuetudo, quotus [12^r] est in hoc Regno eorum numerus (si cum Sinis componatur) ut eorum abusus Sinicae antiquissimae consuetudini praevalere possit! Ne millenis quidem Sinensibus singuli Tartari valent connumerari, Christiani Sinenses Tartarorum numerum plus decuplo excedunt, et tamen non modo non invaluit inter Tartaros huiusmodi abusus, quin potius ipsi a Sinis sinicam venerationem ita exigunt, ut nemo non grave sibi periculum a Tartaris metuat secus faciendo. Ex quo facile colligitur, si qui Tartari nudato capite Sinas hospites excipiant, id ex Sinarum contemptu oriri, quos ipsi barbari barbaros vocitare solent. Ipsimet Tartari cum honestioribus hominibus, vel se maioribus, vel sibi aequalibus, non modo Tartaris, sed etiam Sinis Sinicam semper servant consuetudinem.

10. Itaque cum apud Sinas antiquissimus iste ritus tegendi venerationis causa capitis (sicut apud Europaeos detegendi) in morem inviolabilis legis invaluerit, istis persuadere, ut ad exhibendam maioris venerationis significationem capiti pileum imponant, illis ut detrahant, opus est aequalis utrimque difficultatis. Etsi Europaeis deponendo pileo assuetis (versa quasi in naturam consuetudine) ritus tegendi capitis propter rei novitatem omnino inurbanus appareret; ita multo magis apud Sinas nudandi eiusdem capitis lex non modo antiquissimis sinicae politicae legibus, sed ipsi prope modum naturae adversari videretur.

11. Iam si de Christiana Lege agamus, illa sicuti summam erga Deum Optimum Maximum venerationem tam internam quam externam primis tribus Decalogi praeceptis severissime indicit. Ita quoad

externos ritus, quibus reverentia exprimi solet (iis praesertim, qui a civilibus non differunt) nihil omnino statuit, quod ab universis undique nationibus servari debeat. Sed unamquamque gentem, ut suo quoque ritu supremo numini, quam maximam potest venerationem exhibeat, hortatur ac iubet. Aliter enim diversis populis contraria suadere, ac praecipere videretur. Si enim Sancta Ecclesia unam eademque venerationis externae normam universo terrarum orbi praescriberet, una eademque Lege Summum Deum alibi coli, alibi contemni iuberet: quem nimirum detecto capite [12^r] Sinae parvi ponderent, Europaei venerantur.

12. Certe non latuit primos Sinicae Missionis Patres haec Sinica antiquissima consuetudo; qui postquam diligentissimo praemisso examine statuerunt (non esse reverentiam inter Sinas pileum e capite deponere) simul etiam suis successoribus, ut omnes publicas actiones tam domi et foris, quam in ipso sacro templo tecto semper capite facerent per plura statuta praeceperunt. Et quoniam in Sancto Missae sacrificio prae caeteris omnibus Ecclesiae Christianae mysteriis propter summam eius muneris excellentiam, summa etiam externae reverentiae signa requiruntur. Latinus autem ritus (in quo Europaei sacerdotes sacris semper operantur) tectum caput non admittit; ne inter Sinas tantam maiestatem contemnere potius, quam venerari viderentur: per supplices libellos a Summo Pontifice, ut cum ritu latino pilei usum coniungere liceret, obtinuerunt. Quae Summi Pontificis dispensatio pro Neophytis (ut ii cum omni veneratione ex antiqua sua consuetudine tecto capite sacris functionibus in templo assisterent) nullo modo necessaria fuit; cum in illorum gratiam concessa fuerit sacerdotibus.

13. Cum vero ante istam Pontificiam cum Europaeis sacerdotibus indulgentiam nec templa essent publica, nec Christiani multi, et sacramentorum usus infrequentissimus, eaque in secreto et sine arbitris administrarentur. Minus decorum visum est Patribus eius temporis, unum aut alterum neophytum ad Sacram Synaxim tecto capite accedere, quam sacerdos sine pileo largiretur. Ideoque, ut ipsi etiam Christiani Sacrosanctum Christi Domini corpus Europaeo (non Sinico) ritu deposito pileo reciperent, minus indecens arbitrati sunt. At ea veluti Lex, postquam sacerdotibus in sacro altari caput pileo contegere Pontificia concessione indultum fuit, sublato veluti fundamento concidit, vimque omnem habere desiit. Christiana siquidem re altius fundata, multoque amplius dilatata templisque, in Sinico Imperio ad veri Dei cultum non in occulto, sed palam; et

in ipsa Curia conscio Imperatore iam erectis, Sinicae genti ritibus hisce externis addictissimae, Europaeos homines (qui se illi, [13^r] et Litteratos simul, et urbanos probare vellent) in re, quae summam venerationem exigit, ipso venerationis capite, et fundamento carere, absona plane res (si non barbara) fuisset visa; multoque absurdius ipsismet Sinis velle eundem ritum ac legem venerationis indicere.

14. Itaque post illam Pontificiam concessionem per plurimos annos usque ad Imperii Tartarici initia, omnis optima veneratio a Sinensibus Christianis Deo Optimo Maximo in omnibus Christianae Religionis functionibus (sacra excepta ex homologis etiam in ipso Sacrae Synaxeos mysterio, Sinico ritu universim exhibita fuit. Cuius rei praeter me ipsum (qui haec scribo) testes sunt Pater Antonius de Gouvea huius domus superior, Pater Petrus Cannevarius, P. Franciscus Brancatus, illi quidem 3°. 5°. et 8°. supra trigesimum, ego vero 8°. supra vigesimum anno in Sinis exacto; qui omnes et soli ex nostra Societate in hoc Cantoniensi exilio ad Sinici pertinent Imperii tempora. Reliqui post nos, occupato iam diu a Tartaris Imperio, Sinicam missionem ingressi sunt.

15. Si qua postremis hisce temporibus in hac re varietas fuit (quam fuisse inficiari non possumus) ea nec superiorum iussu, nec aliqua praehabita consultatione, neque ex communi sociorum consensu, sed ex proprio cuiusque sensu facta est, eique originariae aliquae sive causae, sive occasiones non defuerunt. Quarum illa (meo quidem iudicio) prima est, quam initio huius manuscripti affectionem nationalem libuit appellare. Europaei namque homines in Europaea urbanitate atque politia nati, et ad aetatem usque adultam innutriti, ita sibi in Europaeis ritibus placent, ut contrarios alterius gentis ritus, tanquam ipsi naturae repugnantes cum quadam quasi nausea, atque horrore aspernentur. Quid enim homini Europaeo [13^v] sic affecto naturae magis convenire videatur, quam honore dignum hominem detracto e capite pileo venerari? Quid absurdius, quam tecto capite obviam ire honesto viro? Cui tamen opinioni oppositam sententiam Sinae omnes tanquam rationi et naturae magis consentaneam, pro aris et focis defendunt. Hi enim cum sint ethnici maiore, quam Christiani erga suos antiquos ritus affectione imbuti, multo magis exterae cuiuspiam gentis dissimiles a suis consuetudines aversantur.

16. Huic erga suas res affectioni zelum quemdam praetexunt (quae est altera praedictae variationis occasio) assuefaciendae ad omnes Christianos ritus Sinicae huius gentis, ut simul cum divina Lege

etiam ritus et consuetudines Christianorum admittat. Sed deponendi pilei consuetudo nullam habet cum Christiana Lege necessariam connexionem. Gentilitius ille ritus est, et pro diversitate nationum diversus. Ea ratio (quam ipsi ad suam sententiam comprobendam tanquam validissimam in publico coetu attulerunt) a Christiana Lege Sinas potius avertere quam ad illam suscipiendam allicere aut invitare multo est pronior. Quae si valeret, cur non etiam linguam et litteras Europaeas Christianos Sinenses addicere compellimus? Cur non calceos, pileum ac vestem omnem (uti Tartari fecerunt) Europaea forma conficere docemus? (Christianorum enim lingua et litterae sunt; vestisque et ornatus utique Christianorum est) ut Sinicae nationem non modò Christianam, sed etiam Europaeam faciamus?

17. Tertia causa mutationis Tartaris adscribenda. Ea gens in sylvis, ac montibus venando vitam transigere assueta, sine urbibus, sine domibus, tentoria ex crudis ferarum pellibus assuta huc, illuc circumferendo pascendis equorum armentis (quibus eorum regio abundat) graminis subinde [14^r] feraciores terras investigans, primo suo in Regiam Pekinensem ingressu novum ei curiae atque Sinis inusitatum omnino spectaculum dedit. Nam ut erant ii Tartari pauperrimi, inurbani, inciviles, impoliti, inconcinni, nudis plerique omnes pedibus, ac sine pileo, male consutis pellibus semitecti potius, quam induti, coeperunt omnia idolorum fana perlustrare, atque ad ipsum sacrum Dei templum ex curiositate frequentes accedere, et quoquo modo adorare. Quod cum tumidi facerent, utpote (quamvis sine proelio) victores, occasionem Sinensibus Christianis praebuerunt non suspicandi solum, sed apud seipsos certissime statuendi, eum esse Tartarorum ritum ac morem, religionis gratia caput detegere quam ipsi consuetudinem (nempe a magistro suo Europaeo laudatam) arripere atque imitari deberent. Favit ei opinioni gravissimus aestus, et calor qui mense iunio (quo exeunte Pekinensem regiam Tartari intravere) plus solito incensus, Christianis non modo suasit sed omnino persuasit, ut pileum deponerent frigidioris aurae captandae gratia, et simul religiosi cultus novo ritu perficiendi. Idem pariter spectaculum caeteris urbibus, ac provinciis datum est, quocumque ea lues occupando imperio intenta pervadebat.

18. Eadem fuit etiam Patri Ioanni Adamo erroris causa (ut ipsemet et P. Franciscus Furtado tunc temporis superior mihi post annum ex Xantum provincia Pekinum advocato retulere) qui novos Dominos

novo cultu (seu sine cultu potius) videns in ipsa Curia totiusque Imperii Principe Urbe rem suam agere; Sinicam omnem politiam atque urbanitatem (sicuti vestem et crines) omnino esse proscriptam arbitratus, Christianis suis permisit, ut iuxta [14v] Europaeum morem sine pileo sacris mysteriis in templo assisterent; eiusque exemplum aliqui ex Patribus in suis residentiis secuti sunt. At is (ut postea ex eventu patuit) non fuit antiquus aliquis Tartarorum ritus, aut consuetudo Sinicis ritibus opposita, sed ruditas ac barbaries ipsorum Tartarorum fuit, qui in sylvis, atque inter feras nati, educatique nullum profecto politiae aut urbanitatis genus e sua regione in Sinicum imperium afferre potuerunt. Postquam vero rerum potiti Sinicas uxores ducere, et domos atque agros habere coeperunt, ac divites aere alieno facti, holosericis vestibus conspicui apparere, publica insuper munia et praefecturas exercere: alia omnino rerum facies fuit. Nam iidem Tartari iam politici ac civiles redditi; et ad urbanitatem compositi, non modo nihil praeter vestem et crines immutarunt; sed etiam omnem Sinensem cultum ritumque ultro amplexati sunt, quo et seipsos a Sinis honorari velint; et ipsi Sinis reciproca veneratione respondere. Iam in mutuis salutationibus (quando obvii invicem fiunt) in confabulationibus, in conviviiis, in coetibus, inque ipsis idolorum fanis (et si forte in aliis caeremoniis remissiores) certe tegendi capitis vetustissimam Sinarum consuetudinem non segniter servant: addita etiam tam aestui, quam hiberni temporis pileo serica vitta, qua illum (ne excidat) sub mento ligare consueverunt.

19. Quatuor erroris causa una simul, et multiplex. Novi missionarii recens ab Europa in Sinas appulsi tam Sinicae missionis statutorum ignari, quam divinae gloriae zelo incensi, singuli fere singulis residentiis assignati (propter sociorum paucitatem), quid facerent, nisi ad Europaeam amussim omnia dirigerent? Praesertim cum nova undique pullulante segete Christianorum, unicus Pater et linguam Sinicam [15r] addiscere, et veteres Christianos ad meliora promovere, et novas in eadem provincia Christianitates instituere, et templa subinde erigere, et catechismis insistere, et sanctum baptismum, aliaque sacramenta administrare, omniaque Societatis ministeria perficere solus cogeretur! Praeterea frequens per oppida et pagos excursio, infirmorum crebra visitatio, necessaria moribundis assistentia, caeterique urgentissimi pro animarum salute labores ita oppressos potius quam occupatos hoc ultimo tempore (multiplicatis undequaque ecclesiis) omnes missionarios detinebant: ut ad levioris momenti curas (cuiusmodi

esse videntur istae de ritibus meris externis) aliqui animum adiicere ne quidem cogitent. Et quamvis Sinicae missionis regulas ac statuta (quas superiorum ordinationes vocamus) Pater Ignatius a Costa Vice-Provincialis transcribi, eorumque exemplaria quaedam novis Patribus distribui curaverit, ea tamen diligentia sero magis contigit, quam par erat, nec autem praecedentem errorem potuit praeveniendo ne incurreretur impedire, nec in posterum esse admodum proficua generali missionariorum comprehensione atque exilio proxime subsequitis.

20. Postremo loco non levis errandi occasio fuit neophytorum suis in Spiritu magistris obsequendi facilitas, saltem quoad externam speciem, quae Europaeis hominibus Sinicos mores nondum satis edoctis facile persuadere potuit Sinas ipsos non ita suis hisce externis ritibus esse addictos, ut melioribus (Europaeis videlicet) se institui non libenter paterentur. Eius praetensae facilitatis duae causae possunt assignari, altera ex ipsorum Christianorum conditione ac statu, altera ex Evangelicorum ministrorum autoritate desumpta. Quoad primam negari non potest idem hactenus in hoc Sinico imperio contigisse, quod in toto terrarum orbe ab ipsis Evangelicae praedicationis initiis factum esse nemo ignorat, ut scilicet ex iis, qui a daemonum servitute ad Christi castra se recipiunt, plebeorum ac pauperum, quam locupletum ac procerum [15^v] multo maior semper numerus fuerit. Nam ab ipsomet Christo Deo Summo omnium regnorum legislatore missus ad Ioannem fuit qui nuntiaret “pauperes, non divites Evangelizantur.”

Inter Sinas divina favente gratia honestos viros multos et Litteratos et divitiis inclytos et praefecturis conspicuos suavissimo Christi iugo vidimus colla sponte subdidisse; at inferioris notae homines multo plures. Nec est in omnibus provinciis aequalis proportio, ut singulis exempli gratia togatis tot centeni ex plebe respondeant; sed in Australibus nobiles ac Litterati frequentiores Christino nomina dedisse, quam in Borealibus conspiciuntur. Atque in una ex iis provinciis, quae ad Septentrionem pertinent, multa hominum millia postremo ante persequutionem tempore Christi fidem suscepisse novimus, quorum in numero praeter pauperrimos milites, ac tenues rusticos montiumque incolas vix quispiam ex Litteratis, aut ex nobiliore aliqua familia censeatur. Hinc potest aliquis inferre, cum eiusmodi sint Christiani Sinenses, parum aut nihil de politicis ritibus ad illos pertinere. Quis enim in agris aut montibus urbium politiam requirat? Quis ab aratoribus

civilem exigat urbanitatem? Adeoque huiusmodi homines propriis ritibus carentes Europaeos doceri et posse, et debere.

Haec tamen illatio quae in aliis nationibus aliquid includere videretur, in hac Sinica gente nullum locum habet, quae in hoc quidem genere (audenter dico) caeteras omnes antecellit, nullus enim homo Sinensis quantumvis illitteratus ac rudis, rusticus, et pauper, in his caeremoniis vel leviter peccare non piaculum iudicat. In Sinici anni kalendis (quando et mutua amicorum visitatio, et honoraria filiorum erga parentes, discipulorum erga magistros salutatio inviolabili consuetudine fieri debet), quis Sinarum et ex infima plebe non cum novis, aut saltem mundis vestibus, ac decenter compositis, id officis suis amicis, magistris, affinibus, aut consanguineis persolvit? In nataliciis [16^r] cuiuspiam diebus quis non solum ex iis, qui ei aliqua necessitudine coniuncti sunt, sed ex tota vicinia non decentissime ornatus ei gratulatur? In defunctorum comploratione quis sine lugubri veste, aut saltem pileo ad amicum, aut affinem consolandum accedit? In idolorum fanis, aut etiam in sua quisque domo (habent enim Sinae etiam pauperes domi altare, aut mensam suis inanibus diis dicatam), quis vel rusticus nudis pedibus, aut sine pileo, aut non cum omni decore statis horis preces fundit odores incendit aut quoquomodo idola sua adorat ac veneratur?

In his ritibus exactissime observandis toti sunt omnes Sinae etiam pauperes, nec sine gravis notae periculo aliorumque offensione, aut eos omittere, aut in iis quicquam perperam facere liberum illis est. Quare ea, quam supradixi, neophytorum suis magistris obsequendi facilitas non humili eorum conditioni, sed Evangelicorum ministrorum (quos Christiani summopere venerantur) auctoritati adscribenda. Eorum enim a quibus aeternae salutis viam edoceri satagunt, non solum praecepta, sed et consilia et monita quaeque tanquam Leges excipiunt, quibus non exacte obedire sit nefas.

Sed ea Christianorum obedientia minime tollit ethnicorum Sinensium offensionem, qui contrario ritu imbuti Christianorum Deum ab ipsismet Christianis parui fieri existimabunt. Christiani etiam satis inviti parent, qui cum suos istos ritus Christianis Legibus non adversari probe intelligant, pro illis tanquam pro re sua perorare subinde non cessant. Quo autem ministri auctoritas maior, eo parendi studium ardentius, aut certe minus animi ad contradicendum.

Hinc factum est, ut in ipsa curia, in qua Pater Ioannes Adamus apud Tartarum Sinicum imperatorem gratia plurimum valebat,

et multi ex honestioribus Christianis propter Mathematicam scientiam eius moderamine regebantur; nec ii ipsi Mathematices studiosi ei, quem [16^v] quoad saeculi curas praesidens et quoad animi directionem sui arbitrum habebant contrario auderent, et ad eorum exemplum caeteri in eadem curia Christiani, atque etiam in aliis quibusdam residentiis se se componerent, nisi ea ex autoritate magistrorum, quasi violentia accederat, secus omnino facturi.

21. Haec omnes, quas hactenus memoravi causae, vel occasiones, non omnes e nostra societate Sinicos missionarios ad quippiam immutandum permoverunt, sed perpauca, multo maxima pars ab antiquae consuetudinis ritu nullatenus divertit. Et quidem inter eos ipsos, qui nuperrime Sinicam missionem adierunt; ii qui plures huius imperii provincias percurrendo lustrarunt, et magnatum, ac procerum consuetudine liberalius usi sunt, in Sinicis moribus satis eruditi ne latum quidem unguem ab antiquorum ministrorum sensu unquam discreparunt.

22. Paucorum duplex fuit sententia. Altera eorum qui erga Europaeos ritus et consuetudines tam vehementer afficiuntur, ut quae apud Sinas ab illis diversae sunt non possint ipsis non displicere; adeoque Europaeis commutandas censeant. Altera eorum qui eiusmodi Latini ritus caeremonias rubricas aliquas, aut leges Ecclesiasticas putant, quae necessario ubique terrarum observandae sint, nec eas liceat sine Pontificia dispensatione atque indulgentia violare. Postrema haec sententia quam longe a vero aberret, aliarum (quas supra memoravi) nationum contrarius usus clare demonstrat. Prior autem illa ne digna quidem sanctissimae Legis praeconibus censi debet, qui Apostolo teste, et suo exemplo illis praeunte omnibus omnia fieri debent, ut omnes Christo luci faciant. S. Augustinus epistolae 18 caput 9 apud Pater Suarez Liber 2 Contra Regem Anglicanam caput 18 numero 9 in tres ordines mores Ecclesiae distinguens: "In primo ponit ea, quae Divinae Scripturae praescribit autoritas, de quibus ait non esse dubitandum, quin ita facere debeamus, ut legimus. In medio vero ordine ponit [17r] ea, quae toto orbe servat Ecclesia, de quibus ait disputare quin ita faciendum sit, insolentissimae insaniae est. In tertio ponit ea, quae per loca, et regiones variantur, de quibus ait in unaquaque provincia servandum esse quod neque contra fidem, neque contra honestos mores fieri solet". Haec Pater Suarez ex S. Augustino desumpta ad nostram sententiam comprobendam convenientissime affert. Neque enim Sinicus iste mos aut contra Christianam fidem pugnat, aut honestos mores corrumpit.

23. His adde validissimam ex Pontificia concessione rationem. Summus si quidem Pontifex sacerdotibus Europaeis Latino ritu sacrificantibus, ut tecto capite in Sinis celebrent, indulisit propter ipsosmet Sinas; quos utique tecto capite assistere supponit; secus nullo modo talem dispensationem concessurus. Ergo eadem concessione Sinensem ritum approbavit, quem (utpote Christianis Legibus nulla ex parte contrarium) vult esse inviolatum, nec in Europaeum mutari. Et quale ὕστερον πρότερον, quam inversus ordo? Europaeum sacerdotem relicto Europaeo ritu Sinicum assumere, quo ipsos Sinas facilius ad Christianum adducat, et interim Sinenses Christianos compellere, ut suo abdicato, Europaeo ritui assuescant? An non tolerabilius esset Sinis Europaeum sacerdotem Europaeos ritus inter Sinas servare, Sinico ritu Sinis ipsis relicto; quam e contra ademptum Sinensibus antiquissimum suum ritum in Europaeum sacerdotem transferre, Sinenses ipsos Europaeum ritum admittere cogendo?

24. His omnibus rite ac serio expensis placuit Patribus omnem nostrae praxeos dissonantiam, quae in numeris 20. 22. apparet, novae praxeos consonantia temperare quam simul cum Patrum nominibus separatim describemus.

ARSI *Jap. Sin.* 158, f. 5r⁷⁸

Numeri 20 et 22 sic debent emendari : Cum apud Sinas pileum e capite deponere nulla sit reverentia, quin immo omnis externa veneratio tam homini quam vero aut putato Numini tecto capite semper a Sinis exhibeatur, Christiana autem Mysteria summam exigant reverentiam, quae praesentibus etiam ethnicis probetur, Neophyti sive Sancto Sacrificio assistentes, sive Sacerdoti Sacris operanti inservientes, sive etiam ad Sacram Communionem accedentes, ob tanti mysterii rev[erenti]am semper caput pileo tecum gerant.

Antonius a Gouvea, superior domus Cantoniensis
 Felicianus Pacheco, V.Prov^a Sinensis Prepositus V.Pro^{alis}
 Petrus Canevarius
 Fr. Dominicus de Navarrete, Praeses
 Franciscus Brancatus
 Stanislaus Torrens
 Jacobus Motel
 Jacobus Lefauve
 Christianus Herdtrich
 Claudius Motel
 Philippus Couplet
 Fr. Dominicus Maria de S. Pedro
 Franciscus Rougemont
 Joannes Dominicus Gabiani
 Joannes Franciscus Ferrarius

78 See image 1, page 10 above.

