

## Article

# Orthodoxy in China and the West: The Jesuit Interpretation of *Analects* 2.16

Feizhi Qi

School of Philosophy, Shaanxi Normal University, Xi'an 710062, China; qifeizhi@snnu.edu.cn

**Abstract:** The *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (1687) resulted from Jesuit research into Chinese classical texts. Upon its publication, the work conformed to the Jesuits' accommodationist policy, facing challenges over its orthodoxy from both China and the West. The Latin translation and commentary on *Analects* 2.16 mirror these challenges and the Jesuit rebuttal. Compared to earlier translations, this version adheres more closely to traditional Chinese exegesis and participates actively in historical debates over orthodoxy. The annotations also delineate the heterodox teachings of the Yang (楊), Mo (墨), Daoist, and Buddhist schools, juxtaposing them with Confucianism, which they portray as a natural law to be perfected. The inclusion of these four heterodoxies introduces a novel aspect to Christian heresiology, while the portrayal of Confucianism assimilates it into the Christian orthodox framework. This article contends that the translation and commentary exemplify the Jesuits' efforts to establish orthodoxy within both Chinese and Western contexts.

**Keywords:** *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus*; the *Analects*; orthodoxy; heterodoxy; Jesuit; Confucianism

## 1. Introduction

One of the earliest Latin translations of the *Lun Yu* (論語) or *Analects of Confucius* can be found in *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (hereafter referred to as CSP), published in Paris by Philippe Couplet (1623–1693) in 1687. It is the foundational and representative text of the Western transmission of Chinese classics. In addition to the complete translation of *Analects*, it also contains Latin translations of *Da Xue* (大學), or *The Great Learning*, and *Zhong Yong* (中庸), or *The Doctrine of the Mean*. It had a profound influence on the study of Chinese philosophy and the rise of Sinology in Europe. However, the book was not compiled purely out of academic interest, for “our purpose is not so much to serve the amusement and curiosity of those who live in Europe, rather the benefit of those who sail from Europe to bring the light of the Gospel to these last lands” (propositum nobis est non tam servire oblectamento & curiositati eorum qui in Europa degunt, quam utilitati eorum qui ex Europa lucem Evangelicam ultimis hisce terris allaturi navigant) (Couplet et al. 2021, p. 195).

The missionaries initially studied Chinese classics to further their mission, using them as a tool for learning Chinese and to implement Matteo Ricci's accommodationist policy. The preface of CSP summarizes the ideological goal of this policy as *bu ru jue fo* (補儒絕佛), “to supplement and enhance the deficiencies in Confucian philosophy to eliminate the influence of Buddhism on mainstream thought” (Couplet et al. 2021, p. 200). Therefore, a thorough study of Confucian classics is necessary to integrate Christianity and Confucianism and compete for mainstream thought. CSP is considered the final result and one of the supreme achievements of this scholarship (Mungello 1985, pp. 247–52; Luo 2012, pp. 123–28; X. Zhang 2016, pp. 121–26; Meynard 2019, pp. 269–82).

The Chinese intellectual world was undergoing significant change during this time. While the imperial examinations, representing the official ideology, still adhered to Zhu Xi (朱熹) (1130–1200), the emergence of the Wang Yangming (王陽明) (1472–1529) school in the middle of the Ming Dynasty brought about a revolution in Daoxue (道學) or the traditional orthodox school represented by Zhu. However, in the late Ming Dynasty, the Wang



**Citation:** Qi, Feizhi. 2024. Orthodoxy in China and the West: The Jesuit Interpretation of *Analects* 2.16. *Religions* 15: 128. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15010128>

Academic Editor: Thierry Meynard

Received: 16 December 2023

Revised: 13 January 2024

Accepted: 16 January 2024

Published: 19 January 2024



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

school diverged and faced fierce criticism, while Buddhism experienced a revival. Some advocated for the integration of the three doctrines of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Daoism, while others rejected the idea of merging the three. Academic debates flourished while the orthodoxy was in crisis. In these circumstances, the Jesuits, claiming to supplement Confucianism, became involved in, or actively participated in, the orthodox controversies in seventeenth-century China. As Zhang Xiaolin (張曉林) remarks, Matteo Ricci's accommodationist policy fundamentally transformed the Neo-Confucian orthodoxy (Zhang 2005, pp. 328–54).

The Jesuits' engagement with the evolution of Chinese philosophy reshaped their interpretation of their Catholic heritage. Almost fifty years after the Jesuit mission in mainland China, Franciscan and Dominican missionaries arrived in Fujian province. They were astonished to find that the Jesuit priests accepted the Chinese practice of honoring ancestors and Confucius, sparking a long-standing debate among Catholics about Chinese religious rituals (Li 2019, pp. 22–38). In the historical context of the "Ritual Controversy", the Jesuits' study of Chinese classics aimed not only to revive ancient Confucianism but also to clarify to the Western world that Chinese rituals did not involve idolatry.

Due to persecution incited by Yang Guangxian (楊光先) (1597–1669), 23 missionaries were gathered in Guangzhou from 1666 onwards. From 1667 to 1668, they held a 40-day conference to review their missionary activities in China, including the issue of Chinese rites. Despite acknowledging Alexander VII's approval of Chinese rites in 1656, the conference did not reconcile the differences. Navarette (1618–1689), a Dominican who participated in the conference, published *Tratados historicos, politicos, ethicos religiosos de la monarchia in China* in Spain in 1676, condemning Chinese rites as heresy (Li 2019, pp. 31–32). The manuscript of CSP was composed during this same period, as the Jesuits who upheld Matteo Ricci's accommodationist policy faced a significant obstacle in their mission and were on the verge of being expelled from China. Meanwhile, the dispute over Chinese liturgy among missionaries grew increasingly intense. The Chinese rites advocated by the Jesuits would also come under accusations of heresy in Europe.

In this context, the Jesuits had to pay special attention to Confucius's own remarks and ideological elaboration on heresy, which are first found in *Analects* 2.16: *Gong hu yiduan si hai yeyi* (攻乎異端，斯害也已) ("Applying oneself to heterodoxy is indeed dangerous"). The original Chinese sentence is confusing. For instance, the character *gong* (攻) can mean either "applying oneself to" or "attacking", and both meanings appeared in CSP. The last character *yi* (已) is a function word with no actual meaning. But some people interpreted it as "to stop", expressing Confucius' intention to end the danger. However, the most difficult word to understand in this sentence is *yiduan* (異端) or heterodoxy, which literally means "different thread". This is the only place where the word appears in the *Analects*, so we do not know exactly what Confucius meant, leaving room for interpretation. Later generations of Confucian scholars gradually formed a sense of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. From this perspective, the significance of *Analects* 2.16 to the Jesuits was equally important as the importance of this passage to Neo-Confucianists, who also emphasized orthodoxy. Therefore, despite criticizing Neo-Confucianism, the Jesuits had to study Confucian classics through it because both the Jesuits and Neo-Confucianists shared the same goal of interpreting: to establish a new orthodoxy based on Confucian classics.

Through the Latin translation and annotation in CSP, we can see how the Jesuits merged the Christian notion of heresy and the Chinese notion of *yiduan*, and how they established a new notion of orthodoxy bridging China and the West, facing the challenge of cultural imperative from both China and western Catholic traditions.

## 2. The Catholic Notion of Heresy

The term "heresy" originates from the Greek word *αἵρεσις*, with its verb form being *αἵρέω*, meaning "to choose". It is used in the New Testament to refer to various schools or schisms (e.g., Ac.5.17, 15.5, 24.5; 1Co.11.19; Ga.5.20; 2P.2.1). Irenaeus (c. 130–202), in his five-volume work, *Contra Haereses*, mainly targeted the so-called Gnostic School or heresy

(Γνωστικὴ αἵρεσις) (Schaff 1885a, p. 544). According to him, the main issue with Gnosticism was its claim to possess secretive knowledge about salvation, which, in reality, it did not have. Additionally, it had also drawn many followers away from the mainstream Church, making Gnostics the false prophets warned against in the New Testament (Schaff 1885a, pp. 514–15). Compared to the consistency of truth, pseudo-knowledge is significantly inconsistent and self-contradictory in both doctrine and expression (Schaff 1885a, pp. 544–46). The unity of truth is affirmed by the Apostolic Succession, and all churches that originate from the apostles inherit and impart the same doctrine, specifically, concerning the one God, the incarnate Christ, and God's plan for salvation as prophesied by the prophets (Schaff 1885a, pp. 541–43). Therefore, the key to identifying false prophets is to determine if they originate from the apostles or if their teachings align with the apostles. Tertullian (c. 155–220) adopted Irenaeus's criteria for distinguishing true and false knowledge as a guide to uphold orthodox beliefs and reject all heresies. He considered heresies, whether Gnosticism or not, to be equivalent to the false prophets denounced in the New Testament and formally defined heresy as a self-condemned sin (Schaff 1885b, pp. 388–89). Apostolic succession is indeed the golden standard for distinguishing heresy from orthodoxy. However, for churches with a difficult-to-trace history, it is necessary to examine whether their teachings align with the apostles. Tertullian summarized the apostles' teachings as the rule of faith (*regula fidei*), which focused on the faith regarding God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit (Schaff 1885b, p. 397). It became the standard for identifying heresy: anyone who maintained a belief contrary to the rule of faith or taught such a belief was considered a heretic.

The distinction between orthodoxy and heresy, beginning with the Council of Nicaea in 325, extended beyond intellectual debates. Imperial power's coercion added a practical dimension to the creed (*credo*) derived from the rule of faith. The Catholicity assumed by the Orthodox Church was not only ensured by nominal apostolic succession but also the result of mutual balance and compromise among all bishops. The creed was dynamic, subject to adjustments and supplements based on historical contexts. The boundaries between orthodoxy and heresy would shift with changes in power structure and historical circumstances. The tumultuous history of the church, from the First Council of Nicaea to the Council of Constantinople and the multiple exiles of Athanasius of Alexandria (c. 296–373), vividly reflected the volatile nature of this period. Additionally, due to the close alliance between the church and the state, heretics who were defeated in debates would face corresponding political and practical consequences. Being expelled from the church meant that heretics could not seek protection from the empire. Furthermore, the Edict of Thessalonica, issued by Emperor Theodosius I in 380, not only mandated divine condemnation for heretics but also prescribed punishment by secular authorities, thereby making heresy a religious transgression, as well as a crime against the empire (Pharr 1952, p. 440).

The development of the concept of heresy during the first three centuries of Christianity revealed essential, if not all, elements of this concept in later history, both in theory and practice. From a Catholic perspective, heresy is primarily seen as a schism, which is non-Catholic, i.e., the destruction of one faith and one body. The Catholic Church cannot tolerate such destruction in terms of faith, and once the church takes power, it will ensure that heretics face the consequences. However, the controversy between heresy and orthodoxy is characterized by antinomies; any heresy or sect regards itself as orthodox and condemns others as heretics, making it difficult for different sects to agree with each other. Hence, the intervention of authority is necessary for adjudication. If the authority of faith encounters difficulties in adjudicating, the authority of power will be utilized, leading to the shifting boundaries between orthodoxy and heresy based on changes in power dynamics. As G.R. Evans summarized in his book, *A brief history of heresy*, "being persecuted may not be a direct consequence of posing a threat to the true faith and right order, but primarily of being a nuisance to powerful figures and interest groups. This may make such individual dissidents more 'political' than 'religious'" (Evans 2003, p. 159).

During the late Middle Ages and early modern times, as secular monarchs centralized and gained control over religion, the political aspects of orthodoxy and heresy became more prominent. The Edict of Nantes, the first tolerant decree in Catholic history, was not a result of religious tolerance but rather a demonstration of political power. Henry IV, the first monarch of the French Bourbon dynasty, used this decree to temporarily halt France's religious wars. However, the political balance of the sixteenth century reflected the Crown's weakness and did not bring an end to the religious conflicts. The power struggle between orthodoxy and heresy continued, with both Catholic extremists and Huguenots dissatisfied with the Edict of Nantes, making it a transitional compromise despite Henry IV declaring it irrevocable (Sutherland 1988).

During the reign of Louis XIV, Huguenots faced increasing persecution and restrictions on their rights in France. In 1685, the Sun King issued the Edict of Fontainebleau, which revoked the Edict of Nantes that had previously tolerated the Huguenots and officially established Catholicism as the state religion of France, achieving the goal of centralizing power under one king, one law, and one faith. Huguenot believers were compelled to either convert to Catholicism or go into exile. In the preface of *CSP* published in the Royal Library of Paris in 1687, Couplet dedicated it to Louis XIV in the form of a letter and quoted *Analects* 2.16 to support his action against Protestant heresy: "Hence Confucius' words, still celebrated among the Chinese today: *Gong hu yiduan*, attack heretical dogmas (oppugna heretica dogmata). How much joy, then, would it bring to a man who loved piety, if he had been able to reach these most fortunate times of the grace of the law, that care of your King to protect and expand Religion, to root out heresies, and to propagate piety?" (Couplet et al. 2021, p. 192).

Couplet aimed to suggest that Confucius' philosophy was in line with Louis XIV's campaign against heresy and that they could mutually benefit from each other. On one hand, Confucius' teachings supported Louis XIV's political actions and affirmed the validity of his absolute rule. On the other hand, Louis XIV's dispatch of missionaries to China to eliminate heretical beliefs could realize Confucius' ideals (Meynard 2022). However, Couplet's reference to Confucius deviated from the mainstream interpretation of the time and was unlikely to align with Confucius' original intention. This is because during Confucius's era, Confucianism was not the dominant ideology of the ruling class, and it was not feasible for Confucius to promote the attack on a different school or sect. Confucius' attitude toward those with different beliefs was not to conspire with them (*Analects* 15.40).

In the 17th century, mainstream interpreters in China, following Zhu Xi's comments, interpreted *gong* as "entirely working on" (專治). Zhang Juzheng (張居正) (1525–1582), referred to by Prospero Intorcetta (1626–1684) and others, also adopted Zhu Xi's interpretation. Additionally, *gong* was not understood as attacking by other Westerners. Compared to contemporary commentators, Couplet's interpretation was particularly unique. However, considering the context of Couplet's letter and its practical motivation, his choice is understandable. His letters completely transformed Confucius and Confucianism into orthodox beliefs from the perspective of an absolutist monarch. In other words, this understanding was based on the contemporary Catholic notion of heresy, which contrasts with the cultural accommodationist work carried out by his Jesuit colleagues in China. Couplet's translation aligned Confucius's teachings with the culture of European Christian monarchy. In his letter, Confucius's attitude toward heretics resembled that of Theodosius I, both of whom could serve as ideological resources for Louis XIV's political action of establishing Catholicism as the state religion.

In contrast to Couplet's letter addressed to a European monarch, the translation and interpretation of the *Analects* in the third volume of *CSP* did not entirely correspond with the Catholic notion. The following section will analyze the translation and interpretation of *Analects* 2.16 from the standpoint of the Chinese interpretive tradition.



### 3. The Latin Translation

The creation of *CSP* was not the result of a single genius but rather the culmination of collaborative efforts by Jesuits spanning over a century. Apart from the final editor, Couplet, the cover signatures also feature Prospero Intorcetta, Christian Herdtrich (1625–1696), and François de Rougemont (1624–1676). Additionally, when considering several of its prototypes, Michele Ruggieri (1543–1607), Matteo Ricci (1552–1610), Inácio Da Costa (1603–1666), and others should be acknowledged for their contributions (Meynard 2015, pp. 2–19).

Ruggieri's 1590 Spanish translation is the oldest extant Western language translation of the *Analects*. In 1921, Spanish historian Julián Zarco uncovered and released the manuscript. In 2018, Thierry Meynard and Roberto Villasante published a modern critical version of this translation. The second is the Latin manuscript written between 1591 and 1592, currently housed in Biblioteca Nazionale v. Emanuele II, Rome, Fondo Gesuitico 1185/3314. It was previously considered the earliest Western language translation of the *Analects* (Lundbaek 1979). Scholars initially credited Matteo Ricci as the author of the manuscript. However, after conducting a thorough comparative text analysis, Meynard suggested that the translator should be Ruggieri (Meynard 2015, pp. 2–6). Nevertheless, this conclusion is not universally accepted (Luo 2021).

The *Analects* included in *Sapientia Sinica* (hereafter referred to as *SS*), published by Da Costa and Intorcetta in Jianchang, Jiangxi Province, in 1662, is the first published Western language translation of the *Analects*. It served as the direct source for the much more influential *CSP*, which the Jesuits supplemented and revised during the Canton Conference, and Couplet edited before its publication in Paris in 1687.

The translation of *Analects* 2.16 exhibits a consistent theme across the four versions, while differences in wording and sentence structure demonstrate the Jesuits' evolving interpretation strategies and hermeneutic principles for Confucian classics.

Ruggieri's Spanish manuscript (1590): "He who gives himself to the worship of idols and the doctrine of Xiechia (Sakyamuni) will receive great harm from it." (El que se da al culto de los ídolos y a la doctrina de Xiechia recibirá gran daño de ello) (Meynard and Villasante 2018, p. 140).

The Latin manuscript (1591–1592) states that "Worshiper of idols and student of perverse doctrine evidently made a loss". (Idolorum cultor et perversae doctrinae studiosus nimirum quam iacturae fecit) (Biblioteca Nazionale v. Emanuele II, Rome, Fondo Gesuitico 1185/3314. p. 50).

*Sapientia Sinica* (1662): "He who applies himself, and directs himself and others to heretical dogmas, deviates from the direction of the correct law of the Saints, by acting in this way he is harming himself". (Qui applicat sese, ac se et alios dirigit haereticis dogmatibus, declinans a directione rectae legis Sanctorum, hoc modo agendo damno sibi est) (Da Costa and Intorcetta 1662, p. 4).

*Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (1687): "Everyone who pays attention to dogmas foreign and contrary to the teaching of the saints, and who blindly teaches them to others, this kind of innovator will easily harm himself and harm the country". (Quisquis operam dat peregrinis ac diversis a doctrina Sanctorum dogmatibus, eisque temere instituit alios; hujusmodi novator cito perniciosus erit tam sibi quam Reipublicae) (Meynard 2015, pp. 131–32).

The Chinese concept of *yiduan* was initially perceived as idolatry rather than heresy. The 1590 Spanish translation specifically emphasized a specific form of idolatry, namely, the doctrine of Xiechia (la doctrina de Xiechia), which is the transliteration of Shijia (释迦), or Sakyamuni. This translation may have been influenced by Zhu Xi, who cited Cheng Yi (程頤) (1033–1107) to highlight the dangers of Buddhism: "Buddha's words are more sensible than those of Yang and Mo,<sup>1</sup> so they are particularly harmful. Scholars should be as far away from lewd voices and beauties. If they don't, they will suddenly get caught up in them" (佛氏之言, 比之楊墨, 尤為近理, 所以其害為尤甚. 學者當如淫聲美色以遠之, 不爾, 則駸駸然入於其中矣) (Zhu 2013, p. 32).

However, Ruggieri's translation did not accurately reflect Confucius' original text. Idolatry, a concept specific to the Christian world, was unknown to Confucius, as Buddhism did not enter China until at least 500 years after his lifetime. The subsequent Latin manuscript (1591–1592) expressed a similar idea but did not reference Buddhism.

Ruggieri's initial translation of *yiduan* already showed a blending of interpretations, consistent with the Chinese commentary tradition that regarded Buddhism as the most harmful manifestation of *yiduan*. In the meanwhile, the Jesuits viewed Buddhism as idolatrous, interpreting *yiduan* as teachings that promoted idolatry. Later Latin translations discarded the notion of idolatry and instead presented the conflict between Confucius and *yiduan* in the context of orthodoxy and heresy, facilitating its smoother integration into the Chinese commentary tradition.

Concerning the understanding of *gong*, the 1662 Latin translation is similar to Ruggieri's Spanish translation. Both interpreted *gong hu yiduan* in a descriptive clause, and both translated *gong* as "to devote oneself to", which was consistent with Zhu's annotation. Zhu quoted Fan Zuyu 范祖禹 (1041–1098) to annotate the word *gong*: "Gong means entirely working on, so to work on wood, stone, metal or jade is called Gong" (攻, 專治也, 故治木石金玉之工曰攻) (Zhu 2013, p. 32).

In comparison to the Spanish translation, which directly used idolatry or Buddhism as the object of devotion, the Latin translation in SS employed the technical term "heretical dogma" instead. According to Zhu's annotation, this term was explained as "deviating from the direction of the correct law of the Saints" (非聖人之道而別為一端) *Shengren* (聖人) or Sage was translated as Saint (Sanctus), which is opposite to heretic, and *Shengrenzhidao* (聖人之道) or the way of Sage was translated as law of the Saints (lex Sanctorum), which is in line with the Catholic concept, taking Apostolic succession and the creed as the legal basis for orthodoxy and hence rejecting heretics. CSP followed the mode of translating *Shengren* with Saint. However, the Chinese original meaning of *Sheng* (聖) is wise (Duan 1992, p. 692). Mencius proposed a definition that was generally recognized by later generations of Confucian intellectuals: an influential great man (Legge 1960b, p. 490). Accordingly, in addition to ancient sage kings such as Yao (堯), Shun (舜), Yu (禹), and Tang (湯), recognized by Confucian tradition, Confucius himself can also be referred to as *Shengren*. The ancient Chinese historian Sima Qian (司馬遷) (c.145–c.86 BC) used this standard to refer to Confucius as *Zhisheng* (至聖), the Supreme Sage (Szuma 1979, p. 27). Later generations of Confucians also called Confucius *Shengren*. The Tang Dynasty (618–907) court posthumously bestowed the title of king, *Wenxuan Wang* (文宣王), upon Confucius. In the Song Dynasty (960–1279), the word *Sheng* was added to the posthumous title, and in the Ming Dynasty (1368–1644), it was renamed *Zhisheng Xianshi* (至聖先師), the Supreme Sage and Master. However, according to *Analects* 7.33, Confucius himself had already rejected the title of *Shengren*: "the sage and the man of perfect virtue—how dare I rank myself with them?" (若聖與仁, 則吾豈敢?) (Legge 1960a, p. 206).

Zhu Xi interpreted this statement as an illustration of Confucius's humility (Zhu 2013, p. 94), and Zhang Juzheng concurred with his interpretation (J. Zhang 2016, p. 143). However, both SS and CSP translated the statement verbatim and did not adhere to Zhu's or Zhang's understanding of humility.<sup>2</sup> The Jesuits used "Saint" to translate *Shengren* and thereby established the orthodox and heretical categories in the *Analects*, enabling them to avoid labeling Confucius as a Saint and, consequently, prevent themselves from falling into heresy.

Intorcetta's *Vita Confucii*, written for SS, connected the reference of *Xifang you shengren* (西方有聖人), meaning "there is a Sage in the west", from *Liezi* (列子) to the legend of Han Mingdi (漢明帝), the second emperor of the Eastern Han dynasty (25–220), who sent envoys to seek the Dharma. This story is also found in the annotations of Ruggieri's Spanish translation: Mingdi saw a vision in a dream, and an angel told him that a savior had arrived in the West. He then sent an envoy to seek him, but mistakenly brought back Buddhism (Meynard and Villasante 2018, p. 140). Ricci mentioned the same story in his *Tianzhu Shiye* (天主實義), regarding it as a tragedy (Ricci 2016, pp. 368–71). According to Intorcetta, Con-

fucius predicted the coming of a saint from the West in a prophetic tone, inspiring Mingdi to send an envoy to seek the saint and the Christianity he preached. However, the envoy made a mistake. This story is fully preserved in CSP (Couplet et al. 2021, pp. 336–37), clarifying the specific meaning of the law of Saints (*lex Sanctorum*) and heretical dogmas (*heretica dogma*) in the Latin translation of *Analects* 2.16. Through translation, the Jesuits implanted Catholic concepts into the commentarial tradition of Neo-Confucianism in the Song and Ming dynasties.

CSP revised some aspects based on SS, and some detailed modifications may impact our understanding of the Jesuits' interpretation of Confucian classics. Firstly, besides Sanctus, CSP modified certain Latin words according to Zhang Juzheng's annotations, which differ from those in SS and have a Catholic connotation. For instance, instead of directly translating *yiduan* in the *Analects* as heretical dogmas, CSP translated it explanatorily according to the annotations and used "doctrine" (*doctrina*) instead of "law" (*lex*) to translate *dao* (道) in the phrase *Shengrenzhidao*, which is more in line with Zhang Juzheng's annotation.<sup>3</sup> This limited the error of *yiduan* to the academic level rather than an offense to Apostolic succession or the creed. Furthermore, instead of using the legal and religious implications of "damnum" to translate *hai* (害), the broader adjective "dangerous" (*periculosus*) was used, clearly indicating the danger not only to themselves (*sibi*) but also to the country (*Reipublicae*), which could also be supported by Zhang's interpretation.<sup>4</sup>

Furthermore, CSP did not completely conform to the interpretations of Zhu Xi and Zhang Juzheng. As previously mentioned, Zhu interpreted *gong* in terms of *zhuanzhi* (專治), meaning entirely working upon. Zhang adopted this interpretation and provided further elaboration: "If a person is attracted by this art, he entirely works on it and wants to master it, he will create a kind of discussion that is higher than others, and he will establish a separate sect that will become popular in the world" (人若惑於其術, 專治而欲精之, 造出一種議論, 要高過於人, 別立一個教門, 要大行於世) (J. Zhang 2016, p. 29). In SS, *gong* was translated as "applies himself" (*applicat sese*), aligning with Zhu and Zhang's annotation, emphasizing the devotion of heterodoxy. However, CSP changed it to "pays attention" (*operam dat*), expanding the scope of heterodoxy to include not only those devoting themselves to different sects, such as Buddhists, but also those who are not devoting themselves but pay attention to, such as Neo-Confucianists. Additionally, in the phrase *Fei Shengrenzhidao* (非聖人之道), "to reject the way of Sage", CSP used "opposite" (*diversum*) to express *fei* (非) and added the adjective "foreign" (*peregrinum*), calling the object of criticism an innovator (*novator*). These Latin terms, *operam dat*, *peregrinum*, and *novator*, did not align with Zhu and Zhang's annotations or SS's wording, suggesting that the concept of *yiduan* in the traditional annotations was expanded by the Jesuits to include Neo-Confucianism.

Although the CSP introduced the four schools of Yang, Mo, Daoism, and Buddhism in the annotation of this sentence based on Zhang, it did not mention Neo-Confucianism. However, we can discern the CSP authors' attitude toward Neo-Confucianism in the preface and relate it to the translation context here. In the fourth chapter of the preface in CSP, when criticizing Buddhism, it distinguished between two kinds of doctrine: the external doctrine aimed at the common audience, which is essentially idolatry, and the internal doctrine aimed at the intellectual class, which is essentially atheism. Toward the end of the chapter, it was mentioned that Neo-Confucianism and Buddhism converge on atheism, specifically the inner doctrine of Buddhism:

"And while they hated the pleasures of external doctrine (*exterior doctrina*), and the most numerous rites, and abstinence from meat and wine, and so many idolatrous monsters (*tot idololorum monstra*), and the idleness of useless Bonzii to the Republic; yet they embraced not a little the inner and secret doctrine (*interior tamen & arcana doctrina*) in the deep abyss of Atheism (*in profundam Atheismi voraginem*)... Cheu, Cham, Chim, Chu,<sup>5</sup> the four Interpreters, those in this class, not indeed the first, but nevertheless erred most with the ruling dynasty Song (宋)" (Couplet et al. 2021, pp. 226–27).

The Neo-Confucian interpreters did not embrace Buddhism, but they focused on its inner doctrine. Through their exploration of this foreign doctrine, they emerged as innovators among the interpreters of Confucius, aligning perfectly with the definition of *yiduan* proposed by CSP in the Latin translation of *Analects* 2.16. This interpretation is consistent with the Jesuit accommodationist policy, which aimed to revive ancient Confucianism and challenge Neo-Confucianism. It also aligns with the Chinese history of interpretations, as seen in the explanations of Lu Jiuyuan (陸九淵) (1139–1193) and Wang Yangming, both of whom expanded the scope of *yiduan* to encompass Confucianism beyond the schools of Yang, Mo, Daoism, and Buddhism. It is evident that while both the translations of CSP and SS challenged the Chinese hermeneutics of the Song and Ming dynasties, the latter sought to replace or construct the *Shengrenzhidao* and *yiduan* with Catholic notations of orthodoxy and heresy, while the former aimed to assert its own claims within the Chinese interpretive tradition and actively engage in the debate on Chinese orthodoxy, all in accordance with Jesuit interpretation principles of Chinese classics.

However, the categorical framework of orthodoxy and heresy had not been abandoned but instead had been preserved in the comments section. This part was marked in italics in CSP. Similar to SS, it presented Zhang's explanations of Yang, Mo, Daoism, and Buddhism and directly labeled these four sects as heresies (haereses). This separated the annotations from the main text in type font, preventing misinterpretation and the misconception that Confucius criticized Buddhism like Ruggieri, or that SS overly influenced Confucius with Western ideas. The decision to remain as faithful as possible to the Chinese interpretative tradition in the main text, and the integration of Chinese and Western concepts in the annotations, demonstrates that the Jesuits possessed a profound understanding of Chinese classics and were capable of approaching Confucius and his teachings with a hermeneutic attitude.

#### 4. Chinese Heresies

Based on Zhang Juzheng's annotation, SS completed a genealogical study of the four Chinese *yiduan* or heresies, while CSP explored the Chinese interpretation tradition in greater depth, further systematized the genealogy, and introduced the concept of heresiarch (haeresiarcha):

"The heresiarchs (haeresiarchae) Yang and Mo occurred six hundred years before Christ, under the Zhou dynasty, and were already declining at the end of this dynasty. The error of the first, Yang, was like this: the care of one's affairs is enough and one should not get involved with others. He should not direct any effort, work, or skill toward the commonwealth, the ruler and magistrates, or the family. Thus, this wicked man is splitting apart all of humanity and bringing the whole world back to the wilderness. When he asks individual members, or citizens so to speak, to be free from each other and to look for oneself, he is clearly demolishing the most beautiful constructions of cities and kindoms. At the opposite (opposita) of this, there is the teaching of Mo: everyone should neglect themselves and work for others; the same care and benevolence should be applied to all, without any distinction between friends or relatives. Each of these two stupid avoided one vice; one avoided the vice of loving oneself immoderately (se amantis immodice), and the other, avoided the vice of neglecting oneself (se negligentis), yet they were both rushing to the opposite vice" (Meynard 2015, pp. 132–33).

Regarding the traditional interpretation of *yiduan*, early commentaries on the *Analects* emphasized various schools of thought that were not included in the *Six Classics*, as elucidated by He Yan (何晏) (196–249): "there is a unified path to the good, so different paths lead to the same destination. *Yiduan* are those who have different destinations" (善道有統, 故殊途而同歸. 異端, 不同歸者也). Another early interpreter, Huang Kan (皇侃) (488–545), concurred with He Yan's views but provided additional specificity: "*Yiduan* is so-called miscellaneous books, it means that if one does not study the six canonical texts, but instead studies miscellaneously from hundreds of schools of thought, it will cause serious harm" (異端, 謂雜書也. 言人若不學六籍正典, 而雜學於諸子百家, 此則為害之深). Interpreters be-



gan to restrict *yiduan* to Yang, Mo, Daoism, and Buddhism only during the time of Zhu Xi (Cheng 1990, p. 108). However, Yang and Mo were still considered the origins of the latter two sects. For instance, Zhu Xi pointed out that Daoism originates from Yang, and Mencius' refutation of Yang also means refuting Daoism (Li 1986, p. 587). Zhang Juzheng clearly organized the genealogy of the four sects: "As for the Daoist teachings of later generations, they are all like Yang; the Buddhist teachings are all like Mo" (至於後世道家之說, 全似楊朱; 佛家之說, 全似墨翟) (J. Zhang 2016, p. 29). It is in this sense that the Jesuits referred to Yang and Mo as the heresiarchs, whose reasons are rooted in both excesses and deficiencies, as explained by the Cheng brothers:

"For the most part, Confucians devote themselves to the right path and do not tolerate any deviations. The beginning may be trivial, but the end may be irreversible. For example, a quotation from *Analects*: Shi is too much, but Shang is not enough. To the middle way of the sage, Shi is just too dense, and Shang is just not enough. However, if he is dense, he will gradually become a universal lover, and if he is not enough, he will be selfish. Both one's excess and the other's deficiency has origin from Confucianism, but the incompleteness makes them towards Yang & Mo" (大抵儒者潛心正道, 不容有差, 其始甚微, 其終則不可救。如“師也過, 商也不及”, 于聖人中道, 師只是過於厚些, 商只是不及些, 然而厚則漸至於兼愛, 不及則便至於為我, 其過不及同出於儒者, 其末遂至楊, 墨) (Cheng and Cheng 1981, p. 176).

Any deviation from the correct path leads to heresy. Yang and Mo were considered the founders of all heresies due to their extreme inclinations. However, this logical lineage is anachronistic, as Yang and Mo lived after Confucius, and the so-called *yiduan* by Confucius could never have referred to them. Zhang Juzheng observed in his commentary that Confucius predicted these heretical sects and cautioned against them (J. Zhang 2016, p. 29). However, the Jesuits, who clearly referenced Zhang Juzheng's interpretation, completely disregarded this point and directly pushed the age of Yang and Mo's life back to 600 BC, before the time of Confucius. This has no basis in the history of Chinese interpretation.<sup>6</sup> The Jesuits may have adjusted the historical order to align with logical genealogy and ensure historical consistency with logic, thus avoiding interpretational difficulties.

After discussing the heresiarchs, the Latin annotation in CSP introduced the branches of the two heresies, Daoism and Buddhism. The explanation of Daoism was relatively simple. It was believed that Daoism became a heresy not at the time of the founder Laozi (老子) but was corrupted by the superstitions of later generations (Meynard 2015, pp. 132–33). Liu Yuan (劉沅) (1768–1855), a Confucian scholar with an affinity for Daoism during the Qing Dynasty, expressed a similar view in his *Sishu Hengjie* (四書恆解). He believed that Laozi was in alignment with Confucius, but the mystical practices attributed to him were actually passed down by later generations, leading to his being labeled as a heretic (Cheng 1990, p. 109). In a sense, the Jesuits shared the same sympathy for Daoism as Confucian interpreters, as the Jesuit accommodationist policy led them to attack and focus on the same target, which was Buddhism.

After briefly introducing Daoism, the text then explored the heresy that concerned the missionaries the most. The Latin annotator agreed with Cheng Yi's assessment that Buddhism is more truthful than Yang and Mo but deemed it more harmful because it conceals its venom under the guise of truth (*quae virus suum specie illa veritatis occultet*) (Meynard 2015, p. 134). Buddhism appears to be similar to the truth on the surface, making it more confusing. The external and inner teachings of Buddhism, as mentioned in the preface of CSP, reflect the Jesuits' fundamental understanding of Buddhism in the seventeenth century (Meynard 2019, pp. 40–66). The truth-like or deceptive appearance of Buddhism is manifested in the teachings of karma, salvation, discipline, and good deeds in the external doctrine. However, these appearances, resembling the truth, are not the ultimate truth. The external doctrine will eventually lead to inner teachings, which the Jesuits referred to as frauds and intrigues (*fraudes & insidiae*) (Couplet et al. 2021, p. 223).

Following the citation of Cheng Yi, the Latin annotation proceeded to quote historian Qiu Jun (丘浚) (1421–1495) criticizing Han Mingdi for introducing Buddhism into China in *Shishi Zhenggang* (世史正綱). This passage exhibited a strong defensive tone:

“This is the beginning of Buddhism entering China. Since the beginning of the world, the disasters caused by barbarians have never been greater than this. As a son, Han Mingdi admired the teachings of this fatherless doctrine, as the monarch of China, he colluded with foreign barbarians and thus started such controversies, causing endless disasters for thousands of years” (此佛教入中國之始, 自天地開闢以來, 夷狄之禍未有甚於此者也... 明帝為人之子, 乃崇無父之教, 為中國之主, 乃黨外夷之人. 開茲大釁, 以為千萬年無窮之禍) (Qiu 1996, pp. 243–44).

Qiu Jun’s critique of Han Mingdi was aimed at refuting Buddhism from the perspective of Confucian orthodoxy. He argued that Mingdi’s primary mistake was promoting the fatherless doctrine and aligning with foreign barbarians, with his central concern being the protection of the Chinese nation against foreign ideologies. Surprisingly, the Jesuits, who are foreigners themselves, still used Qiu Jun’s arguments to support their interpretation of Buddhism.

In the Jesuit version of the story of Han Mingdi introducing Buddhism into China, Mingdi’s main fault was not the alliance with foreigners but his failure to fulfill the instructions of the dream. As mentioned earlier, CSP continued the interpretation in SS, arguing that Mingdi followed the inspiration of Confucius but made mistakes. According to this story, the Chinese previously received the revelation of Jesus Christ but brought back Buddhist scriptures out of misunderstanding, which led to the spread of Buddhism in China. Through such a narrative, the Jesuits could establish the rationality of the policy to supplement Confucianism and eliminate Buddhism, thereby establishing the historical legitimacy of competing for Chinese mainstream thought. Therefore, although the Jesuits emphasized returning to ancient Confucianism to clarify the errors of Neo-Confucianism when studying Chinese classics, they still accepted the orthodox mode of Neo-Confucianism in terms of methodology—that is, establishing orthodoxy through the compilation of classics. In this sense, Catholicism and mainstream Confucianism shared the same interest in excluding heretics. For Confucian intellectuals who accepted Catholicism, it clarified the teachings implicit in mainstream Confucian thought.

It is intriguing that, as the rival of Catholicism in China, Buddhist scholars employed a similar approach to compete with Catholicism, namely, by aligning with Confucianism to establish an orthodoxy. Xu Dashou (許大受) (1575–1645) rejected Catholicism from the Chinese orthodoxy in his polemical work *Shengchao Zuopi* (聖朝佐闢), which bears a resemblance to the orthodoxy theory in CSP: “The three doctrines will never tolerate the fourth, and each of the orthodoxies of ruling and of ideology will not tolerate adultery, and thus *Shengrenzhidao* will be respected throughout ages” (三教決不容四, 治統道統各不容奸, 而聖人之道自嘗尊于萬世矣) (Xu 2018, pp. 83–84).

Another notable example is found in *Pi Xie Lun* (闢邪論), written by Yang Guangxian, who also opposed Catholicism from the perspective of Confucian orthodoxy: “The reason why Yang and Mo are heretics is that they are biased in their principles and do not follow the middle and just way, therefore they are alienated by sages. Furthermore, the persons and doctrines of theirs are far less than Yang and Mo, and their weirdness is far beyond” (楊墨之所以為異端者, 以其持理之偏, 而不軌於中正, 故為聖賢之所距. 矧其人其學, 不敢望楊墨之萬一, 而怪僻妄誕, 莫與比倫) (Yang 2013, p. 2054).

## 5. “Ju Kiao” or the New Orthodoxy

Similar to the criticism of heresies by Christian church fathers, Zhang Juzheng defined the specific content of *Shengrenzhidao* or orthodoxy before rejecting the four heresies of Yang, Mo, Daoism, and Buddhism. This involves coordinating and regulating individuals and society, including ethical relationships, values, the class division of people, and the methods of governing. SS translated this part verbatim, summarizing it as “Ju Kiao” (儒教) (“Confucian doctrine”), which in Latin was translated as the law and religion of litterati (litteratorum lex ac Religio), characterized by singular (unica), true (vera), ancient (avita), and universal (universalis). CSP continued to define and describe Chinese orthodoxy, with some changes. It omitted the specific content of Confucian orthodoxy in Zhang

Juzheng's commentary and placed the definition of orthodoxy after the introduction of the four heresies, avoiding referring to Chinese orthodoxy as religion (*religio*) and instead calling it doctrine (*doctrina*). Most importantly, it mentioned the relationship of "Ju Kiao" to the grace of Christ, i.e., "Ju Kiao" as Chinese orthodoxy is a natural law waiting to be perfected by grace:

"Therefore, Colaüs and the other interpreters condemn these sects and novelties very strongly, teaching to hold the unique way and law (*viam unam, unamque legem*), constantly held by the saints and common to all lands and nations (*terrīs omnibus gentibusque maxime sit communis*) Evidently, this is the law and teaching of the Literati (*Litteratorum lex et doctrina*), called Ju Kiao, which Confucius had received from the ancient kings and philosophers and which he himself cultivated very earnestly, developing and illustrating with so many words and precepts. If today's Literati professed and served this law, then it would not be difficult for the law of nature (*lex naturae*) to be perfected by another law, and there is a door for the Chinese toward the salvific law of the Christian truth and grace" (Meynard 2015, p. 136).

If the Jesuits' translation and annotation of Confucian classics reflects their competition for mainstream Chinese thought from the perspective of Confucianism, then this paragraph, clearly written for European readers, directly reflects the purpose of publishing translations of Chinese classics in Europe: it explains that the basis of Chinese rites is not idolatry but natural reason; it also defends the accommodationist policy and explains the rationality of the Jesuits' efforts to adapt to Confucianism over the past century for their missionary work. Referring specifically to this explanatory note, the Jesuits established "Ju Kiao", which was distinguished from *yiduan* or heresies and was characterized by its universality applicable to all places and peoples, its ancient origins, and it could be regarded as natural law. Due to these three distinct characters, Confucian "Ju Kiao" can be consistent with Catholic orthodoxy.

Besides apostolic succession and the creed, universality and antiquity were considered crucial in distinguishing orthodoxy from heresy. Irenaeus maintained that the essential characteristic of the catholic church was its consistency, despite being widespread (Schaff 1885a, p. 541). This consistency and universality reflected in space is also reflected in time as antiquity. The truth of Christianity is not a new concept but has its ancient origins. The prophecies about Jesus Christ in the Hebrew Bible are utilized to demonstrate its truth in the *Apologia Prima* by Justin the Martyr (110–165), who asserts that even pagan philosophy originated from Moses (Schaff 1885a, pp. 280–86). When critiquing Marcionism, Tertullian stressed the historical connection between the Hebrew Bible and Jesus Christ in orthodox beliefs, in contrast to Marcion's Christ, which lacks a historical foundation (Schaff 1885b, pp. 529–33). The church historian J. Pelikan quoted the fifth-century monk St. Vincent of Lerins in the first volume of *The Christian Tradition*, defining Orthodoxy as "everywhere, always and by all" (*ubique, semper, ab omnibus*; Pelikan 1971, p. 333). In keeping with this tradition, Matteo Ricci also stressed the universal and ancient nature of Catholicism in the initial chapter of his *Tianzhu Shiyi*: "This doctrine about the Lord of Heaven is not the doctrine of one man, one household, or one state. All the great nations from the West to the East are versed in it and uphold it. What has been taught by sages and worthies has been handed down, from the creation of heaven and earth, men and all things by the Lord of Heaven, to the present time through canonical writings and in such a manner as to leave no room for doubt" (Ricci 2016, p. 43).

The Jesuits' depiction of "Ju Kiao" is similar to the "doctrine about the Lord of Heaven", which is widespread among all regions and peoples. It is not a new concept introduced by Confucius but rather inherited from ancient kings and philosophers. In addition to the universal and ancient qualities resembling Catholic orthodoxy, the Latin Commentary also associated "Ju Kiao" with natural law and viewed it as the preparatory stage of Christian law, which has deep roots in the history of Christian thought.

Irenaeus believed that God's plan in history unfolded in four stages, corresponding to the laws of the Garden of Eden, the Ark, Moses, and the gospel of Jesus Christ. As

history progressed, each law completed and replaced the previous one. He referred to the Ten Commandments of Moses as natural precepts (*naturalia praecepta*) (Schaff 1885a, pp. 706–801). Tertullian also believed in the continuity of laws across different historical stages and that natural law will be perfected by the gospel of Christ when the time is right (Schaff 1885b, pp. 240–42). Lactantius (250–317) argued that Christ revealed the complete truth, but before that, parts of the truth had been partially known by men through natural knowledge. He expressed the continuity between natural knowledge and revelation, stating that even people who have not received any enlightenment will attain some idea of the Creator as long as they look up at the sky (Schaff 1885c, p. 18). Thomas Aquinas discussed the importance of natural reason in understanding God. He maintained that by beginning with natural reason, one can be guided to truths that surpass reason (Aquinas 1911, p. 8).

The Jesuits followed the tradition of scholastic philosophy and intentionally integrated natural laws into their preaching of the gospel. For example, in the opening chapter of *Tianzhu Shiyi*, Matteo Ricci extensively used examples from the natural world, including animals, plants, and celestial bodies, to demonstrate God’s sovereignty and divine order (Ricci 2016, pp. 48–56).

The compilers of *CSP* were well-versed in the historical process of transitioning from natural law to the gospel of Christ. When they referred to “Ju Kiao” as a natural law to be perfected, they were drawing on models from Catholic history. In the preface of *CSP*, St. Paul’s preaching at the Areopagus was mentioned multiple times, where the apostle conveyed the truth of Christ using the framework of Greek philosophers’ understanding of God (Ac. 17.16–34). The Jesuits aimed to emulate Paul by illuminating the light of Christ through Chinese philosophy, which predates Greek philosophy (Couplet et al. 2021, p. 266). *CSP* also contains multiple references to the shift from natural philosophy to the church tradition of revealed truth. They also aspired for Chinese philosophy to achieve the same recognition in Europe as Greek philosophy and to be integrated into Christian orthodoxy as the natural law that paved the way for the gospel. The preface also includes texts that utilize examples from the church fathers to support an accommodationist policy: “Let no one, I pray, seize Jerome, who wrote that the Christian religion is the most similar to the Stoic discipline, from which discipline not a few passed over to Christianity, and afterwards defended it with their writings and blood. Who will argue with Augustine when he writes that at the beginning of the Gospel of John, ‘In the beginning was the Word’, he finds the Platonic philosophers? Who condemns Lactantius, who uses all his work against the ethnic authorities, and after reviewing the dogmas of our Religion which have been handed down by various Philosophers, he finally concludes: therefore, the whole truth and every mystery of the divine Religion is to be reached by the Philosopher” (Couplet et al. 2021, pp. 309–10).

The Jesuits believed that, like pre-Christian Western philosophers, Confucius arrived at truth through natural reason. They saw their mission as emulating the ancient church fathers and perfecting the natural law expounded by Confucius with the law of grace. This may be the meaning of “Philosophus” in the title of *CSP*, referring to a philosopher who discovered and expounded the natural law to be perfected by the gospel of Christ. Just as the Hebrew Bible and Greek philosophy are not heresies, Chinese philosophy is also not heresy or the basis for heresy. It already contains the truth of Christ, but it has yet to be illuminated by the light of the gospel.

## 6. Conclusions

Couplet’s interpretation of *Analects* 2.16 in his letter to Louis XIV, and the translation and annotation of this passage in the third volume of *CSP*, presented two distinct ways for Westerners to understand and accept Chinese ideological categories. The former ignored its Chinese context and interpreted Confucius based on the contemporary Western notion of heresy, believing that Confucius advocated a political attack on heretics. The latter, on the other hand, introduced the categories of Catholic notions of orthodoxy and heresy into the Chinese interpretive tradition. It integrated Chinese and Western categories on a uni-



versal level, subsuming the concrete historical connotation. The revised Latin translation and annotation of *CSP* minimized the religious connotations of these categories and interpreted “Ju Kiao”, representing Chinese orthodoxy, as natural law to be perfected by the gospel, in contrast to the treatment of *SS*. This not only aligned with the Catholic notion but also offered a new foundation for the Chinese debates on orthodoxy, introducing a fresh interpretation of Christian heresy and the Chinese *yiduan*. Through these Latin annotations, both Chinese and Western orthodox thoughts have transcended their individual cultural contexts. Therefore, it can be said that the introduction of Christianity in China led to a new understanding of religion and heresy in the West, as evident in the *CSP*. And the new Western concepts of heresy also had a significant impact on reshaping the modern Chinese term of *yiduan*.

However, the integration of *CSP* has had a negative impact, as it has established a new orthodoxy that differs from both Catholic and Confucian beliefs, making it challenging to be accepted by either. The history following the publication of *CSP* has confirmed this to some extent. In less than half a century, the Holy See prohibited Chinese rituals, and the Chinese emperor Kangxi (康熙) also banned Christianity in China. As a result, the Jesuits were completely defeated in the Chinese ritual controversy. Catholicism has not become integrated into mainstream Chinese thought, and unlike Greek philosophy, Chinese philosophy has not been able to incorporate Catholic doctrines. Catholics who followed Chinese rituals were considered heretics in both Chinese and Western cultural traditions. It is worth noting that in *Sinensis Imperii Libri Classici Sex*, translated and edited by François Noël (1651–1729) and published in Prague over 20 years later, the categories of orthodoxy and heresy were completely abandoned when translating the *Analects* 2.16, thus avoiding the conflict of ideas (Noël 1711, p. 88).

Upon examining the interaction between the two cultures, we find that the orthodox construction abridging China and the West represents a newly formed culture resulting from their encounter and interaction. This construction, with its universality and connectivity, challenges the limited cultural contexts of both China and the West, initiates new dialogues, creates new cultures, and encourages new ideological changes.

**Funding:** This research was funded by the Youth Fund Project for Humanities and Social Sciences Research of the Ministry of Education (教育部人文社会科学研究青年基金项目), grant number 19YJCZH127, Research on the Doctrine of the Soul in Late Antiquity (西方古代晚期灵魂学说研究).

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Data Availability Statement:** Data are contained within the article.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflicts of interest.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Yang and Mo represent two extremes Confucianists criticized: Yang Zhu (楊朱, 395–335 B.C.) advocated egoism, and Mo Di (墨翟, 476–390 B.C.) advocated the opposite, i.e., universal love.
- <sup>2</sup> *SS*: si loquamur de vera sanctitate, et solida virtute cordis, sane ego quomodo praesuma dicere eas virtutes in me esse (Da Costa and Intorcetta 1662, p. 23). *CSP*: quod attinet ad sanctitatem cum solida illa sinceri animi perfectione, quibus praeditum me vulgo autumant; equidem ego qui ausim mihi arrogare? (Meynard 2015, p. 266).
- <sup>3</sup> 張居正: 自古聖人繼往開來, 只是一個平正通達的道理 (J. Zhang 2016, p. 29).
- <sup>4</sup> 張居正: 以之修己, 便壞了自己的性情; 以之治人, 便壞了天下的風俗 (J. Zhang 2016, p. 29).
- <sup>5</sup> These four names here implies Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 (1017–1073), Zhang Zai 張載 (1020–1077), Cheng Hao 程顥 (1032–1085) and Cheng Yi 程頤 brother, Zhu Xi 朱熹, they are all Neo-confucianists.
- <sup>6</sup> The Jesuits determined that Confucius was born in 551 BC by referring to the chronological order recorded in Chinese history books. See (Couplet et al. 2021, p. 180).

## References

- Aquinas, Thomas. 1911. *The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas Part I*. London: R. & T. Washbourne, Ltd.
- Cheng, Hao 程顥, and Yi Cheng 程頤. 1981. *Er Cheng Ji* 二程集 [Collection of the Cheng's Brothers]. Beijing 北京: Zhonghua Shuju 中華書局.
- Cheng, Shude 程樹德. 1990. *Lunyu Jishi* 論語集釋 [Collected Explanations of Lunyu]. Beijing 北京: Zhonghua Shuju 中華書局.
- Couplet, Philippe, Prospero Intorcetta, Christian Herdtrich, and François de Rougemont. 2021. *Zhongguo Zhexuejia Kongfuzi* 中國哲學家孔子 [Confucius Sinarum Philosophus]. Translated by Niecai Wang 汪聶才, Feizhi Qi 齊飛智, and Xiaoxia Hao 郝曉霞. Zhengzhou 鄭州: Daxiang Chubanshe 大象出版社, vol. 1.
- Da Costa, Inácio, and Prospero Intorcetta. 1662. *Sapientia Sinica Lib. Lun Yu. Jianchang*. Available online: <http://www.fondazioneintorcetta.info/Intorcetta.html> (accessed on 15 December 2023).
- Duan, Yucai 段玉裁. 1992. *Shuowen Jiezi Zhu* 說文解字註 [Annotation of Discussing Writing and Explaining Characters]. Shanghai 上海: Shanghai Shudian 上海書店.
- Evans, Gillian Rosemary. 2003. *A Brief History of Heresy*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Legge, James. 1960a. *The Chinese Classics Vol. 1: Confucian Analects, The Great Learning, The Doctrine of the Mean*. Hongkong: Hongkong University Press.
- Legge, James. 1960b. *The Chinese Classics Vol. 2: The Works of Mencius*. Hongkong: Hongkong University Press.
- Li, Jingde 黎靖德. 1986. *Zhuji Yulei* 朱子語類 [The Sayings of Master Zhu]. Beijing 北京: Zhonghua Shuju 中華書局, vol. 24.
- Li, Tianguang 李天綱. 2019. *Zhongguo Liyizhizheng: Lishi, Wenxian He Yiyi* 中國禮儀之爭：歷史、文獻和意義 [The Chinese Ritual Controversy: History, Documents, and Significance]. Beijing 北京: Zhongguo Renmin Daxue Chubanshe 中國人民大學出版社.
- Lundbaek, Knud. 1979. The First Translation from a Confucian Classic in Europe. *China Mission Studies (1550–1800) Bulletin* 1: 1–11.
- Luo, Ying 羅瑩. 2012. *Zhongguo Zhexuejia Kongfuzi Chengshu Guocheng Zouyi* 《中國哲學家孔子》成書過程芻議 [A Brief Discussion on the Publishing Process of Confucius Sinarum Philosophus]. *Journal of Beijing Administration Institute* 北京行政學院學報 2012: 123–28.
- Luo, Ying 羅瑩. 2021. Yesuishi Luo Mingjian Sishu Shougao Xintai 耶穌會士羅明堅“四書”手稿新探 [A New Probe into the Latin Manuscript of Four Books collected by Michele Ruggieri S.I.]. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research* 外語教學與研究 53: 284–95.
- Meynard, Thierry 梅謙立. 2015. *The Jesuit Reading of Confucius: The First Complete Translation of the Lunyu (1687) Published in the West*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Meynard, Thierry 梅謙立. 2019. *Cong Xiehou Dao Xiangshi: Kongzi Yu Yalishiduode Xiangyu Zai Ming Qing* 從邂逅到相識：孔子與亞里斯多德相遇在明清。[De la Rencontre à la Compréhension: Confucius et Aristote sous les Dynasties Ming et Qing]. Beijing 北京: Beijing Daxue Chubanshe 北京大學出版社.
- Meynard, Thierry 梅謙立. 2022. *Cong Boyingli Zhi Luyishisi De Shuxin Kan Ruxue Zai Ouzhou De Zaoqi Chuanbo* 從柏應理《致路易十四的書信》看儒學在歐洲的早期傳播 [The Early Spread of Confucianism in Europe: A View from “The Letter to Louis XIV” by Philippe Couplet]. *International Sinology* 國際漢學 2022: 17–22.
- Meynard, Thierry 梅謙立, and Roberto Villasante. 2018. *La Filosofía Moral de Confucio, por Michele Ruggieri, SJ: La Primera Traducción de las Obras de Confucio al Español en 1590*. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas.
- Mungello, David Emil. 1985. *Curius Land: Jesuit Accommodation and the Origins of Sinology*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Noël, François. 1711. *Sinensis Imperii Libri Classici Sex*. Prague: Kamenicky.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. 1971. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine Vol. 1*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pharr, Clyde. 1952. *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Qiu, Jun 丘浚. 1996. *Shishi Zhenggang* 世史正綱. In *Siku Quanshu Cunmu Congshu* 四庫全書存目叢書 [Siku Quanshu Catalog Series]. Jinan 濟南: Qi Lu Shushe 齊魯書社, vol. 7.
- Ricci, Matteo. 2016. *The True Meaning of The Lord of Heaven*. Chestnut Hill: Institute of Jesuit Sources, Boston College.
- Schaff, Philip. 1885a. *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. 1: The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*. Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library.
- Schaff, Philip. 1885b. *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. 3: Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian*. Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library.
- Schaff, Philip. 1885c. *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. 7: Fathers of the Third and Fourth Centuries: Lactantius, Venantius, Asterius, Victorinus, Dionysius, Apostolic Teaching and Constitutions, Homily, and Liturgies*. Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library.
- Sutherland, Nicola Mary. 1988. The Crown, the Huguenots, and the Edict of Nantes. In *The Huguenot Connection: The Edict of Nantes, Its Revocation, and Early French Migration to South Carolina*. Edited by Richard Golden. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 28–48.
- Szuma, Chien. 1979. *Selections from Records of the Historian*. Translated by Hsien-yi Yang, and Gladys Yang. Peking: Foreign Languages Press.
- Xu, Dashou 許大受. 2018. *Shengchao Zuopi Jiaozhu* 《聖朝佐闕》校註 [Proofreading and Annotation of Shengchao Zuopi]. Gaoxiong 高雄: Foguang Wenhua 佛光文化.
- Yang, Guangxian 楊光先. 2013. *Pi Xie Lun* 闕邪論. In *Mingmo Qingchu Tianzhujiashishi Ziliao Xibian* 明末清初天主教史資料新編 [Newly Compiled Historical Materials on Catholicism in the Late Ming and Early Qing Dynasties]. Beijing 北京: Guojia Tushuguan Chubanshe 國家圖書館出版社.

- Zhang, Juzheng 張居正. 2016. *Zhang Juzheng Zhijie Lunyu Daxue Zhongyong* 張居正直解《論語》《大學》《中庸》 [Direct Interpretation of Lunyu, Daxue and Zhongyong]. Beijing 北京: Zhongguo Yanshi Chubanshe 中國言實出版社.
- Zhang, Xiaolin 張曉林. 2005. *Tianzhushiyi Yu Zhongguo Xuetong: Wenhua Hudong Yu Quanshi* 天主實義與中國學統: 文化互動與詮釋 [The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven and Chinese Academic Tradition: Cultural Interaction and Interpretation]. Shanghai 上海: Xuelin Chubanshe 學林出版社.
- Zhang, Xiping 張西平. 2016. *Ruxue Xichuan Ouzhou Yanjiu Daolun* 儒學西傳歐洲研究導論 [Introduction to the Studies of the Western Spread of Confucianism into Europe]. Beijing 北京: Beijing Daxue Chubanshe 北京大學出版社.
- Zhu, Xi 朱熹. 2013. *Lunyu Jizhu* 論語集註 [Collected Annotations on the Analects of Confucius]. Shanghai 上海: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe 上海古籍出版社.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.