

Transmission of a Comparison: Father Joachim Bouvet's View of the K'ang-hsi Emperor and Louis XIV

John W. Witek, S.J.*

The sixteenth-century presence of western merchants and missionaries extending from India to Japan began to integrate two vastly different, and at times, hostile parts of the world, Europe and Asia. This was effected no longer by the land routes over the Eurasian landmass, but by sea voyages. Those in India and in Japan were startled to see how relatively easy such voyages were made by westerners. Indeed St. Francis Xavier's desire to understand Japan better led him to undertake his first step to penetrate China. Only from afar did he ever view *Chung-kuo* (The Middle Kingdom) for he died on the island of San-ch'uan in December, 1552.

In that same year Matteo Ricci was born in Macerata, Italy. There were no indications in his early life that he would enter the Jesuit Order, let alone go to China. His life has been so well studied and documented that its highlights at this symposium on the four hundredth anniversary of his entrance into China need not be recounted in this paper. His influence on Hsü Kuang-ch'i (1562—1633), Li Chih-tsao (d. 1630) and Yang T'ing-yun (1557—1627) and their assessment of him are quite familiar. Yet no one can underestimate the pithy but poignant evaluation of Ricci made by the mayor of Peking, Huang Chi-shih on the plaque he presented for placement on Ricci's tomb at Chala, "To one who attained renown for justice, and wrote illustrious books." (*Mo-i li-yen*)¹⁾ This was a Chinese way of expressing his esteem to

* Georgetown University

1) Matteo Ricci, *Fonti Ricciane*, ed. Pasquale M. d'Elia, 3 vols. (Rome: La Libreria dello Stato, 1942-1949), II, 616-17; for a short biography, see L. C. Goodrich, ed. *Dictionary of Ming Biography*, 2 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), II, 1137-44; hereafter cited as *DMB*.

perpetuate the memory of the friendship that existed between them.

The phrase *li-yen* comes from the *Tso-chuan* and has recently been translated as "to leave worthy writings to posterity."²⁾ The aim of this paper is not to examine the writings of Ricci but rather to view an aspect of the continuation of that spirit of "writing for posterity" that he had begun by the end of the sixteenth century. The focus will be on Joachim Bouvet's *Portrait historique de l'empereur de la Chine*³⁾ not only in its contents, but most especially its publication and translations that appeared in Europe in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Moreover the translations into Chinese and Japanese completed quite recently become an integral part of this study for the historical portrait of the K'ang-hsi Emperor compared to Louis XIV adds another dimension in the development of this century's historiography of the early Ch'ing period.

Upon Ricci's death in 1610, a small nucleus of a Catholic presence in China had been achieved. The fall of the Ming dynasty and the rise of the Ch'ing administration under Manchu leadership significantly altered the circumstances in which that nucleus evolved over time into different cities and towns of China. Eventually surpassing Yang Kuang-hsien (1597—1669) in an astronomical contest, Johann Adam Schall von Bell (1592—1666) and Ferdinand Verbiest (1623—1688) achieved an important liaison position for Christianity by their appointment to the Bureau of Astronomy⁴⁾. As Vice-Provincial in the Jesuit Order, how-

2) Liang Shih-chiu, *A New Practical Chinese-English Dictionary* (Taipei: Far East Book Co., 1971), p. 799.

3) (Paris: Michallet, 1697).

4) For biographies on Yang, see A. Hummel, ed., *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period* (Washington, 1943-44; reprint ed., Taipei: Ch'eng-wen, 1967), pp. 889-92; hereafter cited as *ECCP*; on Schall, see *DMB*, II, 1153-57; Louis Pfister, *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne mission de Chine (1552-1773)*, (Shanghai: Mission Catholique, 1932-34; reprint ed., Nendeln: Kraus Reprint, 1971), pp. 162-82 and Joseph Dehergne, *Répertoire des Jésuites de Chine de 1552 à 1800* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu and Paris: Letouzey and Ané, 1973), pp. 241-42. For biographical accounts of Verbiest, see Pfister, *Notices*, pp. 338-62 and Dehergne, *Répertoire*, pp. 288-90.

ever, Verbiest, ten years before his death, indicated his concern about the lack of missionary personnel. In his August, 1678 letter, he urged his fellow Jesuits in Europe to consider the China mission as a possible apostolate.⁵⁾

When Verbiest's letter arrived in Europe in 1680, getting more missionaries to China was already under discussion as the result of a proposal in France. The possibility of sending several Jesuits as royal mathematicians to make astronomical observations in the East was part of a plan that the director of the observatory in Paris, Jean-Dominique Cassini(1625—1712) had suggested to French officials. There were no immediate results until Philippe Couplet(1622—1693), a Belgian Jesuit missionary from China, visited Louis XIV in September, 1684 and the envoys from Siam also had an audience with the king in December of that year. The two events converged so that the monarch now could send some Jesuits to China in the company of a French envoy to Siam. Six Jesuits recruited: Joachim Bouvet(1656—1730), Jean de Fontaney (1643—1710), Jean-Francois Gerbillon(1654—1707), Louis Le Comte (1655—1728), Guy Tachard (1648—1712) and Claude Visdelou (1656—1731)⁶⁾. In the last months of 1684 and the early weeks of the 1685 they were preoccupied with hasty preparations for this important venture in Sino-French relations. Four of them were designated as "mathématiciens du Roy" at the Académie Royale des Sciences. The purpose of the group was to make astronomical observations and to study Chinese literature in order that some of them might return to Paris where they would translate the Chinese books that they were to collect for the Royal Library.

The six Jesuits reached Siam in late september, 1685 after a six-month uneventful voyage. By spring the following year, their future plans were undergoing change through the efforts of Phra Narai, the king of Siam. After witnessing the skills of the Jesuits, he asked Tachard to return to France to get twelve confreres for his court. Moreover

5) John W. Witek, S.J. *Controversial Ideas in China and in Europe: A Biography of Jean-Francois Foucquet, S.J. (1665~1741)* (Rome : Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu, 1982), pp.23-24.

6) *Ibid.*, pp.25-33.

he prevailed on Le Comte to stay there while the other four tried to reach Macao. Forced to return to Siam because of bad weather, the Jesuits stayed until June, 1687 and, together with Le Comte, reached Ningpo on July 23. Chin Hung, the governor of Chekiang, opposed their entry to China, even to the point of delaying the transmission of the imperial orders allowing them to enter Peking.⁷⁾ Having reached the outer limits of the city on February 1, 1688, they learned of the death of the Empress Dowager, Hsiao-chuan (1613—1688), the grandmother of the Emperor, and of Verbiest⁸⁾. The group actually entered Peking on February 7, but because of the mourning period, all official business was halted until late March. After the Bureau of Astronomy examined them, the Emperor ordered Bouvet and Gerbillon to work at the court but the others were allowed to live in the interior as they wished⁹⁾.

During their first five years in Peking, Bouvet and Gerbillon witnessed two momentous events in Chinese history: the conclusion of the 1689 Treaty of Nerchinsk at which Gerbillon assisted Thomas Pereira (1645—1708) and the Edict of Toleration of 1692 by which Catholicism was no longer to be listed among the heterodox sects proscribed by Chinese law. Working not only on improving their abilities in the Manchu and Chinese languages, both Jesuits were engaged, along with their confreres who had preceded them at court, in teaching the Emperor western mathematics, astronomy and medicine. After being cured by quinine which the French Jesuits provided, the Emperor offered them a house in the enceinte of the palace¹⁰⁾. That same evening, July 4, 1693, Bouvet was notified of his appointment as the imperial envoy

7) Chin Hung, a native of Wan-p'ing hsien, Shun-t'ien in Chihli, received the *chin-shin* degree in 1652. He served as governor of Fukien (1683-86) and then governor of Chekiang (1686-89). For details, see *ibid.*, p. 42, n. 78.

8) *ECCP*, pp. 300-301.

9) Witek, *Controversial Ideas*, pp. 42-44.

10) *Ibid.*, p. 63; see also the discussion of the Edict in my "Understanding the Chinese: A Comparison of Matteo Ricci and the French Jesuit Mathematicians of Louis XIV," in *East Meets West: The Jesuits in China, 1582-1774* (—in press). These are the proceedings of the conference at Loyola University, Chicago, in October, 1982.

(*ch'in-ch'ai ta-ch'en*) to thank Louis XIV for his generosity in sending the French Jesuits to China¹¹⁾.

By the time Bouvet arrived in Brest in March, 1697 after a long trip via Surat, he understood that if progress on the mission was to be forthcoming, it would then be necessary not just to extent the gratitude of the Emperor to the Sun King, but also to ask the latter for additional funds and permission for more French Jesuits to leave for China. In this milieu, he published his *Portrait historique de l'empereur de la Chine*¹²⁾. Only against a backdrop of Europe's knowledge of China can the impact of Bouvet's relatively short book be assessed. The challenge in attempting such an evaluation is to note those works about China available in Europe and to indicate how widespread the conception of China existed at least among European savants. Besides Ricci's *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinas* (Augustae Vind., 1615), such works as Alvarez Semedo's *Imperio de la China* (Madrid, 1642), Martini's *Novus Atlas Sinensis* (Amsterdam, 1655) and his *Sinicae historiae decas prima* (Munich, 1658) as well as Gabriel de Magaillans *Nouvelle relation de la Chine* (Paris, 1688) need to be included. Several recent studies indicate the complexities of the topic that cannot be further explored in detail herein¹³⁾. But since Le Comte, in returning to France in 1693, had already reported to Louis XIV about the China mission, Bouvet's similar task four years later was thereby made easier. In fact Bouvet had written a significant part, if not the whole manuscript of his *Portrait* as early as 1691¹⁴⁾. Without the original manu-

11) Witek, *Controversial Ideas*, p. 64.

12) Hereafter the work is cited as *Portrait*.

13) Edwin Van Kley, "Europe's 'Discovery' of China and the Writing of World History," *American Historical Review* LXXVI (April, 1971), 358-85; Donald F. Lach, *Asia in the Making of Europe*, 2 vols. to date (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965); Raymond Dawson, *The Chinese Chameleon. An Analysis of European Conceptions of Chinese Civilization* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967).

14) In December, 1691, Bouvet had completed a fairly long letter to the Duc de Maine which contained "le Portrait de l'Empereur de la Chine et un petit abrégé de son histoire." See Bouvet to Jean Bomier, Surat, December 21, 1695, Rome, Archivum Romanum Societatis Jesu, *Japonica et Sinica* 166, ff. 93-94v. See also Witek, *Controversial Ideas*, p. 53.

script, however, the exact changes he may have made enroute from China during his prolonged stay in Surat or even in Paris just before the publication appeared cannot be ascertained. With such extensive preparation over several years Bouvet was able to get the *Portrait* published just six months after his arrival in Brest¹⁵.

Perhaps the most unusual feature of the *Portrait* is that it is addressed primarily as a long letter to Louis XIV. On the first page one finds "Au Roy, Sire" and then the opening, "Le Portrait, que je prens aujourd'huy la liberté de présenter à Votre Majesté, est assurément la chose la plus rare, qu'on ait apportée jusqu'icy de l'Orient." The reports on China, Bouvet continued, furnish the readers with subjects that were "most worthy of your curiosity and attention." This was the portrait of an emperor who, as Louis XIV, joined with a genius both solid and sublime, has a "heart yet more worthy of the Empire; who is master of himself and of his subjects, and "equally adored by his peoples and respected by his neighbors." In a word he was a prince who "reuniting in his person the most grand qualities that form heroes would be the most accomplished Monarch who had since reigned a long time on the earth if his reign had not run concurrently with that of Your Majesty." Bouvet noted that despite the Emperor's sad state of paganism, his conduct was "almost half Christian." In fact the Emperor's good dispositions led Bouvet to hope that "perhaps one day" he would become the "destroyer of idolatry in China." just as Louis XIV had extirpated heresies in his states¹⁶.

The Emperor, then forty-four years old, and in his thirty-sixth reign year, had an air of majesty, an aquiline nose but a face with several smallpox marks and was somewhat above average height. Bouvet claimed that the Emperor was an excellent hunter and acquainted with Chi-

15) The first edition of the *Portrait* notes: "Achevé d'imprimer pour la premier fois, le 15 septembere 1697." See also C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 12 vols. (Brussels: C. Schepens, 1890-1932), II, 55.

16) *Histoire de l'empereur de la Chine* (La Haye: Meyndert Uytwerf, 1699; reprint ed., Tientsin, 1940), pp. 5-8. The 1699 text is the same as the 1697 original edition, but pagination varies. Comments on the Tientsin reprint are noted below.

nese-Manchu weapons as well as European firearms. His musical tastes were also crosscultural for he could play European instruments as well as those of the Chinese and Manchus. Possessing a memory, the Emperor was approachable toward his subjects and as sagacious in handling the peace negotiations with the Russians at Nerchinsk as in putting down revolts against his rule. In overseeing the complex administration of the Sino-Manchu state he continued to govern with firmness. The K'ang-hsi Emperor had studied the Chinese Classics and learned European philosophy, medicine, astronomy, and mathematics. Yet in administering the vast country, he demanded that the subordinate governors honestly execute his policies. For example, Bouvet noted, the year after the arrival of the five Jesuit mathematicians in Peking, the governor of Chekiang, Chin Hung, was sent into exile. A declared opponent of Christianity, Chin wanted to deport the five Jesuits. But in 1689 he was accused of embezzlement and was punished with exile¹⁷. On the other hand, Bouvet added, if an official was falsely accused of embezzlement, he could be restored to his position, as had occurred when the Emperor toured the central provinces of China.¹⁸ He liberally granted aid for repairing public buildings, taking care of rivers, canals, bridges, and so forth, which serve for the common welfare and commerce.

The principles of European astronomy and mathematics the Emperor first learned from Verbiest and then Antoin Thomas(1644—1709) explained their practical application with mathematical instruments. He was especially pleased with those the French Jesuits presented to the throne and with the European books that they were charged to translate into Manchu and Chinese. For the sake of developing fine arts, he created a type of academy of printers, engravers and workers in iron and copper for clocks and mathematical instruments. The Emperor used as his model the Académie Royale set up in Paris by Louis XIV¹⁸. He

17) For data on the imperial decree, see *Ch'ing-shih*, ed. Chang Ch'i-yün et al., 8vols. (Taipei: Kuo-fang yen-chiu yüan, 1963), I, 86.

張其昀等編：清史

18) Bouvet, *Histoire*, pp. 53 ; 59-60 ; 131 ; for a biography of Songgotu, see *ECCF*, pp. 663-66.

definitely supported Christianity through the Edict of Toleration which one of his officials, Sosan, (Songgotu, d. 1703) so forcefully defended in the Board of Rites (*Li-pu*).

Although Bouvet admitted that no one could fathom the heart of the Emperor, he did not resemble Louis XIV, the most distinguished of all the Christian monarchs, in one respect—religion. To do so the Emperor would need to accept Christianity. If one judged by the knowledge, esteem, open protection and advantageous sentiments that he inspired in his subjects about Christianity, then one could believe that the Emperor was “not far from the kingdom of God.” In fact if the Emperor ever became converted to Christianity, Bouvet foresaw that that act would have such an impact that it “very probably” would bring along the entire and “perhaps” even the nations surrounding China. Calling attention to the support Louis XIV had already given in the past, Bouvet requested that more Jesuits be sent to China since the Emperor himself had asked for such men. This support in turn would assist France in developing further commercial relations with China and thereby more missionaries could be sent to preach there. Such aid from the Sun King was important, in Bouvet’s view, for it contributed to the renown of the monarch in various parts of the world¹⁹.

The presentation in the *Portrait* was quite successful. The Sun King granted 10,000 ecus to Bouvet to buy appropriate presents for the K’ang-hsi Emperor²⁰. Aboard the *Amphitrite* Bouvet, accompanied by several other Jesuits, returned to China and reached Peking in 1699. How widespread an impact Bouvet’s book made in France and elsewhere in Europe is not an easily answered question. An examination of the book’s contents reveals more about the K’ang-hsi Emperor and can quite justifiably be called a *Portrait* without simultaneously attempting to present a full biographical account. Moreover, it appears that Bouvet wisely omitted many comments about Louis XIV since in so doing, such a book might offend the monarch. Seeking royal support for the

19) Bouvet, *Histoire*, pp. 152-55 ; 166-70.

20) Witek, *Controversial Ideas*, p. 86.

mission, Bouvet did not want any negative reactions. Moreover, absent from France for a decade, he may have believed that his knowledge of French domestic and foreign affairs may not have been extensive enough to create a more complete comparison.

To appreciate Bouvet's role in 1697, one cannot overlook the position or more precisely the positions that he filled simultaneously. He was in a sense "wearing two hats" for he had left Paris in 1685 with the designation "mathématicien du Roi" and still retained that status as the envoy of the K'ang-hsi Emperor. This twofold perspective could lead to a greater acceptance of his *Portrait* and may well have contributed to the need for additional editions in French and even translations²¹⁾. The first edition already cited reappeared the following year in Paris, but this time it was printed by Robert and Nicolas Pepie. In fact the *Journal des Savans* that year carried a review of the newer edition. The following year the French edition appeared with a new title, *Histoire de l'empereur de la Chine* at The Hague²²⁾. In Utrecht during that same year (although it is not clear whether the French re-edition preceded the Dutch translation), a Dutch translation of Bouvet's work appeared bound together with Charles Le Gobien's treatise on the history of the empire of China. Further readership of Bouvet's book was extended in that same year to England and to Germany. In the former, it became an appendix bound with *The Present Condition of the Muscovite Empire, Till the Year 1699 in two letters... with the Life of the Present Emperour of China, By Father J. Bouvet, Missionary*²³⁾. Although in both instances it was an appendix to other books, at least in the case of Le Gobien's study a potential reader would be attracted to the term *China* in the title. But in the London printing, the

21) How many copies of the first edition of the *Portrait* were printed and sold has not been determined.

22) *Journal des Savans* (1698), 246-48. The 1699 edition at The Hague has 171 pages in contrast to the 264 pages in the original 1697 edition.

23) *'t Leven en bedrijf Van den tegenwoordigen Keiser van China* (Utrecht: A. Schouten, 1699). A separate English edition bears the title, *The History of Cang-hy, the Present Emperour of China* (London: F. Cogan, 1699). For details, see Henri Cordier, *Bibliotheca Sinica* (Paris: E. Guilmoto, 1904-1924), I, 635.

reader would first need to be interested in Russia in order to find out something about the Chinese emperor. In Germany, also in 1699, Gottfried Wilhelm Freiherr von Leibniz, who already had published his *Novissima Sinica* two years earlier, decided to translate Bouvet's work into Latin, *Icon Regia Monarchae Sinarum nunc regnantis*. As an addition to his second edition Leibniz had it paginated separately. The story of Leibniz's interest in China and his correspondence with several Jesuits, including above all Bouvet, is too well known to be related at this point²⁴⁾.

About a decade later an Italian version appeared in Padua under the title, *Istoria de l'imperador de la Cina presentata al Re di Francia*. In 1700 the Sorbonne had condemned the Jesuit views of the Chinese Rites issue so that in some quarters in Europe China was a topic of the moment. An unresolved issue about this Italian version is the reason for the delay in the translation²⁵⁾. More research about the translator and the story of his work needs to be completed before any definite assessment can be reached.

During the nineteenth century no re-issue of Bouvet's work seems to have appeared. In 1940, however, it was reprinted in Tientsin under circumstances that are not clear. The book (19.5×14cm.) has a dark tan paper cover with the title in both French and Chinese. But several errors occur: 1) *Chne* instead of *Chine* in the title itself; 2) Tientsin, instead of the more common Postal Atlas system, Tientsin, and above all, 3) the publisher, Meyndert Uytwerf, Paris, instead of La Haye, or The Hague. Apparently the reprint editor (who incidentally is not known nor is the publishing house cited) assumed that since the book was in French, it was probably printed in Paris. Moreover, in the copy in the author's possession the *Avertissement* is bound at the end of the book, although it belongs at the beginning. The indication is the duplication of the first syllable of the next page on the last line of the preceding page. How many copies of this Tientsin edition were printed

24) David Mungello, *Leibniz and Confucianism: Search for Accord*. (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1977.

25) Cordier, *Bibliotheca Sinica*, I, 635.

and how widely disseminated it became in the circumstances of the Second Sino-Japanese war cannot be readily ascertained²⁶⁾.

One of the earliest twentieth-century references comparing the Kang-hsi Emperor to Louis XIV occurs in an article "On the History of the French Revolution" published four years before the Revolution of 1911²⁷⁾. The pseudonymous author claimed that Louis XIV became the "master of his age" by establishing his authority through victorious campaigns. In this, the K'ang-hsi Emperor was similar, for by crushing the San-fan Rebellion and overthrowing the power of Galdan, his military achievement was assured²⁸⁾. Neither ruler was erudite, the author asserted, but the K'ang-hsi Emperor used up the energy of the literary savants by sponsoring the publication of the *K'ang-hsi tzu-tien* and the *P'ei-wen yun-fu*. But this only weakened the anti-Manchu spirit of the Chinese people. In fact this article in *Min-pao* is one of the many examples in that journal of Chinese scholars learning about the upheavals in the West and trying to create a typology for an anti-Manchu campaign that was part of the fabric of Chinese history in the first decade of this century.

More than half a century ago, a Japanese scholar, Gotō Suetō (1886—1967), began to study the Jesuits in China during the late Ming and early Ch'ing periods. In one of the leading historical journals, *Shigaku zasshi*, he published "Kō-Ki tei-den to Rui jūyon sei" (The K'ang-hsi Emperor and Louis XIV)²⁹⁾. Its principal contribution is the discussion of the Western scientific and philosophical studies in which the Emperor was engaged and the teaching methods that the Jesuits employed.

26) For example it is not cited in a scholarly essay written just a few years later and in Shanghai, not too far from Tientsin. See Joseph Dehergne, "Un envoyé de l'empereur K'ang-hi à Louis XIV. Le Père Joachim Bouvet (1656-170), *Bulletin de l'Université l'Aurore*, 3rd ser. N (1943), 651-83.

27) Chi-sheng, "Fa-kuoko-ming shih lun," *Min-pao*, no. 13 (1907), 1-16, reprinted in *Min-pao* (Peking: K'o-hsüeh ch'u-pan she, 1957), II, 59-74. The name Chi-sheng means "parasite."

寄生：法國革命史論，民報

28) *Ibid.*, pp. 66-69.

29) *Shigaku zasshi* XLII (1931), 329-57.

史學雜誌

The principal sources were the *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses* with some references to Bouvet's *Portrait*. Yet despite the title the comparison is not the core of the article. In fact only towards the end of essay is an assessment of such a comparison attempted. This article, however, proved to be a seminal study for Chinese scholars since it was translated twice into Chinese within a few years of its publication in Tokyo. The first by Chou Chien-i appeared in *Shih hsüeh* in 1933 while the second by Chou Ching-lien in *Jen-wen yüeh-k'an* appeared three years later³⁰. Such a double translation of a Japanese essay contributed to the dissemination of the two monarchs especially for those Chinese who might not be able to read the Japanese original article.

Perhaps in light of the success of his article Gotō Sueo completed a Japanese version of Bouvet's *Portrait* one decade later. Entitled *Kō-ki tei-den* (A biography of the K'ang-hsi Emperor) it was to become the foundation of future Chinese translations and thus a brief overview of its contents would be appropriate. But a copy of this original 1941 edition was not located in the United States³¹. From the advertisement in Gotō's biography of the Ch'ien-lung Emperor which he published the next year, it is known that the original edition had 292 pages. If the format of both biographies is comparable, then the 1941 edition was intended for a fairly wide reading public.

- 30) Chou Chien-i, "K'ang-hsi ta-ti yü Lu-i shih-ssu," *Shih-hsüeh* (Chung-yang ta-hsüeh), II (1933). This essay was not located. See also Chou Ching-lien, "K'ang-hsi ta-ti yü Lu-i shih-ssu," *Jen-wen yüeh-k'an* VII, no. 5 (1936), 1-9; VII, no. 6 (1936), 9-19.

周鑑頤：康熙大帝與路易十四，史學

周景濂：康熙大帝與路易十四，人文月刊

- 31) *Kō-ki-tei den* (Tokyo: Seikatsusha, 1941), 292 p. There is a copy in the University of Tokyo Library. See *Tokyo Daigaku bungaku bu Chūgoku tetsugaku Chūgoku bungaku kenkyū shitsu zōsho mokuroku* (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku bungaku bu, 1965), p. 134. For a discussion on renaming the book's title to *Ch'ing Sheng-tsu pen-chi*, see Lu Cheng-kao, "Fa-kuo Po Chin chu Ch'ing Sheng-tsu pen-chi shu-lüeh," *Ta Kung Pao* (Tientsin), February 11, 1946, p. 4.

康熙帝傳

東京大學文學部中國哲學中國文學研究室藏書目錄

陸徵誥：法國白晉著清聖祖本紀述略大公报

In 1966 in Taiwan Feng Tso-min completed the first Chinese translation of Bouvet's *Portrait* as part of his *Ch'ing K'ang Ch'ien liang-ti yü T'ien-chu chiao chuan-chiao shih* (The Ch'ing emperors, K'ang-hsi, Ch'ien-lung and the Catholic missionaries)³². The reader may be somewhat puzzled to find Po Chin's name (i.e., Bouvet's) on the title page. Since Bouvet died in 1730, he could hardly have written an account of the Ch'ien-lung Emperor whose reign began six years later. In his preface Feng clarifies this apparent discrepancy by commenting on the sources used. He relied heavily on Gotō Sueo's two biographies of these emperors³³ and added comments based on more recent materials. Admitting that he was not acquainted with French, Feng relied on Gotō for accuracy for that language.

A number of important features in Feng's work are quite helpful for a better understanding of the translation. In the first chapters he sets the scene in discussing the position of Catholicism during the K'ang-hsi era. The next chapter centers on Portugal's developing interest in China from the time of Vasco da Gama's entry into India and later. The following two chapters focus on the sending of the French Jesuits under the patronage of Louis XIV and their activities in China both in terms of a missionary apostolate and of their writing books in French for a European audience. Two chapters then discuss the Edict of Toleration of 1692 and the eventual deterioration of Catholicism in China because of the Chinese Rites Controversy. The last chapter before the translation of the *Portrait* itself contains biographical sketches of all the persons, mostly Jesuits, named in Bouvet's text.

The actual translation of the *Portrait* has no footnotes, although in several instances a short phrase is added to identify certain individuals

32) Feng Tso-min, *Ch'ing K'ang Ch'ien liang-ti yü T'ien-chu chiao chuan-chiao shih* (Taichung: Kuang-ch'i, 1966). For the bibliographical data on its earlier periodical serialization see *Chung-kuo chin erh-shih nien wen shih che lun-wen fen-lei so-yin* (Taipei: Kuo-li chung-yang t'u-shu kuan ch'u-pan, 1970), p. 357.

馮作民：清康熙兩帝與天主教傳教史
中國近二十年文史哲論文分類索引

33) Feng, *Ch'ing K'ang Ch'ien*, p. 7. Additional Chinese and Japanese books on Sino-Western relations are cited.

in the text³⁴⁾. By this means the reader can move fairly quickly through the work. There is, however, no translation of the *Avertissement* section which Gotō Sueo had included in the 1941 edition. Feng does not explain its omission nor does he indicate its existence in the French text he cites, that is, the 1696 edition at The Hague. The rest of Feng's work presents a Chinese translation of Gotō's study of the Ch'ien-lung Emperor and thus is not directly pertinent to this essay. Nonetheless, except for the lapse already noted, Feng's translation of Gotō's Japanese text is quite solid, especially with the additional data drawn from other sources not cited by Gotō.

In the 1970 Heibonsha reprint of Gotō Sueo's work, Yazawa Toshihiko(1915—), a leading Japanese scholar on the introduction of Chinese thought into France, made several changes in format. Bouvet's original *Avertissement(kaisetsu)* is relocated by Yazawa and placed after the entire biography of the Emperor. This is then followed by Yazawa's own separate commentary. Gotō's original footnotes(chū) are marked within the text itself and follow after the various sections of the text as divided by Gotō. But Yazawa's important contributions are the *hochū* and the *betsuchū*, that is, the supplementary notes that explain specific terms or names while the latter are separate, special notes that provide general background to the text itself³⁵⁾. With his thorough acquaintance of the *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*, the writings of the earlier missionaries and above all the more recent secondary literature on the topic, Yazawa has clearly strengthened Gotō's pioneering effort in translating Bouvet's biography of the K'ang-hsi Emperor.

34) *Ibid.*, pp. 73-108.

35) Gotō Sueo, ed. Yazawa Toshihiko *Kō-ki-tei den* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1970). Among Yazawa's works are *Chugoku to seiyō bunka* (China and Western culture), (Tokyo: Nakamura shoten, 1947) and *Chugoku to kirisutokyō-tenrei mondai* (China and Christianity---The Rites Controversy), (Tokyo: Kondo shuppansha, 1972)

後藤末雄：康熙帝傳

矢澤利彦：中國と西洋文化

中國とキリスト教——典禮問題

36) Gotō, ed. Yazawa, *Kō-ki-tei den*, pp. 161-201 (*betsuchū*); but the *hochū* follow section of the text and are not separately cited herein.

The second Chinese version began in 1974 in translating French into Chinese in the Foreign Languages Department of Shanghai Normal University. Using Bouvet's French text in the classroom, Feng Hsü-hsiang completed a first draft but others also assisted him in the compilation. It appeared three years ago in a collection of Ch'ing historical studies. Expressing his diffidence in translating an old French book, Feng welcomed any criticism from his readers³⁷. Carefully distinguishing his own footnotes from those in the original French text, Feng also identified the personal names in the text. Most are accurate, but some errors are present. Pereira was not a Spaniard, but a Portuguese national. Fontaney was not the leader of the French Jesuits deputed by Louis XIV to that position as they left Paris for China. Nor is it possible that Grimaldi was born in 1657 and then went to Macao three years later³⁸. Yet since Bouvet's original text did not contain information on several of these persons, Feng had to rely on some additional sources which regrettably are not cited. For the Chinese reader unacquainted with subtle differences in Western names, Feng's failure to include such names in brackets can be confusing³⁹. The Jesuits who worked in China during the late Ming and early Ch'ing chose their own Chinese names which are not always transliterations of their Western names. Then too, in the *Portrait* Bouvet cited several French leaders whose names are transliterated by sound, but whose names even to a Western scholar might not be familiar. This omission at times detracts from the efforts Feng exerted in his translation project.

For the third Chinese version of Bouvet's *Portrait* that appeared just two years ago in Harbin, the 1941 Japanese translation by Gotō Sueo was used once again. Entitled *K'ang-hsi huang-ti* (The K'ang-hsi

37) Po Chin, ed. Feng Hsü-hsiang, "K'ang-hsi ti chuan" (Biography of the K'ang-hsi Emperor) in Chung-kuo she-hui k'o-hsüeh yüan li-shih yen-chiu so Ch'ing-shih yen-chiu shih, ed., *Ch'ing-shih tzu-liao* (Peking: Chung-Hua shu-chü, 1980), I, 193-252.

白晉, 馮緒祥: 康熙帝傳 清史資料

38) *Ibid.*, pp. 193; 202n. 2; 232.

39) Ambiguities of the sounds in the process of transliteration are not infrequent nor is the full Western name transliterated in its entirety.

Emperor), it is the work of Chao Ch'en with corrections by Liu Yao-wu⁴⁰). In the translator's foreword the reader learns that Bouvet's book was a type of memorial presented to Louis XIV. Incorrectly claiming that Bouvet first entered Peking on February 7, 1682 (instead of 1688), Chao points out that the author is a Catholic priest whose book is dedicated to the French monarch. In Chao's view the evaluation of the K'ang-hsi Emperor is inadequate and there is an inexact treatment of the Chinese people and their religion. Thus he urges the reader to take these points into consideration in perusing the book.

Several omissions from Gotō Suetō's work are clearly indicated by Chao, but these can be seriously questioned. First, Chao specifically cites the 1941 Japanese version of Gotō, but is unaware of the 1970 version with the addenda by Yazawa Toshihiko—a study mentioned earlier. Perhaps only the first edition was available to him. But, secondly, to excise a number of sections from Gotō's own work seems quite strange, especially since their inclusion would not appreciably lengthen the 92-page book. By inversion Bouvet's *Avertissement* appears as the *pa* or postscript at the end of the biography. Chao claims that he omitted the commentary (*chieh-shuo*) of Gotō and the "criticism in the original" (*yuan-chu te p'i-p'an*). Without access to the original edition it is difficult to determine what Chao intended by this term⁴¹). Inclusion of the fairly extensive biography of Bouvet and the biographical entries of the Westerners in China from Gotō's original work assist the Chinese reader to understand such Western names. Indeed in contrast to the Shanghai edition from the French text, full Western names are presented in the Chinese text. Yet there is a shortcoming

40) Chao Ch'en, with corrections by Liu Yao-wu, *K'ang-hsi huang-ti* (Harbin: Heilungkiang jen-min ch'u-p'an she, 1981). The names of Chao and Liu appear on the title-page but not those of Gotō nor of the original author, Joachim Bouvet. There were 140,000 copies printed. Gratitude is extended to Dr. Mi Chu Wiens, of the Chinese and Korean Section, Asian Division, Library of Congress, for calling this book to the author's attention.

趙晨，劉耀武：康熙皇帝

41) This may refer to Gotō's preface in the original edition but also reprinted in the 1970 edition, *Kō-ki-tei den*, pp. 4-6.

in the omission of the bibliography of the Chinese works of these Jesuits as Gotō had listed them⁴²⁾.

In light of the above discussion two somewhat intricate questions can immediately arise. The first centers on the complete accuracy of the translations. But the second is equally noteworthy, the historiographical validity of the comparison of the two monarchs. To determine an answer to the first question a separate essay would be necessary. Its contents could be an analysis of the Japanese translation from the French, then the Chinese from the Japanese and the Chinese from the French versions. The use of certain nouns, compound terms and adverbial expressions in the late seventeenth century original French and the translations in the present can be a complex issue requiring an understanding of the subtle changes that the Chinese language has undergone during the past half century. Such an analysis has not been attempted herein, for it would require a separate study. But the fact that the *Portrait* can be scrutinized in this way underlines its value as perhaps the only book of its era to have appeared in Western, Japanese and Chinese translations over the centuries⁴³⁾.

In completing the *Portrait* Bouvet realized that it had been just over eighty years since Matteo Ricci died in Peking. His *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinas* had presented important aspects of the society, government and economy of late Ming China. The other Western works about China discussed earlier added further details to the picture of China for Europe. For example, Ricci, through the efforts of Brother Bento de Goes, was able to prove to Europe that Cathay and China were one and the same. Yet along with Europe's need to expand its geographical knowledge about China was the concomitant need to rid itself of the notion that the Chinese were barbarians. Ricci unable to

42) See, among others, under Schall, *ibid.*, p. 81.

43) The discussion is not about Western book on astronomy and mathematics, that were translated into China and Manchu during the late Ming and early Ch'ing periods. But Bouvet's work differed in that it was an account of China that was in its own day fairly widespread in Europe because of the different translations there and in this century has become more accessible to Chinese and Japanese readers.

come into personal contact with the Wan-li Emperor (1573—1620) wrote about the imperial system only in a general way. Moreover later Jesuit writers, e.g., Magaillans, discussed the fall of the Ming dynasty and the rise of the Ch'ing court under the Manchus. But the Europeans could still ask whether these new conquerors were just like the Huns in European history—barbaric, crude, uncivilized. Bouvet's *Portrait* was an attempt to dispel affirmative answers to these questions. This is not to deny that Schall and Verbiest through their letters sought to describe the Manchu people who now led China. But severe problems they had to overcome in light of the attacks on Christianity and on Western astronomy offered little opportunity to publish essays about the new rulers for the reading circles of Europe. Later Verbiest's prodigious work at court on astronomy, mathematics and other topics helped to restore the status of Christianity in China. By the time the French Jesuit-mathematicians arrived in 1688 biographical details about the ruler of China were fragmentary in Europe.

Argumentation by analogy is the key element in Bouvet's *Portrait* although the 1699 edition in Holland for some unknown reason changed the title to *Histoire de l'empereur de la Chine*. The new title reflects a slightly different purpose than Bouvet originally had indicated. Perhaps one might call Bouvet's work a bit daring, even for its day. The comparison of one living monarch with another in publications of the late seventeenth century was not common. Moreover to juxtapose the Emperor of China and the king of France had not been done before. Yet Bouvet knew that such analogical argumentation with its elements that are partly the same and partly different would be a forceful method to show the Sun king that China was ruled not by a barbarian, but by a leader who effectively administered control over an empire several times larger than France.

A recent study on the K'ang-hsi Emperor argues that instead of comparing the Emperor to Louis XIV, a more apt comparison exists with Peter the Great of Russia⁴⁴. Such a suggestion misses the mark,

44) Liu Ta-nien, "On the K'ang-hsi Emperor," *Chinese Studies in History* XIV no. 4 (Summer, 1981), 76-107. He contends that the more proper

for Bouvet was not in the service of the Russian Czar. Bouvet stressed that both monarchs had ascended their thrones at a young age and above all that both were personally dedicated to the support of the academic interests of scholars in the arts and sciences. The *Portrait* may be viewed as an account of the Emperor whom several French Jesuits served in the first place because of the initial support of the Sun King. If, however, the suggestion about Peter the Great was intended to open an entirely different historical inquiry beyond Bouvet's work and thus compare the entire reigns of both monarchs, then additional issues arise. Is it possible that there are more points of differences than of similarities? For example, was Peter the Great as personally interested in and a promoter of the arts and sciences as the K'ang-hsi Emperor proved to be throughout his reign, even beyond 1697? Are there systematic studies on the administrative systems of Russia and China under both monarchs to ascertain the validity of comparing them as efficient rulers? Even if an answer is limited to the field of Chinese studies, one recognizes that a thorough biography of the K'ang-hsi Emperor has yet to be written. Only recently have the secret memorials sent to him and on which he wrote personal comments been published in Taipei. But any full biography of the Emperor must transcend administrative documentation and include both positive and negative comments of Chinese and Manchu officials who were acquainted with him. Above all it should stress the variations in the life of the Emperor, e.g., a comparison of his decision-making in his youth in contrast to his later years, his deepening understanding of Chinese culture and his response to it, and so on. Such larger questions may be apt for today's historian, but not entirely for Bouvet's *Portrait*. By the time he returned to China in 1698, even he understood that with the Emperor's developing interest in Buddhism, the hopes about the Emperor becoming a Christian expressed in the *Portrait* would never be realized. His discussion of early Ch'ing administration was but a brief sketch, not

comparison is the Emperor and Peter the Great. This article that first appeared in Peking in 1961 and has been included in anthologies on Chinese history, has also been translated into Russian.

an analysis that might be achieved at present. Two decades ago one writer noted that the century of Louis XIV seemed to "mark the apogee of national grandeur" in the history of France and that the K'ang-hsi in Chinese history attained the "same bright glory"⁴⁵. That Bouvet's *Portrait* contributed to the development of such a perspective cannot be underestimated.

Bouvet returned to China a year after the *Portrait* had appeared, knowing that its objectives of continued financial support of the French Jesuit mission and additional personnel had been achieved. Of all the Jesuits who returned to Europe till then he had been the first to have worked in the court of Peking for several years and thus describe from personal experience the Emperor of China. Only from correspondence with Leibniz and others in Europe could he try to understand the impact his book had made. Nor indeed does he appear to have been asked to authorize the translations that followed thereafter—a not uncommon practice in that era. With the completion of Chinese and Japanese translations of the *Portrait*, a full circle has been completed. It is no longer a work that made an impact on the intelligentsia of Europe in the past, but can influence the reading public in Asia today. In the field of Sino-European contacts in the eighteenth century, the importance of the *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses* needs no explanation. Thus far only Japanese translation has appeared⁴⁶. The stylistic and editorial changes these letters may contain and thus the need for a critical edition do not lessen their usefulness as source material to ascertain how eighteenth-century Europeans created an image of

45) Witek, *Controversial Ideas*, pp. 85-86, n. 41. For Wei's statement, see his "Louis XIV et K'ang-hsi: L'épopée des missionnaires français du Grand Siècle en Chine," *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, XIX (1963), 93-109; 182-94; the quotation, p. 94.

46) Yazawa Toshihiko, ed. *Yezusukaishi Chugoku shokanshu* (Collection of Jesuit letters from China), 6 vols., (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1970-74) and *Chugoku no igaku to gijutsu. Yezusukaishi Chugoku shokanshu* (Chinese medicine and techniques. Collection of Jesuit letters from China), (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1977).

矢澤利彦：イエズス會士中國書簡集

中國の醫學と技術イエズス會士

中國書簡集

China. For those who seek to study this topic at length a Chinese translation of the *Lettres édifiantes* would be invaluable and it is hoped that such an effort may be concluded before the end of this century. Ricci was praised for his *li-yen* or "writings for posterity" by the many of Peking who quite likely had no inkling of his journal, *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinas*. The latter work, nonetheless, began a series of relatively few publications on China completed in the seventeenth century. Bouvet's *Portrait* of 1697 was one of the last in that era but was important for its perspective about the monarch who then ruled China as a promoter of Chinese civilization. The contemporary Chinese and Japanese translations open a window to a deeper understanding of that cultural exchange that the Jesuits first began under the direction of Matteo Ricci.

GLOSSARY

betsuchu 別注

chieh-shuo 解說

Chin Hung 金鉉

ch'in-ch'ai ta-ch'en 欽差大臣

hochu 補注

Hsiao-chuang 孝莊

Hsü Kuang-ch'i 徐光啓

Huang Chi-shih 黃吉士

kaisetsu 解說

K'ang'hsi tzu-tien 康熙字典

Li Chih-tsao 李之藻

Li Ma-tou 利瑪竇

Li-pu 禮部

Min-pao 民報

Mo-i li-yen 慕義立言

pü 跋

P'ei-wen yün-fu 佩文韻府

Po Chin 白晉

Songgotu (Sosan) 索額圖

Tso-chuan 左傳

Yang Kuang-hsien 楊光先

Yang T'ing-yün 楊廷筠

yuan-chu te p'i-p'an 原著的批判

〈國文 要約〉

부베의 康熙 황제와 루이 14세에 대한 比較論
—특히 그 傳承에 대하여—

존 와이텍

마테오 릿치의 카톨릭宣教師 中國派遣에 관한 日記는, 中國에 관한 西洋語의 書籍이 출판되는 추세에 도움을 주었다. 1697년에 프랑스 宣教師인 부베(Joachim Bouvet)는 「한 中國皇帝의 傳記」라는 冊을 출판하였다. 약 10년전에 부베는 처음 中國으로 왔었다. 5년 남짓 北京에 있는 동안 中國史에 있어서의 두가지 중요한 事件, 즉 1689년에 네르킨스크 條約의 締結과 1692년의 宗教寬容의 論旨를 目擊하였다. 부베 自身은 루이 14세의 王室算學者로서 中國에 파견되었었다. 1693년에 康熙황제는 루이 14세가 中國에 프랑스의 예수회 선교사를 파견한데 대한 感謝의 뜻을 表示하기 위해 特派使臣으로 부베를 任命하여 프랑스에 歸國하게 하였다. 1697년 3월에 그는 드디어 프랑스에 도착하여 6개월 내에 康熙황제의 傳記를 出版하였다.

이 冊의 內容, 體裁, 構成, 性格에 대하여 간단히 叙述하겠다.

1700년까지에 이 冊은 佛語로 再版되었고, هول란드語, 라틴語로 번역되었다. 1700년대 初에 이탈리아語로도 번역되었다. 여러가지 번역을 거치는 동안에 이 책의 題目과 編輯方針에 몇 가지 변경이 있었다. 19세기 末에 日本學者 後藤末雄은 康熙황제와 루이 14세를 比較하는 論文을 썼고, 드디어 그는 부베가 쓴 傳記를 日本語로 번역하였다. 이것으로 말미암아 20世紀에 이 책의 中國語번역이 나오게 되었다.

마테오 릿치가 中國과 그 文化, 言語, 習俗을 西洋에 紹介하기 시작한 바를 부베는 이어 받았으나, 後者는 그의 獨特한 方法으로 루이 14세를 위하여 康熙皇帝의 傳記를 文學的으로 描寫한 것이다. 이 佛語의 著作은 日本과 中國의 東洋語로 번역되었다. 릿치가 시작하고 부베가 계속한 東西의 對話는 이제 中國人의 反應에 의하여 더욱 계속될 것이었다.

<Reaction>

Choi, So-ja

(Ewha Womans University)

Father Witek's study was the view of the K'ang-hsi Emperor and Louis XIV in the transmission of *Portrait historique de l'empereur de la Chine* written by Bouvet. This paper was revised a little after having been presented in Taipei Symposim last September. In this presentation Father Witek compares and studies most of the translated editions of Bouvet's book very much in detail and with accuracy. I trust that no one has studied as much as Father Witek has done so elaborately about Bouvet's book. One of the other achievements of this study of Bouvet was Yasawa Toshihiko's footnotes of the book.

Bouvet, as is well known, was one of the five French Jesuits who came to China in 1688. He worked in the court with Gerbillon and served many fields closed to the Emperor. After the Edict of Toleration in 1692, he went back home to France in order to bring more scholarly fathers to China by the request of K'ang-hsi. It is true, however that he could not identify himself as the envoy of the Emperor. So Bouvet's book was presented to Louis XIV and it had many complicated connotations and intentions.

Therefore, the book was written for the support and expansion of future activities in China from Louis XIV. And it could be said that K'ang-hsi was described with very good intentions and as a clever emperor in the book. But the book was also valued for its historical materials. Whoever read the book could think about K'ang-hsi, and compare him with Louis XIV. And so I, at first, had been interested in the comparative study of K'ang-hsi and Louis XIV, but the paper does not focus clearly on this subject.

Except for the transmission of the book in various languages and countries—as described in the paper—what does Father Witek think of the other subjects treated in the paper? For example, as a foreigner how did Bouvet view the K'ang-hsi emperor? Especially since it was impossible for the Chinese to freely write their impressions or write about the emperor during his lifetime. Thus this work by Bouvet is an important and unique historical record. Can you make a comment on this?

The comparison of these two rulers, Louis XIV and K'ang-hsi, is itself of historical importance and value. Also have you studied more in detail about the comparative study of K'ang-hsi, Louis XIV and Peter the Great from a historical point of view?

What influence did Bouvet's work have on France and Europe... besides getting the royal support of Louis XIV? Is there any importance or significance in the change of title from *Portrait* to *History*?

In 1688—1693 when Bouvet was in China(Peking), K'ang-hsi emperor loved and respected the Jesuit missionaries very much. Later this diminished, and he changed his attitude. Did very much the fact that Bouvet received the greatest respect from the Emperor at that time, have a decisive influence on Bouvet and his writing of the *Portrait*? Could you please make a comment?

This is another question beyond the scope of your paper. Because of the *Edict of Toleration* in 1692, did Catholicism expand and increase in China or did it remain the same as before? Was there any noticeable development or improvement because of this *Edict*?

Thank You.