

# THE REPORT OF KILIAN STUMPF ABOUT THE CASE OF FATHER JOACHIM BOUVET

by *Claudia von Collani*

The Chinese transscription in the main text is Pinyin.

## *Abbreviations*

<i>Actes</i>	=	<i>Actes du Colloque international de Sinologie, Chantilly</i> (Paris, Taipei)
<i>AHSJ</i>	=	<i>Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu</i> (Roma)
<i>APF</i>	=	<i>Archivum Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide</i> , Rome.
<i>ARSJ</i>	=	<i>Archivum Romanum Societatis Jesu</i> , Rome
<i>JS</i>	=	<i>Japonica et Sinica</i>
<i>B.Nat.</i>	=	<i>Bibliothèque Nationale</i> , Paris
<i>Ms. fr.</i>	=	<i>Manuscrit français</i>
<i>BNC VE</i>	=	<i>Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Vittorio Emanuele II</i> , Rome
<i>FG</i>	=	<i>Fondo Gesuitico</i>
<i>LBr</i>	=	<i>Leibniz Archiv</i> , Hannover
<i>MS</i>	=	<i>Monumenta Serica</i> (Nettetal)
<i>MSMS</i>	=	<i>Monumenta Serica Monograph Series</i> (Nettetal, Sankt Augustin)
<i>NZM</i>	=	<i>Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft</i>
<i>SWCRJ</i>	=	<i>Sino-Western Cultural Relations Journal</i> .

## *Introduction*

The Jesuit cartography project of all of China from 1708 to 1718 was perhaps the most famous of all scientific enterprises ever done by the Jesuits in China. It played an important role in the Jesuits method of accommodation to lead China to Christianity by means of European science and art. But it is only the culmination of a long development of the Jesuit Cartography showing the rest of the world to China and China to Europe. Connected with their beautiful maps in China and of China are the names of Jesuits as Michele Ruggieri (1543–1607),<sup>1</sup> Matteo Ricci (1552–1610) with his famous world maps

---

<sup>1</sup> MICHELE RUGGIERI, *Atlante della Cina*, E. Lo Sardo (ed.), Roma 1993; EUGENIO LO SARDO, »The Earliest European Atlas of Ming China: An Unpublished Work by Michele Ruggieri«, in: *Actes VI*, 1989 (1995), pp. 259–273.



from 1584, 1598 and 1602,<sup>2</sup> Giulio Aleni (1582–1649) with his *Zhifang waiji*, »Account of Countries not Listed in the Record's Office« (1623),<sup>3</sup> Francesco Sambiasi's (1582–1649) World map from ca. 1648, a simplified version of the large World maps by Matteo Ricci,<sup>4</sup> Michal Piotr Boym's (1612–1659) *Zhongguo Tu* (Map of the Middle Kingdom),<sup>5</sup> Martino Martini (1614–1661) with his well-known *Novus Atlas Sinensis* (Amsterdam 1655) the first map of whole China and its provinces published in Europe<sup>6</sup> and Ferdinand Verbiest (1623–1688) with his map of the two hemispheres.<sup>7</sup>

In the trainee of the young Jesuits at the Jesuit Colleges, at the Collegio Romano for example, mathematical sciences played a very important role. In the second year of philosophy, practical arithmetic, sphere and geography were taught.<sup>8</sup> In the third year of philosophy, the Jesuit students had to deal with the astrolabe and the theory of the planets. The course of Geography initiated the students into the mathematical part of it, the so-called »Cosmography« of the terrestrial globe. In principle it was based on the classical treatise of Ptolemy, but the newest data were added by cosmographers and their more modern maps. Abraham Ortelius (1527–1598) for example was the first to conceive a radical reform of Ptolemaic geography. Gerhard Mercator's (1512–1594) reputation laid more on the mathematical side of geography. Both introduced the system of projections by increasing latitude-lines employed almost exclusively in maps used in navigation.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>2</sup> PASQUALE M. D'ELIA, *Il mappamondo Cinese del P. Matteo Ricci S.J.*, Città del Vaticano 1938. This map was on a flattened sphere projection with parallel latitudes and was based on the 1570 world-map of Abraham Ortelius. See COLIN A. RONAN, *The Shorter Science and Civilisation in China 2*, Cambridge 1995, p. 282. See also SOTHEY'S, *The Library of Philip Robinson. Part II: The Chinese Collection*, London 1988, Nr. 86.

<sup>3</sup> LOUIS PFISTER, *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne Mission de Chine 1552–1773*, Chang-hai 1932–34, p. 135 Nr. 24; EUGENIO MENEGON, *Un solo cielo. Giulio Aleni S.J. (1582–1649). Geografia, arte, scienza, religione dall'Europa alla Cina*, Brescia 1994, pp. 38–43 (pictures); pp. 141–146; »Scholar from the West«. Giulio Aleni S.J. (1582–1649) and the Dialogue between Christianity and China, T. LIPIELLO / R. MALEK (eds.), (MSMS XLII), 1997.

<sup>4</sup> SOTHEY'S, N° 90.

<sup>5</sup> SOTHEY'S, N° 91.

<sup>6</sup> THEODORE N. FOSS, »A Western Interpretation of China: Jesuit Cartography«, in: C.E. RONAN / BONNIE B.C. OH (eds.) *East Meets West. The Jesuits in China, 1582–1773*, Chicago 1988, pp. 209–216. On Martini's Atlas see O. BALDACCIO / A. CUCAGNA / G. HAMANN / G. STALUPPI / A. TAMBURELLI / WU CHUANJUN, in: *Martino Martini. Geografo, cartografo, storico, teologo, Trento 1614 – Hangzhou 1661. Atti del Convegno Internazionale*, a cura di Giorgio Melis, Trento 1983, 53–170; *Martino Martini. A Humanist and Scientist in Seventeenth Century China*, F. DEMARCHI / R. SCARTEZZINI (eds.), Trento 1996. Martini's *Novus Atlas Sinensis* had its last publication in Trento in 1981.

<sup>7</sup> LIN TONG-YANG, »Apperçu sur la mappemonde de Ferdinand Verbiest«, and CHRISTINE VERTENTE, »Nan Huai-jen's Maps of the World«, both in: *Actes V*, 1986 (1993), pp. 145–173; pp. 257–263.

<sup>8</sup> See for example GASPARD SCHOTT SJ (1608–1666), *Cursus Mathematicus sive absoluta omnium Mathematicarum disciplinarum encyclopedia*, Bambergii 1676, which mentions twenty-seven fields belonging to »mathematics«.

<sup>9</sup> HENRI BERNARD, *Matteo Ricci's Scientific Contribution to China*, Westport 1973, pp. 29–31. See also the text of a lecture in mathematics of the Jesuit students: ALBERT KRAYER, *Mathematik im Studienplan der Jesuiten* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Universität Mainz 15), Stuttgart 1991. Ortelius' *Theatrum orbis terrarum* (Antverpiae 1570) and Mercator's *Atlas sive Cosmographicae meditationes de fabrica mundi et fabricati figura* (Amsterdam 1613) and his *Atlas minor* (Amsterdam 1628) were in the Jesuit library in Beijing. See H. VERHAEREN, *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque du Pé-t'ang* (Pékin 1949; repr. Paris 1949), N° 2229, 2230, 2355 and 2356.



The project of the surveying of China in the service of the Kangxi-emperor (1662–1722) is very closely connected with the general Jesuits method of accommodation in China: maps and geography should arouse the curiosity of the Chinese scholars who would then perhaps also become interested in Christianity.<sup>10</sup> An important role for transmitting European science had the French Mission in China, inaugurated by Louis XIV himself. In 1685, he sent the well-known »Mathématiciens du Roi« as an scientific expedition to China. The six members were all trained in several kinds of science. France and especially Paris was at that time the center of mathematics, astronomy and cartography.<sup>11</sup> The study of geography was an important part of the Jesuit education in France of that time. Since 1669, Jean-Dominique Cassini (1625–1712) was director of the observatory in Paris. For his new great planisphere he needed the dates of new discoveries, measurements and observations. So the French Jesuits sent to the Far East should contribute to Cassini's enterprises. The head of them was Jean de Fontaney (1643–1710), formerly professor at the Jesuit Collège Louis-le-Grand. He was ordered by Cassini to obtain astronomical data for the observatory in Paris and to make geographical observations. Before he left for China, he was specially trained in geographical technique.<sup>12</sup>

### *The Jesuit's Great Cartography Project*

Here, I only want to deal with quite a small episode during the first stage of great cartography project, started by the three French Fathers Jean-Baptiste de Régis (1663–1738), Pierre Jartoux (1669–1720) and Joachim Bouvet (1656–1730).<sup>13</sup> This episode not only shows the strong and obstinate character of Bouvet, a very religious man,<sup>14</sup> but also the Jesuits connections with the imperial court and the problems which can arise between two cultures, even if both sides are tolerant and good-willed.

The main source for this article is the very detailed report written by the German Jesuit Kilian Stumpf (1655–1720) »Relatio eorum quæ acciderunt in casu Patris Joachimi Bouvet Pekini et in Tartaria à mense Junio 1708 ad diem 2.<sup>um</sup> Octobris inclusiue«.<sup>15</sup> The report itself contains twenty-eight pages. About thirty original documents in Latin, Manchu and Chinese are included as copies in the texts and added as originals in the appendix. Stumpf

<sup>10</sup> BERNARD, pp. 26f.

<sup>11</sup> CATHERINE JAMI, »From Clavius to Pardies: The geometry transmitted to China by Jesuits (1607–1723)«, in: F. MASINI (ed.), *Western Humanistic Culture Presented to China by Jesuit Missionaries (XVII–XVIII centuries)* (Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.I. XLIX), Roma 1996, p. 186.

<sup>12</sup> FOSS, pp. 219f.

<sup>13</sup> For Bouvet see CLAUDIA VON COLLANI, *P. Joachim Bouvet S.J. Sein Leben und sein Werk* (MSMS XVII), 1985.

<sup>14</sup> Another example for Bouvet's character in religious things was the incident with the »pien«, for whose construction Bouvet was helping with his interpretation. He considered it to be an sceptre for an idol, whereas the prince told that it was for his personal use. See VON COLLANI, *Bouvet*, pp. 46f.

<sup>15</sup> BNC VE II, FG 1254/17. See GIOVANNI STARY, *Opere Mancesi in Italia e in Vaticano*, Wiesbaden 1985, N° 21 (pp. 8–15); MARINA BATTAGLINI, »The Jesuit Manuscripts Concerning China Preserved in the National Central Library Vittorio Emanuele II° in Rome«, in: *Actes V*, 1986 (1993), p. 58, N° 36; HARTMUT WALRAVENS, »Neue Veröffentlichungen zur frühen Chinamission«, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitschrift* 58 (1993), pp. 349–365.



had composed this report acting as Apostolic Notary; it was signed on the 14th of November 1708.<sup>16</sup> Besides the famous »Acta Pekinensia ...«, the »Relatio« is one of the little masterpieces written by Stumpf in his usual objective manner and with a good feeling for the relations between people trying to avoid his personal view.<sup>17</sup> Because of Stumpf's bad handwriting, the coadjutor brother Miguel Vieira (1681–1761) then had to rewrite the report.<sup>18</sup> Stumpf wrote his report by order of the Jesuit visitor, Giampaolo Gozani (1659–1732), (visitor from 1708–1714), and it was sent via Portugal to Rome.<sup>19</sup> Another important source are the above mentioned »Acta Pekinensia ...«, also written by Kilian Stumpf where we can find some summaries about the whole event,<sup>20</sup> and the letter dated November 8, 1708 written by Stumpf to the General.<sup>21</sup>

### *Preparations for the Project*

The story about the famous project of the Jesuit cartography of China is well-known,<sup>22</sup> but there are some doubts who at first had had the idea. According to English Sinologist Joseph Needham, it had been François Gerbillon SJ (1654–1707).<sup>23</sup> The Kangxi emperor

<sup>16</sup> »Processum uerbalem circa casum P. Bouuet iussu Rdi Patris Visitatoris accurate feci ipsaque originalia, quae allego mittenda tradidi, et sub directione ejusdem Rdi Patris Visitatoris rectissima videntur ire viâ longiore per Lusitaniam; quia hoc anno desunt aliæ naues.« ARSJ, JS 172, fo 332v, Postscriptum.

<sup>17</sup> For Kilian Stumpf, who had arrived in China in 1694 and later became director of the Ministry of Astronomy (1711–1720) and visitor of China and Japan (1714–1718) see SEBALD REIL, *Kilian Stumpf 1655–1720. Ein Würzburger Jesuit am Kaiserhof zu Peking*, Münster 1978; CLAUDIA VON COLLANI, »P. Kilian Stumpf SJ – Nachfolger des heiligen Kilian in China«, in: *Würzburger Diözesan-Geschichtsblätter* 51 (1989), pp. 554–567. The »Acta Pekinensia« are mostly dealing with the visitation of the Apostolic Legate to the imperial court of China from 1705–1707, Charles-Thomas Maillard de Tournon (1668–1710).

<sup>18</sup> »Ego infra scripto feci mense octob. 1708 in Residentia S.J. intra murum croceum (=Beitang) et legendum exhibui qui iuxta tenorem relationis ex mandato Imperatoris respective præsente fuerunt legerunt et approbarunt tanquam congruentem veritati, illumque descripsit Fr. Michael Vieiyr, ego vero manu meo correxi et subscriptione mea cum sigillo muniri ...«. Kilian Stumpf, »Relatio eorum quæ acciderunt in casu Patris Joachimi Bouvet Pekini et in Tartaria a mense Junio 1708 ad diem 2.<sup>um</sup> octobris inclusiue«, BNC VE, FG 1254/17, fo 28.

<sup>19</sup> Letter dated November 8, 1708, ARSJ, JS 172, fo 332r.

<sup>20</sup> »Acta Pekinensia sive Ephemerides Historiales eorum, quæ Pekini acciderunt à 4.<sup>a</sup> Decembris anni 1705. 1.<sup>a</sup> adventus Ill.<sup>mi</sup> Rev.<sup>mi</sup> et Exc.<sup>mi</sup> Dñi D. Caroli Thomæ Maillard de Tournon Patriarchæ Antiocheni Visitatoris Apostolici, cum potestate Legati de latere &c.« Original in ARSJ, JS 138 and parts of it APF, Informationum Lib. 166. Pro Missione Sinensi Vol. II. Collectus anno 1713. See VON COLLANI, »Kilian Stumpf« (1989), pp. 564f.

<sup>21</sup> ARSJ, JS 172, ff. 330r–332v. The letter quite probably arrived in Rome in September 1711, because the summary is dated September 12, 1711.

<sup>22</sup> HENRI BERNARD, »Les étapes de la cartographie scientifique pour la Chine et les pays voisins«, *MS I* (1935), pp. 428–477; the same, »Note complémentaire sur l'Atlas de K'ang-hi«, *MS XI* (1945), pp. 191–200; WALTER FUCHS, »Materialien zur Kartographie der Mandju-Zeit«, *MS I* (1935), pp. 386–427; the same, »Materialien zur Kartographie der Mandju-Zeit«, *MS III* (1937), pp. 189–231; the same, *Der Jesuiten-Atlas der K'ang-hsi-Zeit. Seine Entstehungsgeschichte nebst Namensindices für die Karten der Mandjuren, Mongolei, Ostturkestan und Tibet*, Peking 1943.

<sup>23</sup> FOSS, p. 222. For Jean-François Gerbillon see: MME YVES DE THOMAZ DE BOSSIERRE, *Jean-François Gerbillon, S.J. (1654–1707). Un des cinq mathématiciens envoyés en Chine par Louis XIV* (Louvain Chinese Studies II) (Leuven 1994).



had been taught geography by him and Bouvet<sup>24</sup> and now thought himself to be a great expert. But when he made a fault in computing the position of the town Shenyang, alias Fengtian (in Manchu Moukden) which he thought to be at the same height as Beijing (39° 56'), Dominique Parrenin SJ (1665–1741) corrected him. Kangxi sent him to Moukden to take the height and to make a map of the environment. The emperor now thought it good for the better administration of his empire and his glory to have a general map of his whole empire.<sup>25</sup> In this way, Parrenin seems to be the initiator of this project, a fact which is confirmed by the French Jesuit Antoine Gaubil (1689–1759) in 1728 in his letter to his confrère Étienne Souciet (1673–1739) in Paris: »Ceux qui s'interessent pour la géographie de la Chine seront peut-être bien aises de savoir: premièrement que c'est le P. Parrenin qui trouva le moyen de faire naître à l'empereur Kang-Hi le désir de voir une carte de la grande muraille ...«<sup>26</sup> But the emperor was, of course, convinced that it had been his proper idea to have new maps of China.<sup>27</sup> He also saw that the maps of Chinese towns and landscapes already existing were not very exact in their distances. So he ordered the Europeans to fulfill the task of surveying China with their more accurate mathematical methods.<sup>28</sup>

Already in 1685, the Kangxi emperor wanted to have a map of Tartary.<sup>29</sup> Between 1688 and 1690, Fontaney, Gerbillon and Bouvet measured the exact position of the Jesuit College in Beijing.<sup>30</sup> On January 24th in 1691, the Kangxi emperor during his lesson in geometry by Gerbillon asked several questions about the latitude and the longitude of different places showing his wish to have an exact map of these places. Antoine Thomas SJ (1644–1709) and Gerbillon confirmed this plan and proposed to start with a map of Tartary which should be made by several of the Jesuits.<sup>31</sup> In fact, a first map of the Western Tartary was made by Thomas and Gerbillon together in 1698. Thomas made another map of the Huang He in 1698 and 1699.<sup>32</sup> In winter 1700/1701, Thomas and Bouvet accompanied by two of the newly arrived French Jesuits made within 70 days a map of one of the districts of the Province of Beijing (»de cette province«). This topographical map had a size of 20 square feet and showed the land from Beijing to the south.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>24</sup> For Kangxi see JONATHAN D. SPENCE, *Ich, Kaiser von China. Ein Selbstportrait des Kangxi-Kaisers*, Frankfurt 1985. The lessons, the emperor received from Bouvet and Gerbillon are described in: JOACHIM BOUVET, *Histoire de l'Empereur de la Chine présentée au Roy ...*, La Haye 1699, pp. 82–106.

<sup>25</sup> Gaubil to Jean-Jacques Dortous de Mairan, October 3, 1741, in: ANTOINE GAUBIL, *Correspondance de Pékin (1722–1759)*, ed. by Renée Simon, Genève 1970, p. 541; HENRI BERNARD, »Les étapes ...«, p. 458.

<sup>26</sup> GAUBIL, p. 214.

<sup>27</sup> Also Kilian Stumpf writes that the emperor himself had been the initiator of the idea. FOSS, pp. 222f.

<sup>28</sup> See also SPENCE, p. 125.

<sup>29</sup> Letter by Antoine Thomas to the Duchess of Aveiro, November 14, 1685, quoted in: MME YVES DE THOMAZ DE BOSSIERRE, *Un belge Mandarin à la cour de Chine aux XVII<sup>e</sup> et XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles. Antoine Thomas 1644–1709*, Paris 1977, p. 67.

<sup>30</sup> GAUBIL, p. 614.

<sup>31</sup> THOMAZ, p. 67; JOACHIM BOUVET, »Journal ...«, B. Nat., Ms. fr. 17 240, fo 287r.

<sup>32</sup> THOMAZ, pp. 67f.

<sup>33</sup> Joachim Bouvet, letter to Leibniz, November 4, 1701, in: *Leibniz korrespondiert mit China. Der Briefwechsel mit den Jesuitenmissionaren (1689–1714)*, ed. by R. WIDMAIER, Frankfurt 1990, p. 159; s.a. FOSS, p. 223.



One of these new Jesuit scientists was Dominique Parrenin, the other was Jean-François Régis who seemed to have a special talent in mapping.<sup>34</sup> Both of them belonged to the eight Jesuits brought to China by Bouvet commissioned by the emperor himself.<sup>35</sup> In December 1702, Thomas in company with the third son of the emperor, Yinzhi (1677–1732) also measured the exact length »d'un degré terrestre« and of one Chinese Li.<sup>36</sup> They used the same »pied« (foot) as the French geographers did. For one degree they counted 195 1/6 Chinese Li<sup>37</sup> or 74 886 Roman feet or 70 206 Chinese feet. The Li got officially a new and exact definition.<sup>38</sup> Thomas took the opportunity and used the science to propagate Christianity such showing science in its classical role in the Jesuit mission in China as »ancilla missionis«.<sup>39</sup> In 1705, Antoine Thomas together with Bouvet, Régis and Parrenin made a complete map of the surroundings of Beijing.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>34</sup> SHANNON MCCUNE, »Jean-Baptiste Régis, S.J. an Extraordinary Cartographer«, in: *Actes IV*, 1983 (1991), pp. 239f.

<sup>35</sup> CLAUDIA VON COLLANI, »Ein Brief des Chinamissionars P. Joachim Bouvet S.J. zum Mandat des Apostolischen Vikars von Fu-kien, Charles Maigrot MEP«, in: *NZM* 43 (1987), pp. 188–211. Régis belonged to the eight Jesuits who came on the famous »Amphitrite« to China. VON COLLANI, *Bouvet*, p. 24.

<sup>36</sup> BERNARD (1935), pp. 455–458; JOSEPH DEHERGNE, *Répertoire des Jésuites de Chine de 1552 à 1800*, Roma, Paris 1973, pp. 308f; THOMAZ, *Thomas*, p. 112; GAUBIL, letter October 29, 1736 to Nicolas Fréret, p. 458. In his letter to Delisle, dated July 13, 1734, Gaubil wrote: »C'est au commencement de ce siècle que le 3<sup>e</sup> fils de l'Emp<sup>r</sup> KANG HI et le P. Thomas jésuite de Namur, entreprirent dans cette province de voir juste le nombre de lis d'un degré, et ils voulurent savoir combien de pieds chinois il y avoit dans un degré. J'ai vu la meilleure partie de ce qui se fit pour cette mesure, et dans cet écrit il y a je ne sais quoi qui me paroît défectueux. l'écrit est entre les mains des P.P. Kogler, Pereyra et Sclavicek ... Depuis l'entreprise du P. Thomas et le 3<sup>e</sup> fils de Kang hi, plusieurs de nos P.P. dans le temps de la carte se sont aperçus de l'inégalité de degrés, mais je n'ai vu sur cela rien de bien détaillé.« (GAUBIL, pp. 376f). — The third Prince, Yinzhi, was specially talented in European sciences and had been taught mathematics by Antoine Thomas. Later he was the director of a kind of Academy, founded by the emperor in the garden of the Imperial villa Changzhongyuan who had collected talented young men to teach them sciences. But Yinzhi did not like the Europeans and wanted to beat them with their own weapons, i.e. with the knowledge of their sciences. See JEAN-FRANÇOIS FOUCQUET, »Relation exacte de ce qui s'est passé ...«, Appendix to: JOHN WITEK, *A Eighteenth Century Frenchman at the Court of the K'ang-hsi Emperor: A Study of the Early Life of Jean-François Fouquet* (Diss., Georgetown University, Washington D.C., 1973), pp. 466–468; s.a. ARTHUR W. HUMMEL, *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period (1644–1912)* (Washington 1943; repr. Taipei 1970) pp. 235f.

<sup>37</sup> Gaubil, letter November 2, 1738 to Étienne Souciet SJ, in: GAUBIL, p. 506. Gaubil was quite astonished that Du Halde took 200 Li for one degree. — One Li = 351 Chinese feet. ALFRED ZERLIK, *P. Xaver Erbert Fridelli. Chinamissionar und Kartograph aus Linz*, Linz 1962, p. 27.

<sup>38</sup> THOMAZ, *Thomas*, p. 112.

<sup>39</sup> Letter by Claudio Filippo Grimaldi SJ to the Jesuits General, 1703, in: *Der Neue Welt-Bott* (Augsburg, 1726) I, 4, Nr. 87, p. 28. Grimaldi describes Yinzhi as »von der Natur mit einem guten Gemüth und stattlichen Verstand versehen, auch in Mathematischen Wissenschaften, die er von seinem Herrn Vatter dem Kayser selbst erlernet sehr geschickt und ziemlich erfahren.« For the connection between Christianity and science in China see also CLAUDIA VON COLLANI, »Theologie und Wissenschaft in China«, in: *Naturwissenschaftliches Weltbild und Evangelisierung*, ed. by K. MÜLLER (Veröffentlichungen des Missionspriesterseminars St. Augustin bei Bonn Nr. 43), Nettetal 1993, pp. 83–115.

<sup>40</sup> THOMAZ, *Thomas*, p. 68.



### *The First Part of the Cartographic Project*

The Chinese emperor, very satisfied with the mapping work done by the Jesuits, wanted them to continue the work for whole China. The Jesuit map of the entire empire should be the base for the successful policy of scattered local governments and maintenance of imperial control, and last but not least, it would help to understand the geographical situation and the extent of the empire.<sup>41</sup>

It seems that it was Dominique Parrenin, too, who chose the geographers among his French confrères. Evidently he and the emperor took French Jesuits some of whom had already some experiences in regard of such affairs. Parrenin himself also helped to do the work in the provinces Beizhili, Shandong and Liaodong and some parts of Tartary. The others were besides the above mentioned French Jesuits Régis and Pierre Jartoux, Joseph Anne Marie Moyriac de Mailla (1669–1748), Pierre-Vicent du Tartre (1669–1724), the Alsatian Romain Hinderer (1669–1744) and Joachim Bouvet together with the Portuguese Jesuit João Cardoso (1671–1723) and the Austrian Jesuit Xaver Ernbart Fridelli (1673–1743).<sup>42</sup> Later, the French Augustinian Guillaume Bonjour-Fabri (or Fabre-Bonjour, 1669–1714), sent by the Propaganda Fide to China, joined them.<sup>43</sup> Their methods of surveying are described by Antoine Gaubil in a letter in 1728 to Etienne Souciet: »These fathers requested a quadrant of two inches in radius; they often chequed it carefully and they found that it constantly represented the altitudes as too great. They had a great compass, several other instruments, a pendulum and other things needed for the fulfillment of the emperor's orders. With cords divided exactly, they accurately measured the way from Beijing. On this road, they often took observations of the meridian of the sun. At every moment they observed the rhumb and took care in observing the variation and the declination of the peak ...«<sup>44</sup>

The project started the May 21, 1708. The emperor explained the Europeans that he would send three of them into Tartary to make a map of it by the help of the Western geographic rules. Afterwards, the work should be published by the way of the Ministries. So Kangxi sent a mandate to the Ministry of Rites to choose some men from the Ministry of Mathematics as company for the expedition with the Europeans. But neither then nor the following days the Europeans got to know the names of the chosen Chinese or Europeans inspite of the fact that they asked everybody. Finally in the beginning of June, the emperor named Fathers Joachim Bouvet, Jean-Baptiste Régis and Pierre Jartoux.<sup>45</sup> They got the necessary instruments and had to assemble in the imperial villa.<sup>46</sup> Their task was the making of a map of the area surrounding the northern Great Wall from Shanhai-guan, the pass where the Wall meets the sea, then they should follow the Wall near Suzhou

<sup>41</sup> FOSS, pp. 223f.

<sup>42</sup> For Fridelli's life, see ZERLIK.

<sup>43</sup> Letter to Lorenz Lange, May 15, 1732, in: GAUBIL, p. 302; cf. FOSS, pp. 224–227.

<sup>44</sup> FOSS, p. 227; GAUBIL, p. 214.

<sup>45</sup> KILIAN STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, ff. 906f.

<sup>46</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 913.



going on to the northern part of Shaanxi, then descend to Xinan and from there return to Beijing.<sup>47</sup> Their departure was fixed on June 4, 1708.<sup>48</sup>

### *The Project in Printed Jesuit Sources*

A short description of the first part of this project is given by Joseph Marie Anne de Moyriac de Mailla in his *Histoire générale de la Chine*: »He (the emperor) at first only wanted to make the map of the Great Wall which separates China from Tartary. Bai Jin, Lei Xiaosi and Du Demei (i.e. the missionaries Bouvet, Régis and Jartoux) whom he named for this purpose, departed from Beijing in the beginning of the year 1708, and went to Tianjin nearby the Eastern Sea, from where they went back to the north following this sea till Shanhaiguan where the Great Wall begins whose curves they followed till Jiayuguan, nearby Suzhou in the northern end of Shaanxi. From this point, descending till Xining, the mathematicians and mandarins who accompanied them, took the way back to the Court. Bai Jin had then already returned from Shenmuxian where he had fallen ill.«<sup>49</sup>

The description in Jean-Baptiste Du Halde's introduction is little bit longer: »This great Prince (i.e. the Kangxi emperor) having ordered the missionaries to draw a map of the environments of Beijing and thought by himself how exact were the European methods, and from this he got the idea to get in the same manner the maps of all Provinces of his Empire and of the Tartary, which is now subjected to him. In charging the missionaries with this task, he argued with them in the most obliging manner, protesting publicly that

<sup>47</sup> FOSS, p. 223; s. letter by KASPAR CASTNER, September 29, 1708: »Interim Rex Patres Bouvet et Jartoux cum varijs Mandarinis misit, ut totum murum Sinicum in mappa Geographica delinearent ...«. LBr 105, fo 59r and fo 60v. Cf. STUMPF: »Iter eis ita præsriptum fuit, ut a portâ Regiâ rectâ tenderent ad littus Maris Orientale, inde ascenderent ad initium magni muri, et hujus ductum sequentes, eo tenderent, ubi post dies non multos statim fixurus erat Imperator in Kara Hodon, loco Tartariæ non procul semoto ab illo muro, murorum miraculo.« STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia«, fo 913.

<sup>48</sup> Stumpf as an eyewitness of the events explicitly speaks of the 4th of June and not July; see his »Relatio«, fo 2 and his »Acta Pekinensia«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 913: »4.<sup>a</sup> Junii. Abierunt 3 Patres cum 3 aut 4 Mandarinis, aliisque pluribus ex diversorum Tribunalium numero delectis.« Antoine Gaubil's description also has the first events in June (BERNARD, »Note complémentaire ...«, p. 194). The Chinese date was the sixteenth (day) of the forty-seventh year of Kangxi, which corresponds to June (see DU HALDE below). Most other authors are speaking of the 4th of July, so for example Régis, who took part in the enterprise (see MCCUNE, p. 240; ZERLIK, p. 28), and also Du Halde speaks of July (see DU HALDE).

<sup>49</sup> »Il (the emperor) ne se proposa d'abord que de faire la carte de la grande muraille qui sépare la Chine de la Tartarie. Pé-tsin (Bai Jin), Lei-hiao-ssé (Lei Xiaosi) & Tou-té-meï (Du Demei) (c'est-à-dire, les missionnaires Bouvet, Régis & Jartoux) qu'il nomma pour cet effet, partirent de Pé-king au commencement de l'an 1708, & se rendirent à Tien-tsing-oueï (Tianjin), près de la mer Orientale, d'où ils remontèrent au nord, le long de cette mer, jusqu'à Chan-hai-koan (Shanhaiguan), où commence la grande muraille, qu'ils suivirent dans tous ses détours jusqu'à Kia-yu-koan (Jiayuguan), près de Sou-tchéou (Suzhou), à l'extrémité septentrionale du Chen-si (Shaanxi). De ce point, descendans jusqu'à Si-ning (Xining), les mathématiciens & les mandarins qui les accompagnoient, reprirent la route de la cour. Pé-tsin y étoit déjà retourné de Chin-mou-hien (Shenmuxian), où il étoit tombé malade.« JOSEPH-ANNE-MARIE (sic!) DE MOYRIAC DE MAILLA, *Histoire générale de la Chine* ... XI, Paris 1777, Taipei 1969, p. 314; cf. BERNARD, »Les étapes ...«, p. 459.



he considered this great enterprise as a very important affair for the welfare of his Empire and for which (enterprise) he wanted to save nothing.

Indeed, the following days he gave order to the grand Tribunals (i.e. Ministries) to name mandarins to preside the measurements which would be necessary, to give exactly the names of the important spots which should be passed through, and to let execute his orders to the officers of the cities prescribing to every of them to go with his people to the frontiers of his district and the other help which one needed. It was this point which was executed with an astonishing exactitude; visible proof of the great order and the admirable policy which reigns in such a vast Empire.

The work was started July 4, 1708 in our manner of counting, but following the Chinese calendar, it was the sixteenth of the fourth moon of the forty-seventh year of Kangxi. Fr. Bouvet, Fr. Régis and Fr. Jartoux undertook it this year to determine exactly the situation of the famous Great Wall which separates China from the Tartary, having a very high number of remarkable points, as the gates which give entrance to the Empire, and as the cities of war by which it is flanked, could serve to regulate the longitudes of the Northern Provinces, which it bounds to the North ...

Because Fr. Bouvet had fell ill after two months of work, Frs. Régis and Jartoux continued the work and only returned to Beijing January 10, 1709.<sup>50</sup>

### Kilian Stumpf's Report

In contrast to this more or less laconic descriptions, the informations in Stumpf's report and letters are much more exhaustive and circumstantial. Stumpf starts with the political back-ground. After his war and his victory against the tribes of the Eleuths,<sup>51</sup> the Kangxi Emperor wanted to have more precise informations about the size of the Chinese empire.<sup>52</sup> So in the middle of May 1708 (see above: May 21), he authorized and equipped a cartographic expedition, made up by the three French Fathers Joachim Bouvet, Jean-

<sup>50</sup> WALTER FUCHS, *Der Jesuiten-Atlas* ..., pp. 60f. In the English edition of DU HALDE, *The General History of China* V. 1, London 1741, this introduction is lacking.

<sup>51</sup> Antoine Thomas had written a report of eighty-five pages about that war against the Eleuths: «De Bello Cam-Hi Imperatoris Tartaro-Sinici contra Tartaros Eruthanos» in 1697 (ARSJ, JS 149, ff. 618-648). Henri Bosmans had planned to publish this report but had died before doing so. THOMAZ, *Thomas*, p. 84.

<sup>52</sup> Stumpf mentions that a certain prince named »Tschuam Raptan« had with his army invaded the land of »Tand-schin Raptan«. Then he occupied the district of »Tchergiz«. The nearby Russians (»Moscouitæ«) used the occasion and went into the new region »Oronkoi« where they founded a garrison. »Tschuam Raptan« seems to be Tsewang Araptan (1643-1627), the nephew and successor of Galdan (1632-1697) as Bushktu Khan of the Sungars. The Sungars were a tribe of the Eleuths (Oelots) or Kalmucks, Western Mongols. Under the rule of Tsewang Araptan they succeeded to found a huge empire from Southern Siberia till Tibet, inclusive the Ili-valley and the Western part of Mongolia. JACQUES GERNET, *Die chinesische Welt*, Frankfurt 1983, p. 405. For Galdan and Tsewang Araptan see HUMMEL, pp. 265-268; 757-759. In the letter dated September 26, 1716, Pieter Van Hamme SJ (1651-1727) mentions that »Zuong-raptan« was a descendant of the Tamerlan family who had their reign in Samarcand. Also later he made hostile invasions into the Chinese empire. P. VISSCHERS, *Onuitgegeven Brieven van eenige Paters der Societeit van Jesus Missionarissen in China, van de XVII<sup>e</sup> en XVIII<sup>e</sup> Eeuw*, Arnhem 1857, p. 135.



Baptiste Régis and Pierre Jartoux accompanied by five Mandarins. They were sent out in the beginning of June (4th).<sup>53</sup> The task of this group was to make a map of the Great Wall, beginning in the east at the Yellow Sea.<sup>54</sup> In his letter dated November 8, 1708, Stumpf mentions that it was considered as a great honour for the French Jesuits to be sent out in the emperor's service. But in spite of that, they were not very pleased about this cartographic expedition to Tartary: it was a busy and tough task to work in that »desert«. The Jesuits also lacked then for missionary work. So Parrenin asked the eldest son of the emperor, the »Regulus«, Prince Yinti (1672–1734) to substitute one of the French Jesuits with the German Jesuit Kaspar Castner (1665–1709) or the Austrian Jesuit Xaver Erbert Fridelli. Two Jesuits seemed to be enough to do the work, even if one would become ill. But Parrenin did not succeed with his proposals.<sup>55</sup>

At the fare-well audience, the Emperor asked Bouvet, why his face was so pale? The answer was: Bouvet was so pale because of reading too many books. Bouvet used this occasion, as he often did, to take his commentaries about the *Yijing* out of his bosom and to give them to the Emperor.<sup>56</sup> He said: »The reason for my poor health is that I have dedicated years of labour and spirit to enlighten the darkness of this book. In spite of this, the work is still not perfect, and will be now interrupted.« It was evident that he did not want to join the cartographic party because he rather wanted to continue his research on the »Book of Changes«. This work would now be impossible for many months or even years. Everybody with the emperor understood that Bouvet did this to avoid the way into Tartary.<sup>57</sup> Prince Yinti, responsible for all Europeans and thus for the *piao*, i.e. the permission to stay in China,<sup>58</sup> was wavering between admiration and anger for Bouvet's behaviour, because Bouvet had not asked him for permission to present his studies. The Kangxi emperor asked Bouvet if he wanted to stay at home and to continue his research? Should somebody else go in his place? But Bouvet, knowing the Emperor's intention, resigned himself to the Emperor's wishes and answered that he would start on his way.<sup>59</sup> He gave his commentaries into the emperor's hands who took them quite benevolent and said it needed a longer, accurate examination.<sup>60</sup>

As already mentioned, the expedition started from Beijing on June 4. It consisted of the three fathers with three or four Mandarins and some others from the different ministries.

<sup>53</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio ...«, fo 2.

<sup>54</sup> MCCUNE, p. 240.

<sup>55</sup> Kilian Stumpf to Michelangelo Tamburini, ARSJ, JS 172, ff. 331r–v.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, fo 913, where he gives a short description of Bouvet's intentions to work with the »abstruse« Canonical book *Yi Jing*. Bouvet wanted to restore the true and laudable sense of the »mappa combinatoria« invented by Fuxi (2952 BC), and commented by Wen Wang, Zhou Kong and Confucius. With his studies, Bouvet wanted to refute the misinterpretations of the »moderns« (i.e. the Song Confucianists) and the Daoists for fortune-telling. More about Stumpf, figurism and *Yi Jing* in CLAUDIA VON COLLANI, *Die Figuristen in der Chinamission*, Frankfurt, Bern 1981.

<sup>57</sup> ARSJ, JS 172, fo 331v; STUMPF, »Relatio«, ff. 1f.

<sup>58</sup> See CLAUDIA VON COLLANI, »Kilian Stumpf SJ zur Lage der Chinamission im Jahre 1708«, in: *NZM* 51 (1995), p. 124.

<sup>59</sup> The single stations of their journey can be seen in a report by Antoine Gaubil, see BERNARD (1945), pp. 194f.

<sup>60</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 913.



Their way was given. From the gate of the capital they went right to the Eastern Sea, then to the beginning to the Great Wall, then followed the Great Wall. After a certain number of days they should meet the emperor in Kara Hoton in Tartary, not far from the Wall.<sup>61</sup> Indeed, after forty days, the expedition reached Kara Hoton where on June twenty-eight Kangxi arrived to avoid the heat in Beijing. The three Jesuits showed him the part of the map they had done so far. The Emperor liked it very much. Because Jartoux felt weak and could not sit on horseback, the Austrian Ernbert Xaver Fridelli and the Italian Luigi Gonzaga SJ (1673–1718) were called from Beijing as substitutes for him.<sup>62</sup> They arrived on July 18. But since both were not really proficient in drawing maps, they stayed for some time in Kara Hoton.<sup>63</sup> Gonzaga returned with the Emperor and Régis, Jartoux and Bouvet continued their work.

On August 23, Brother Bernard de Rhodes (1645–1715) got a letter written by Dominique Parrenin, the Superior of the French Jesuit house in Beijing, who was then in Rehe (Jehol) in Tartary. This letter had the message that other letters from 200 lieues of distance reported that Bouvet had fallen with his horse.<sup>64</sup> It seems that he had contusions of the breast and the hip feeling quite ill and weak and suffered from headaches and insomnia (perhaps a concussion of the brain).<sup>65</sup> So all went to Shenmu where after consultations the Fathers and the Mandarins decided that he should leave mapping to the others and return to Beijing to regain his health again. They wrote to the Emperor,<sup>66</sup> who only said: »Lagha«, »I have got to know«. But nobody asked for the official Imperial permission for Bouvet's return. Therefore Bouvet returned to Beijing without it.<sup>67</sup> Bouvet seemed to recover his health on his way back to Beijing and could ride the last twelve French miles to Beijing (more than fifty kilometers).<sup>68</sup> He arrived at the Beitang, the French residence, in the evening of September 16.

He first went to the house of the Manchu Mandarin Henkama to ask about the emperor's health. Henkama, also Hescken or Hesihen (He Shiheng) was a Manchu official of the Imperial Household (Yangxindian), or »Académie des Arts« in Bouvet's description.<sup>69</sup> Henkama's family name was Wang, so he was often called Wang laoye (the venerable Mr. Wang). Together with his assistant Charki (Zhang Changzhu), Henkama was responsible for the Wuyingdian, the Department of Publications. Henkama was a mandarin of the third order and a Christian. José Soares SJ (1656–1736) had baptized him on June 28, 1707 as »Petrus« (chin. Baidou). For thirty years, he had been the friend of

<sup>61</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 913.

<sup>62</sup> See ZERLIK.

<sup>63</sup> Kaspar Castner SJ had to test Fridelli's knowledge of making maps. STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia«, APF, lib. 11, fo 489.

<sup>64</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, ff. 2–3; see also BERNARD (1945), p. 195.

<sup>65</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1035.

<sup>66</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 2.

<sup>67</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1035.

<sup>68</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 3.

<sup>69</sup> Paris, B. Nat., Ms. fr. 17 240, fo 270.



the Jesuits and often had helped them.<sup>70</sup> They used to work together when they had to translate official documents from the Wuyingdian, as for example when the Kangxi emperor sent the two Jesuit delegations with documents about the Tournon legation to Rome.<sup>71</sup> But as Henakama was also a personal friend of Bouvet,<sup>72</sup> he was very pleased to see Bouvet again, and free of the obligations for the emperor. He proposed that Bouvet should join the Jesuits who planned to go in the morning to the palace to see the Emperor. Bouvet did not know the reason for this audience: Claudio Filippo Grimaldi (1638–1712) and Antoine Thomas had to report about an error in computing an eclipse. When Bouvet came to the Beitang, all his confrères were quite pleased to see him again. They hoped that the emperor would be pleased about Bouvet's return and benevolently overlooked the error the Mathematical Ministry had committed.<sup>73</sup>

The next morning (September 17), Fathers Grimaldi, Thomas, Tomé Pereyra (1645–1708), Kilian Stumpf and Brothers Rhodes, Jacques Brocard (1661–1718) together with Franz Stadlin (1658–1740) accompanied Bouvet to the palace to thank the emperor for his benevolence. But nobody seemed to know that Bouvet had returned to Beijing without explicit imperial permission. Henkama and the Jesuits together gave a petition of thanks to the emperor:

»September 17, 1708

»Respectfull report to the throne by Henkama.

The third day of this month Bai Jin arrived. The 4th day Min Mingwo (Grimaldi) came and said lying on his knees: »When we arrived who came from the west, we received uncountable proofs from the Emperor of his grace and of his divine teaching. The Emperor had pardoned our errors and faults. Uncountable times he remained broadminded and we did not succeed to be gratefull for the grace and the virtue of the divine emperor.

When we were earnestly obliged in the works of measuring the territorries of the frontier – without costing much labour – Bai Jin unfortunately fell from his horse and returned from half of the way. We all were ashamed of this and felt an infinite terror. We caused confusion in the places (where we passed); on the street, we were furnished with sedan-bearers, horses and animals, every day we got food and drinking, and receiving attention and help, we reached the capital.

We do not find words to express (our gratitude) for the high grace, comparable to that of Heaven, reserved to the divine emperor.

<sup>70</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekiensia«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1052; s.a. FRANCIS ROULEAU, »Maillard de Tournon, Papal Legate at the Court of Peking«, in: *AHSJ* XXXI (1962), pp. 285f.

<sup>71</sup> ROULEAU, p. 289 Nr. 49; CLAUDIA VON COLLANI, »Zwei Briefe zu den figuristischen Schriften Joachim Bouvets«, in: *SWCRJ* XIV (1992), pp. 26–29.

<sup>72</sup> When Bouvet stayed in Hangzhou to help other missionaries with his translations to obtain the piao, he wrote in his letter dated 10th of May 1707: »Plurimam salutem amicis ex yam sin tien, chao lao ye & vam lao ye utriusque.« ARSJ, JS 170, fo 166v. (»Chao lao ye« is Zhao zhang or Pursama, whom Bouvet knew well from the failed delegation with Sabino Mariani in 1706; s. CLAUDIA VON COLLANI, »Une légation à Rome manquée – Joachim Bouvet et Sabino Mariani«, in: *Actes VI, 1989* (1995), pp. 277–301. See also *Sinica Franciscana* IX, Madrid 1995, pp. 579f, Nr. 2.

<sup>73</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, ff. 1035f.



Till now, we did not get news from the West, but they will soon arrive.<sup>74</sup> What concerns Bai Jin, he is as well again as before. After having fallen from the horse, he fell ill; now he is completely healthy again.«

This notice has been communicated to the throne, together with other ones.

The fourth day of the eighth month of the forty-seventh year Elhe Taifin (= Kangxi).«<sup>75</sup>

The mandarins congratulated Bouvet for his return. Bouvet's letter of thanks was given to the emperor. The responsible mandarin then added that Bouvet's good will after his return was not less than at his departure. But the emperor did not show any signs of benevolence. Instead of it, he showed himself to be offended: Bouvet had left the expedition without his imperial license! Stumpf adds that Bouvet had sinned innocently because he had thought that his Superior, Parrenin, had already arranged everything with the emperor and not knowing that he needed the imperial permission to return.<sup>76</sup>

On September 22, all were called again to the palace. A very anxious Henkama showed them a letter with imperial words written by the Regulus, Prince Yinti: »From the beginning, Pe çim (Bai Jin) did not have the will to go; as his will is as told, he in a deceitful way said he returned to to be restored. He were a man preaching everywhere the law (i.e. Christianity) but going around without reason and shame erring everywhere. It would be good if he would be send to join his companions the day he would feel better. Doing so, his great sin would be thought lighter. I do not understand the actions of thanks made by the Europeans. But because you (Henkama) in an imprudent way brought the whole thing to me, it would be convenient to drive you from the office of your mandarin, to put you into irons and to surrender you to the interior Ministry of Crime to judge about the committed sin. Opening your mouth and starting to speak you are producing words of politeness and courtly decency; but what about the letter?«<sup>77</sup> In the afternoon of the same day, Henkama came to the Jesuit College as an old friend to help them with the right reply to the emperor: one answer should be from Henkama himself, the next one by all Jesuits together and the last one by Bouvet. Henkama's apology was like that: »The great lord like a father showered me with gifts in a generous way and educated me to improvement. Supported by the benefit of such kindness, I spent my life until this hour. I, the slave, know that I have been stupid and weak and that I will not improve my

<sup>74</sup> The Kangxi emperor waited for news and answers from Rome, where he had sent to legations, one consisting of the Jesuits António de Barros (1664–1708) and Antoine Beauvillier (1657–1708), starting in autumn 1706 from Beijing, and the other one consisting of the Jesuits Antonio Provana (1662–1720), Ramón Arxó (1663–1711) and François Noël (1651–1729), starting 1708 from Macao. See COLLANI, »Zwei Briefe ...«, ff. 27f.

<sup>75</sup> BNC VE, FG 1254/17, doc. A. The Italian text is to be found in Sary, *Opere mancesi*, Nr. 21, p. 8f, part 1: Report to the Throne (Manchu transcription with Italian translation). The translation of the all Italian texts about the case of Bouvet, see Appendix of this article.

<sup>76</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1036; »Relatio«, fo 15.

<sup>77</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, BNC VE, FG 1254/17, ff. 3f and doc. B, Manchu transcription and Italian translation in: Sary, pp. 10f; see also Appendix Nr. 2.; STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, p. 1036; STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 4.



situation untill my death having committed again and again (things) worthy of death. I am no good slave; I am crying with justified fear and do not stop to crying.»<sup>78</sup>

Stumpf adds that the Mandarin really felt very burdened as everybody used to be who had committed even the slightest offense against His Majesty. Also the Jesuits confessed their error and begged for the imperial pardon. They excused themselves that they had not known that Bouvet had returned without the will of the emperor. If they had known, they would have sent him back to the expedition.<sup>79</sup>

But unexpected problems arose with Bouvet. He said he had had the permission of Régis and Jartoux. In this way, both of them became accused, too. The visitor Giampaolo Gozani and the vice-provincial José Soares did not permit this and proposed that Bouvet should take all guilt himself. In vain several of his confrères exhorted him to do so. Also the Christian mandarin in the Mathematical Tribunal, Michael Fan, well-versed in translating and writing Chinese, advised him to acknowledge his guilt and error. But Bouvet wanted His Majesty explicitly to send him back. So only the replies of Henkama and the other Jesuits were sent to the emperor.<sup>80</sup> Henkama wanted to avoid a long and useless disputation, for there were only two words to be said: Bouvet will return, or Bouvet will not return. Bouvet felt offended as if he would be subject of the other Jesuits. He stated that he was fifty-four years old, a member of the Society, in Beijing for twenty years and knew the Chinese language well.<sup>81</sup> But Henkama insisted that the Jesuits themselves should solve the problem. But the French and the other Jesuits did not come to an agreement.

The whole affaire became dangerous now. Prince Yinti was, as Stumpf tells us in his letters, not only an enemy of Christianity,<sup>82</sup> but also of Henkama. He told Henkama that he was a bad servant of his lord and only tried to further his own advancement. He should be thrown out of his mandarinat and bound. Bouvet was guilty; he rode several hundred li to Beijing instead of staying and curing his health and then joining the expedition again. The Jesuits should send Bouvet back again instead of saying thanks to the emperor.

Henkama now wrote an apology. Bouvet did likewise. He had really been ill and all companions of the journey had known this.<sup>83</sup> But Henkama did not want to send this apology. According to his Chinese way, he wanted to take sole responsibility for the whole affair. So Bouvet sent his apology to Parrenin, his superior who should give it to the emperor. Henkama and the Jesuits sent letters to the palace.<sup>84</sup> But Bouvet did not want to excuse his behaviour for he felt innocent. The visitor and the vice-provincial and others told him to confess his fault, i.e. having returned without permission, but in vain.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>78</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 4; cf. STARY, part II, pp. 10f.

<sup>79</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 5 and doc. C. (Appendix).

<sup>80</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 5.

<sup>81</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 10.

<sup>82</sup> STUMPF, letter November 7, 1708, LBr 105, ff. 57–58, in: COLLANI, »Kilian Stumpf ...« (1995), p. 124.

<sup>83</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, ff. 1036f.

<sup>84</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, fo 1037; Henkama's letter see BNC VE, FG 1254/17, fo 4 and doc. C (Appendix here).

<sup>85</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, ff. 5f.



In the meantime, Henkama had fallen ill because of his sadness, as his servants explained. The blame of the emperor had touched his heart deeply. He became even more sad when he found out that the Prince was not content with his letter, but tried to damage him. Henkama had a son, who in spite of his youth, was already a mandarin. At that time, he was in Manchuria and was now fearing to be driven away because of his father's pretended fault.

On September 26, all were summoned to the palace. The Jesuits got a harsh letter with an imperial mandate. The courtiers told the Jesuits, that the only right thing to do would be to send Bouvet back to the mapping or Bouvet should go back of his own free will. Otherwise, there was the danger that the emperor would transmit the matter to the Ministry of Crime (Libu). The best way to solve the problem would be the old Chinese way inside the family or community. Also Henkama's son begged them to do so. But now Bouvet's obstinacy again appeared. He felt innocent and independant of all of them and knew they could not send him back. He only wanted to write to the emperor that his illness had been no fiction. But the mandarin told them he would not send something like that to the emperor but only the words: »Bouvet goes back to make the map, or he does not return.«<sup>86</sup>

The next day, on September 27, the Jesuits (José Soares, Bouvet, Stumpf, Gonzaga, Baudino, Rhodes) were called to the palace again. Henkama was lying ill in his house. The fathers were shown a libellum with Henkama's and the fathers' common answer. At the end of this document, Kangxi had written with his own hand: »Pe çim amasi unghire babe aragha acu bij Baitacu gisum fulu: ai baita?« (Bai Jin be amasi unggire akû babe arahakûbi. baitakû gisun fulu ai baita?).<sup>87</sup> Bouvet, who was quite skilled in reading and translating Manchu, did not want to translate this. He got the translation from the secretaries. The emperor had written that there was no word in the whole document that Bouvet would return or not, but there was too much idle talk.<sup>88</sup>

But Bouvet refused to go back and said that he was not healthy again and that he had commissioned no fraud. Stumpf suggested a way to convince the emperor of Bouvet's innocence. It would be good to take some physician.<sup>89</sup> Now for the sake of the whole community, the visitor, Giampaolo Gozani, decided to send Bouvet back under an order of obedience. But first, all wanted to try other means to get him back. The whole afternoon of September 28 and the whole night, Gozani, Soares, and Gonzaga sat in the Beitang, the French residence, and did their best to persuade Bouvet to return to cartography. The following day, the resolution should be sent to the palace.

Bouvet, very obstinate and fearing for his good reputation as a religious man, did not want to fulfill their wish. The time approached to send the message to the palace. So the visitor together with the other fathers instantly fell on their knees (»genuflexus«) and with tears begged Bouvet to avert the emperor's anger from himself, from them all, from the

<sup>86</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1039.

<sup>87</sup> STARY, p. 15. »There is no notice about the fault of Bai Jin. There are only so many useless words; how are they?«

<sup>88</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 6.

<sup>89</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 8.



mission, and especially from the French Jesuits. They saw the imminent danger that they all would be thrown out of China. Finally, Bouvet admitted to go to Henkama's house with them all, but under the condition that his excuse would be given to Henkama and sent by him to the Emperor. They agreed and Soares, Bouvet, Stumpf, and Gonzaga went to Henkama. Henkama refused to send something else besides: »Bouvet will return, or he will not return.« But Bouvet did not want to go if he was not sent by the emperor himself. He even made Henkama responsible for the emperor's wrong opinion about him, for Henkama had reported to the emperor that he had looked healthy when he returned. Henkama felt very offended and angry about that accusation, and said that he was an old friend of the Jesuits and had helped Bouvet and the other Jesuits for twenty years. The fathers wrote to the visitor, and as the last remedy, the visitor sent a letter and told Bouvet to return by virtue of obedience, the last and strongest remedy to solve problems in the Society of Jesus. So finally, Henkama wrote under Bouvet's protest »Bouvet will return to the geographic expedition.«<sup>90</sup>

On October 1, Bouvet prepared for his journey. On the second, he started at midday carried in a palakin, Porquet and Br. Brocard accompanying him to the gate of the town. The same day, Henkama send a message to the emperor that Bouvet had returned to the expedition. But the emperor seemed not very much interested in Bouvet's return. He was in great sorrow because his favorite little son, the eighteenth, Yinjie (born 1701), had fallen very ill when accompanying his father to Manchuria.<sup>91</sup> Despite of the art of Chinese physicians and of the European physician, Br. Giandomenico Paramino (1661–1713), the boy died on October 8, his death was made public on October 17.<sup>92</sup> This event also caused the eruption of the problems between Kangxi and his heir apparent Yinreng (1674–1725). Yinreng was brought back to Beijing in chains.<sup>93</sup> Some days later, on October 11, Henkama died in his sleep.<sup>94</sup> He was buried on October 28. The year before, when Henkama had been ill, the Emperor had extolled him highly because of his many merits, but not now.<sup>95</sup> Henkama's place in the Yangxindian was occupied at once by a Chinese named Wang Daohua.<sup>96</sup>

This first stage of the expedition lasted till January 10, 1709. The day before, Régis and Jartoux came back from Tartary and slept in a little village a few miles away from the

<sup>90</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia ...«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1040; »Relatio«, ff. 17, 20.

<sup>91</sup> Yinjie was the son of the Imperial concubine Mi-fei (Lady Wang), a Chinese erudite lady, whom the emperor loved dearly. See SILAS H.L. WU, *Passage to Power. K'ang-hsi and His Heir Apparent, 1661–1722*, Cambridge, Mass. 1979, p. 114.

<sup>92</sup> WU, p. 118; Stumpf, »Acta Pekinensia«, ARSJ, JS 138, ff. 1052; 1059–1063; *Sinica Franciscana* IX, p. 87, Nr. 5.

<sup>93</sup> WU, 120; Stumpf, »Acta Pekinensia«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1052.

<sup>94</sup> STUMPF, »Relatio«, fo 28; »Acta Pekinensia«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1052. Stumpf here also writes about Henkama's younger brother »scientia et eruditione superior« who also wanted to become a Christian.

<sup>95</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1056.

<sup>96</sup> We find his name already under the date of October 31, see STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia«, ARSJ, JS 138, fo 1059. He was now the second prefect of the Yangxindian after Zhao zhang. Later on, Wang Daohua led to much trouble for the Jesuits and he often was confounded with his predecessor Wang laoye (Henkama).



Imperial villa Changchunyuan. Bouvet did not accompany them, and returned a little later, but Stumpf omits to tell the exact date.<sup>97</sup> Yet the whole affair ended well at least for Bouvet. We only find his name in the first cartographic expedition, then never again. Until now, I was not able to find the exact reason why Bouvet could later stay in Beijing, or at least in Tartary, and continue with his research in the *Yijing* instead of helping with the continuation of the cartographic project. Evidently, the emperor saw no use of sending Bouvet to further expeditions, or Bouvet just seemed to be too old for that kind of hardship.<sup>98</sup> Stumpf, an ardent defender of the Portuguese Padroado against the French Jesuit independence, used the incident and Bouvet's behaviour to emphasize the necessity of reuniting the French to the Padroado again.<sup>99</sup>

The first group of French Jesuits had made a map of more than fifteen feet (five metres) which showed all detours and gorges and about 300 gates of the Great Wall, all fortifications and military points.<sup>100</sup> The results of the mapping of the whole empire were presented in 1717 to the emperor. In the period between 1717 to 1726 four different Chinese editions appeared. The xylographic edition of 1721 was sent by the Jesuits to Europe and provided Du Halde with maps for his *Description générale de la Chine* (vol. IV) which were made by Jean-Baptiste Bourguignon d'Anville (1697–1782). The scale was 1:2.000.000. In 1725, the Jesuit map was offered to the King of France by Bertrand-Claude Tachereau de Linières SJ (1658–1746), the royal confessor.<sup>101</sup> It was considered to be much better than the contemporary maps of Europe.<sup>102</sup>

### Résumé

The case of Joachim Bouvet is only a small incident within the great project of cartographing China with the most modern methods available at that time. Bouvet's case is to be seen in the greater context of the Rites Controversy, which had brought Christianity in China in a very dangerous situation. In February 1707, the Papal Legate Charles-Thomas Maillard de Tournon (1668–1710, in China from 1705–1710) had issued his prohibition for Christians in China to take part in the Rites for Confucius and the ancestors and to use other names for the Christian God than *tianzhu* (Lord of Heaven). At the same time, the Kangxi emperor demanded the so-called *piao* from each missionary who wanted to stay and work in China.<sup>103</sup> So the missionaries had to be very cautious and to avoid every sign of opposition towards the emperor.

<sup>97</sup> STUMPF, »Acta Pekinensia«, APF, Informationum, lib. 166, Pro Missione Sinensi, vol. II, fo 340.

<sup>98</sup> COLLANI, *Bouvet*, pp. 59f. In 1709, he was fifty-three years old.

<sup>99</sup> Kilian Stumpf, letter November 15, 1708 to Michelangelo Tamburini, ARSJ, JS 172, fo 360v.

<sup>100</sup> BERNARD, »Les étapes ...«, p. 459; De Mailla XI, p. 314.

<sup>101</sup> FOSS, pp. 235f.

<sup>102</sup> DEHERGNE, p. 309.

<sup>103</sup> VON COLLANI, »Kilian Stumpf ...« (1995), pp. 123ff.



The most astonishing result of this incident is that the cartographic expedition also became the cause of another work with the *Yijing*, »the Book of Changes«. Régis, the main person responsible for the mapping, worked there together with Pierre Vincent de Tartre and Joseph Marie Anne de Moyriac de Mailla.<sup>104</sup> It was perhaps at this time that the three of them started their translation of the *Yijing*, which was intended to be a refutation of Bouvet's figurism.<sup>105</sup>

## Appendix

English translation of the Italian translation of the five Manchu texts at the end of Kilian Stumpf's »Relatio eorum quæ acciderunt in casu Patris Joachim Bouvet«, BNC VE, FG 1245/17. The Italian translation was made by Prof. Giovanni Stary, Venezia, and is published in: *Opere mancesi in Italia e in Vaticano* (Wiesbaden 1985).

1. Copy of a report to the throne presented by Hesihen dated September 17 (1708). It consists of twenty-five lines in cursive.

The third day of the present month, Bai Jin arrived. The fourth day, Min Mingwo (Grimaldi) came and said lying on his knees:

»When we, who came from the West, arrived, we received uncountable proofs from the emperor of his grace and of his divine teaching. The emperor had pardoned our errors and faults. Uncountable times he remained broadminded and we did not succeed to be grateful for the grace and the virtue of the divine emperor.

When we were earnestly obliged in the works of measuring the territories of the frontiers – without costing much labour – Bai Jin unfortunately fell from his horse and returned from half of the trip. We all were ashamed of this and felt an infinite terror. We caused confusion in the places (where we passed); on the street, we were furnished with sedan-bearers, horses and animals, every day we got food and drinking, and receiving attention and help, we reached the capital.

We do not find words to express (our gratitude) for the high grace, comparable to that of Heaven, reserved to the divine emperor.

Till now, we did not get news from the West, but they will soon arrive. What concerns Bai Jin, he is as well again as before. After having fallen from the horse, he fell ill; now he is completely healthy again.«

This notice has been communicated to the throne, together with other one. The fourth day of the eighth month of the forty-seventh year Elhe Taifin (= Kangxi).«

<sup>104</sup> BERNARD, »Note complémentaire ...«, pp. 194ff.

<sup>105</sup> See *I-king, antiquissimus Sinarum liber* ..., 2 vol., ed. by JULIUS MOHL (Stuttgartiae–Tubingae, 1834–1839). But like many other books written by China missionaries, it was not printed until the 19th century. See KNUD LUNDBÆK, »The First European Translation of Chinese Historical and Philosophical Works«, in: T.H.C. LEE (Ed.), *China and Europe. Images and Influences in Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries*, Hong Kong 1991, pp. 40f.



2. Copy of a report to the throne presented by Hesihen, consisting of 60 lines in block letters, written in black ink, dated September 23, 1708.

»Report to the throne by Hesihen, September 23, 1708:

(Henkama repeats Prince Yinti's words) »Because Bai Jin has been sent onto the way against his will, he pretended to be ill, his health being the same as ever. When he returned and arrived at home, (he affirmed) that his health had become better and he started to preach his religion. Acting lazy in this way, he exceeded every limit.«

If he is healthy again, it would be good at the moment, if he would return to his way tomorrow, his big sin would not be as great.«

(Yinti to Henakama:) »If the things happened as you are reporting in your ordinary report, you should be driven from your mandarinat, arrested and handed over to the Ministry of Justice; you have the laws only in your mouth; what else is in the document?«

(Henkama) »I, slave, after having read this with reverence, am trembling unbearably and I am endlessly desperate.

I, slave, have asked Bai Jin why he did not return to his way after having fallen from the horse and after being healthy again after his illness, but I could not tell (his answer) to the emperor.

All Westerners turned to the throne to offer thanks for the grace, (but in) stumbling unintelligible words.

I, slave, (...) am regretting.

I, slave, will never cease to count the faults I have committed. All have been pardoned by the emperor, (as by) a father. After having learned from the instruction and the wonderful grace, I came to the following conclusions:

I, slave, I am in my nature stupid and abject, therefore I will be incorrigible till the end. Therefore I am committing permanently faults which deserve the capital punishment. I, your slave, I have an unbearable fright; without end, I am blaming myself.

When I showed the letter with the imperial ordinance to Min Mingwo and his people, Min Mingwo was frightened to death; after having talked for a short time with Bai Jin in a Western language, Min Mingwo said on his knees together with Xu Risheng (Tomé Pereira), An Duo (Antoine Thomas) and Su Lin (José Soares):

»When Bai Jin returned on the third of this month, and we asked him about his fall from the horse, he answered that he felt quite well. His health was like ever. Therefore we thought that there had been sent an order. Consequently, he who was in the meantime healthy again should start his trip back. Therefore we all assembled to thank on our knees before the throne for the imperial grace. After that we got to know from Bai Jin that there had been no order to start his way when he had become healthy again. Nevertheless, knowing that there had been no order to start his way had been given to Bai Jin, we, Min Mingwo, have urged Bai Jin to go back.

For fifty years, the emperor has kind-hearted educated us Westerners like just born children, and he has kept divine thoughts about us. Our fault was caused by a misunderstanding. The catalogue of our stupid errors is without end. The divine emperor has always pardoned everything and will do it also under these circumstances. To obtain this grace,



we, Min Mingwo, have not done the least labour. Now we are fainting away, and confused like Bai Jin, too, by his imprudent action; we want to repair showing an unbearable shame for our faults. Moreover, will we have enough courage to bear the case of Bai Jin? We, Min Mingwo, Xu Risheng and An Duo, we all are old and ill and not able to express all our gratitude for the protective grace of the divine emperor. Day and night, we are praying before the Throne of the Lord of Heaven so that he will give 10 000 years of good health to the Emperor. In showing the honest intentions of us men from far away, we are thanking earnestly for the high protective grace.

For this reason we have reported to the throne, lying on our knees and trembling in an unbearable way.

The tenth day of the eighth month of the forty-seventh year Elhe Taifin.«

3. Fragment of eleven lines in cursive script of the above document.

4. Copy of a report to the throne presented by Hesihen in fourteen lines in italics written with black ink, dating from September 29.

Reverent report to the throne by Hesihen:

In the message from the 14th of that month there was this Imperial rescript: »There is no notice about the fault of Bai Jin. There are only so many useless words; how are they?«

Obedying reverently, I gave it for reading to Min Mingwo and his (companions). Min Mingwo, Xu Risheng, An Duo, Su Lin, Ji Li'an

(Kilian Stumpf), Bao Zhongyi (Giuseppe Baudino) and Gong Leisi (Luigi Gonzaga) have answered together:

»We are lacking the words to thank for the wonderful grace of the emperor. After having been pardoned for our great fault, we have reverently obeyed to the order given to Min Mingwo, concerning the fault committed by Bai Jin. Bai Jin has therefore started his way to finish his work entrusted to him before.

For that reason we have reverently reported to the throne. The sixteenth day of the eighth month of the forty-seventh year Elhe Taifin.«

5. Fragment of two lines in cursive of the precedent document (second sentence).<sup>106</sup>

### Summary

The great cartographic project of surveying the whole of China carried out by the Jesuits between 1708 and 1718 has to be seen as part of the Jesuits' method of accommodation in China. To overcome Chinese xenophobia and to lead the Chinese to Christianity, the Jesuits used not only the literary Apostolate but also worldly means. They attracted the

<sup>106</sup> Stary, Nr. 21, pp. 8–15.



attention of the Chinese by means of things which could be useful for China. The most important contribution the Jesuits made to China was the reform of the all-important calendar and the directorship of the Astronomical Office. Other services were the casting of cannons and the introduction of European curiosities. With the arrival of the French Jesuits in China in 1687, modern French science was brought to China. With the most advanced methods, the French Jesuits surveyed China and made maps for the Kangxi emperor (1662–1722). The report of this cartographic project includes a story about Fr. Joachim Bouvet, which shows on the one hand the good connections between the Jesuits and the Chinese and Manchus at the Imperial court in Beijing, and on the other the problems between Chinese and Europeans which could arise from the delicate religious feeling and personal obstinacy of Fr. Bouvet.