

A Buddhist Christian Encounter in Late Ming Dynasty: New Insights from the Chengdu Conflict of 1643–1644*

THIERRY MEYNARD 梅謙立
Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou

Abstract: The Buddhist-Christian encounter in the late Ming has left an important body of literature which has been the object of scholarly attention in the last decades. This paper investigates a very little-known document, never published, about a short but violent conflict in 1643–1644 in Chengdu. The manuscript, written by a direct witness and actor in the conflict, the Portuguese Jesuit Gabriel de Magalhães, contains a half-dozen original documents translated into Portuguese. Based on those documents and other sources, we attempt to reconstruct the course of the events, and to elucidate the root cause of the conflict. As we shall show, the conflict in Chengdu is a prolongation of the anti-Christian campaign launched by the abbot Miyun Yuanwu in 1632 in Zhejiang, but it was greatly exacerbated by the political crisis felt by the saṃgha in Chengdu in the final year of the Ming.

Keywords: Sichuan, Buddhism, Miyun Yuanwu 密雲圓悟 (1566–1642), Poshan Haiming, Jesuits

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.15239/hijbs.06.02.04>

* This paper was presented at the conference ‘Religions and Local Society in the Historical, Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives’, August 12–14, 2022, University of British Columbia. I would like to thank Professor Timothy Brook for his response to my conference paper which allowed me to make further

I. Introduction: Catholic-Buddhist Conflicts in Late Ming

The conflict with Buddhism is almost consubstantial to late Ming Christianity. Due to many apparent similarities between the two religions, Jesuit missionaries since Michele Ruggieri (1543–1607) and Matteo Ricci (1552–1610) were forced to explain doctrinal differences and to enforce the orthopraxis of Christianity, not to be mixed with Buddhist practices. In doing so, missionaries and Chinese Christians often disparaged Buddhism. Unlike Christianity, Chinese Buddhism is a non-exclusivist religion which tolerates a diversity of religions. This explains why the Buddhist reactions to Christian attacks were mild and progressive.

In the *Tianshuo* 天說 [Discourses on Heaven, 1615], the abbot Zhuhong 祿宏 (1535–1615) engaged himself publicly in the debate, dealing not only with religious beliefs but also practices. One year after the publication of *Tianshuo*, the *libushilang* 禮部侍郎 (Vice President of the Ministry of Rites) in Nanjing, Shen Que 沈淮 (?–1642) prohibited Christianity, and the Italian Jesuit Alfonso Vagnone (1566–1640) imputed the responsibility to Buddhist monks. Despite Vagnone's claims, the involvement of the saṃgha is not clearly documented. The official documents related to the case never

developments. I benefited from the help of Dr. Camilla Russell of the Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu (IHSI, Rome) to obtain a good scan of the original document. Dr. Lai Yueshan 賴岳山, Southern Normal University 華南師範大學, helped me in finding some Chinese sources about the monk Lizhi. Chen Yufang 陳玉芳 from Fudan University 復旦大學, shared with me the draft of her Chinese translation of ARSI ms. Jap.Sin.127. Dr. Yang Hongfan 楊弘帆 read a draft of this paper and suggested some editorial changes. Maggie Mitchell, Executive Editor of the *Hualin Series on Buddhist Studies*, suggested style changes and edited the text for this volume. I express my gratitude to all of them. This research received the support from the Major Program of National Social Science Fund of China: 'Chinese documents of Catholic Church in Ming and Qing, and Dialogue of Christianity with Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism' 國家社科基金重大項目《明清中國天主教漢籍校注整理及耶儒佛道對話研究》(19ZDA242).

mention a conflict with Buddhism, and instead accuse Christianity of threatening Confucian politics and morality. Later, Xu Dashou 許大受 (1580–1650), a disciple of Zhuhong, started in 1623 an anti-Christian campaign in Zhejiang with his work, the *Shengchao zuopi* 聖朝佐關 [Help for the Refutation of the Holy Dynasty against the Teaching of the Lord of Heaven], but the saṃgha was not directly involved in the campaign, which was quickly aborted.¹

However, starting in 1632, the saṃgha became institutionally involved in an anti-Christian campaign in the Zhejiang and Fujian provinces, as attested by the writings of Miyun Yuanwu 密雲圓悟 (1566–1642) and Feiyin Tongrong 費隱通容 (1593–1661). As Iso Kern says, with Yuanwu, the Chinese Buddhists entered ‘the second stage of the anti-Christian movement’.² They engaged themselves in an open conflict with Christianity, not because of doctrinal differences, but essentially because they saw the quick development of Christianity as an existential threat. This was partially provoked by the direct methods of evangelisation by the newly arrived Franciscan and Dominican friars in Fujian, and in reaction, Christianity was banned in Fujian in 1637.³ Yuanwu played an important role in this ban by sponsoring the *Poxie ji* 破邪集 [Collection for the Destruction of the Heresies] which gathers fifty-nine anti-Christian texts, including official documents related to the Nanjing case and many texts from the Buddhists, like the *Tianshuo* by Zhuhong and the *Shengchao zuopi* by Xu Dashou. Some texts are closely linked to Yuanwu, like his own ‘Biantian sanshuo’ 辨天三說 [Three Discourses to Distinguish Heaven, hereafter *Third Discourse*], and also a text from his disciple Tongrong 通容. Yuanwu entrusted the task of editing the collection to Tongrong and to the lay Buddhist Xu Changzhi 徐昌治.⁴ It may appear strange that Chan masters in the late Ming

¹ Xu, *Aide à la réfutation de la Sainte Dynastie*.

² Kern, *Buddhistische*, 14–37.

³ Criveller, *Preaching Christ in Late Ming China*, 152.

⁴ For translation and analysis of the Third Discourse, see Kern, *Buddhistische Kritik*, 94–106; Gernet, *Chine et Christianisme*, 110–12 and 295–96; Lancashire, ‘Buddhist Reaction to Christianity in Late Ming China’, 92–95.

engaged themselves in an anti-Christian campaign, but as Wu Jiang 吳疆 has recently explained, Chan masters could develop a very strict idea of orthodoxy based on their experience of immediate enlightenment, and indeed Yuanwu wrote very polemical texts against some fellow Chan masters.⁵ So, it is no wonder that Yuanwu would engage himself in harsh polemics against Christianity.

The anti-Christian campaign by Yuanwu was built on a strong alliance with the literati. Xu Dashou had already laid the intellectual foundation of such an alliance by reshaping the unity of the *sanjiao* 三教 (Three Teachings) into a defensive program against a fourth teaching, Christianity, but Xu had failed to put this into practice. Through the powerful institutional base of the Buddhist monasteries and the connections with the literati and officers of Zhejiang and Fujian, Yuanwu put the alliance of Buddhism with the Confucian elite against Christianity into practical action. As Wu Jiang remarks, 'Miyun Yuanwu and Feiyin Tongrong showed a clear intention to assume the leadership of this movement'.⁶

II. Three Historic Documents on the Conflict of 1643–1644 in Chengdu

The Buddhist-Christian conflict happened just a few months before the rebel leader Zhang Xianzhong 張獻忠 (1606–1647) entered

⁵ Wu, 'Encountering the Jesuits', 108–33, 132: 'A claim of orthodoxy by the Huangbo masters had emerged from their emphasis on the immediate enlightenment experience and the strict practice of dharma transmission. For them, the meaning of orthodoxy was largely confined within the Chan Buddhist world. In this controversy against the Jesuits, we find that the claim of orthodoxy extended beyond a sectarian boundary and had gained an inter-religious connotation: other religious traditions were incorporated into the context and were judged according to the most correct way.'

⁶ Wu, 'Encountering the Jesuits', 126. See also the Ph.D. dissertation of *idem*, 'Orthodoxy, Controversy and the Transformation of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-century China', 197–217.

Chengdu, and many historical records of the conflict were certainly destroyed later on, amid the mass-killings perpetrated by Zhang, which have attracted the attention of historians. In this regard, the reports of the Italian Jesuit Lodovico Buglio (利類思, 1606–1682) and of the Portuguese Jesuit Gabriel de Magalhães (安文思, 1610–1677) constitute a valuable source of information. When Zhang entered Chengdu in August 1644, the two Jesuits had already left the city. Zhang proclaimed himself king on December 4, 1644, and when a prominent supporter of Christianity in Chengdu was promoted by Zhang as *libu shangshu* 禮部尚書 (President of Ministry of Rites), he called the two Jesuits to return and work at Zhang's court. In 1649 and 1651, Magalhães wrote two reports on the tragic events which had unfolded.⁷ Only the report of 1649 is extant (72 pages, or 36 *folia*), and was partially translated from Portuguese into Latin.⁸ This important document, never published in full, narrates the massacres perpetrated by Zhang in Sichuan, including the destruction of the entire Catholic community of Chengdu. Zhu Zhishu 朱至澍 (?–1644), prince of Shu 蜀王, killed himself, but his elder son surrendered. Another relative of the princely family hid inside the Daci Temple 大慈寺, and when Zhang learnt of their hiding, he ordered the killing of two thousand monks, according to Magalhães.⁹ After this, Zhang turned his rage against the tiny Christian community, and finally against all the inhabitants of Chengdu. However, Buglio, Magalhães, and their Macanese student Cai Anduo 蔡按鐸 (1620–1670) managed miraculously to escape death.

In this paper we shall not discuss Zhang's rule in Chengdu but focus instead on the Buddhist-Christian conflict of 1643–1644. Only three Church historians have mentioned the conflict. The French Jesuit historian Louis Pfister (1833–1891) had access in Shanghai to ancient documents of the Jesuit mission, and when writing the biography of Buglio, he gives a half-page long descrip-

⁷ *Relação da perda e destruição da Província el Christiandade de Suchuen; Relação das tyrantias obradas por Canghien chungo famoso ladrão da China.*

⁸ *Notes du P. Gourdon sur l'histoire de la mission du Sichuan.*

⁹ See Zürcher, 'In the Yellow Tiger's Den', 366.

tion of the conflict.¹⁰ Despite its shortness, important information can be gathered. First, Pfister gives the Chinese names of the two protectors of the Christian community in Chengdu: the military officer Yan (Yan Du 閻督) who was baptised as Thomas (Thomé), and the civil officer Wu Jishan 吳繼善 (?–1644) who apparently was never baptised.¹¹ Pfister mentions the gathering of four thousand bonzes, the judgement of the *ancha shi* 按察使 (Tribunal of Crimes against Christianity), and the distribution of anti-Christian libels or pamphlets in the city. For Pfister, the persecution was provoked by some officers who were not admitted to baptism, with the bonzes playing only a secondary role. However, Irene Pih, a biographer of Magalhães, while describing the conflict on the basis of Pfister's account, raises doubt about the issue of polygamy or the jealousy of the monks as being the reasons for the conflict, and she considers that the true reason may have been political.¹²

Besides the short account by Pfister, François-Marie-Joseph Gourdon (古洛東, 1842–1927), a priest of the Paris Foreign Missions Society (MEP), gave a longer account, in Chinese, running nine pages in his *Shengjiao ruchuan ji* 聖教入川記 [Records of the Entry of the Holy Teaching in Sichuan, 1918].¹³ Being based in Sichuan, Gourdon became interested in the history of Christianity in the

¹⁰ Pfister, *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne Mission de Chine*, note 80 (Buglio), 231.

¹¹ According to Erik Zürcher (1928–2008), Wu Jishan was the *zhixian* 知縣 (subprefect) of Chengdu; see Zürcher, 'In the Yellow Tiger's Den', 358. Magalhães gives his Chinese name in transliteration as U Ki xen; see *Relação da perda e destruição*, 3r. He was from Taicang 太倉 in Jiangsu, and he became *jinshi* in 1637.

¹² Pih, *Le Père Gabriel de Magalhães*, 29–32. Also, Luisa Paternicò briefly mentioned the Christian-Buddhist conflict of 1643–1644, and she seems to rely exclusively on Pfister's account, mentioning the two reasons for the persecution: the jealousy of the Buddhist monks and the frustration of some literati caused by the Christian interdiction of polygamy; see Paternicò, 'Ludovico Buglio e la sua rocambolesca avventura cinese', 70.

¹³ Gu, *Shengjiao ruchuan ji*.

province, and he went to Shanghai to find historical documents of the Jesuit mission. From the Chinese text of Gourdon, we summarise below basic information, giving the page number as reference in parentheses.

There was a first batch of thirty-one baptisms in 1641 (4), among whom was Peter from the family of the prince of Shu 蜀. A female relative of Peter was practicing Buddhism to get delivered from a bad spirit, but without avail. After Peter taught her catechism and gave her a cross, she was relieved from a bad spirit and joined the church with all her family (5). After the coming of Magalhães in Chengdu in 1642, Christianity developed very quickly. Thomas Yan (the military officer mentioned by Pfister) was a former *daoshi* 道士, but at the age of seventy years old, he converted to Christianity, together with his sons, great-sons, soldiers, and servants. He even had a chapel inside his residence. The quick development of Christianity stirred up jealousy among the *daoshi* (6). Some officers who wanted to keep their concubines were rejected for baptism, and in frustration against the two Jesuits, they contacted a higher officer to get them expelled. The officer rejected the request since the two behaved well and enjoyed good repute (7).

There was a meeting of four thousand *daoshi*, expressing their opposition to the two Jesuits, and they decided to send them to the Criminal Court to be punished with death penalty under the following accusations: no respect for Chinese tradition, repudiation of the bodhisattvas, harming national security, discarding the rituals to the ancestors, and being spies for a foreign country. Libels were printed and posted in the whole city. The accusations against the Jesuits were rejected by the court of the prince of Shu and by the officers of Chengdu, and the *daoshi* brought the case to the Criminal Court, but the accusations were once again rejected. Finally, the *daoshi* assembled a crowd of six thousand persons in front of the Criminal Court. To avoid public disorder, the vice-director accepted the accusations and planned to prosecute the two Jesuits. However, the Christian military officer Yan placed his guards around the Jesuits' residence to protect them.

Then, Wu Jishan, the *zhixian* 知縣 (subprefect) of Chengdu,

returned from Beijing and handed over to Buglio and Magalhães a letter from the German Jesuit Adam Schall von Bell (1592–1666). Learning about the conflict, this Christian sympathiser visited several officers in Chengdu and assured them that the two Jesuits were good persons, highly educated, and useful to the Ming court (10). However, the eunuchs at the court of prince of Shu had received bribes from the *daoshi* and were now opposing the two Jesuits. The *daoshi* and the eunuchs were pushing people to destroy Christian icons, objects, and books. One night, the Jesuit residence was surrounded by people with torches, but the Christians managed to protect the place. For half a month, there were tensions around the church, and the Christians also printed their own libels and pamphlets to defend Christianity. Finally, the Christian military officer Yan led a cavalry with six hundred horsemen to re-establish public order, removing the pamphlets against Christianity. When the *daoshi* saw that the Christians were protected by the army, they did not dare to attack them anymore (12). Buglio and Magalhães wrote an apology of Christianity, and also reprinted the apologies of the two famous Chinese Christians Xu Guangqi 徐光啟 (1562–1633) and Yang Tingyun 楊廷筠 (1557–1627). When the inhabitants of Chengdu read those apologies, they were all praising Christianity, and all the enemies disappeared. The officers at the Criminal Court were punished, some being allowed to remain in the province, others being expelled from the province (13).

As we can see, this account is much more detailed than the one by Pfister. Gourdon mentions that Thomas Yan was originally a *daoshi*, and that his conversion created jealousy among other *daoshi*, suggesting therefore an opposition between Christianity and a heterodox group of *daoshi*.

Besides Pfister and Gourdon, the third historical document describing the conflict can be found in the *Historia Sinarum* [History of China] by the Polish Jesuit Tomasz Ignacy Szpot Dunin (1645–1713). Unlike Pfister and Gourdon, Szpot Dunin never came to China, but he was entrusted with the task of writing a history of the Jesuit mission based on the archives kept in the Roman headquarters. Unfortunately, his work has never been published to this

day. The conflict with Buddhism fills only two *folia* (four pages). Like Pfister and Gourdon, Szpot Dunin probably made a summary out of Magalhães' report because the account is very similar.¹⁴

Those three historical sources already give us precious information about the conflict. While the actors supporting Christianity, like Thomas Yan and Wu Jishan, are clearly identified, there is an ambiguity about the identity and the motivations of those who launched the anti-Christian campaign. Pfister talks about bonzes, but with the Chinese term *daoshi*, Gourdon seems to have understood that the campaign was instigated by Daoist monks. Also, was the conflict in Chengdu sporadic, or the result of a well-orchestrated campaign like the one launched by Yuanwu in Zhejiang and Fujian in 1632? Was it a local and isolated conflict, or was it connected to a nationwide context with religious and political groups fighting for influence? Was there an alliance between religious groups—Daoist or Buddhist—with the Confucian elite in Chengdu suppressing Christianity? Finally, was the root of the conflict cultural (the issue of polygamy), religious (competition between rival groups), political (loyalty to the Ming), or something else?

III. Report of Magalhães and Other Direct Sources on the Conflict

We have described three historical sources about the conflict in Chengdu in 1643–1644. Let us now see the primary sources. Before discussing the unpublished report by Magalhães, we first discuss a few short mentions of the conflict in the published materials written by Buglio and Magalhães.

When Magalhães died in Beijing in 1677, his thirty-six-year long companion Buglio wrote an obituary in which he mentions briefly the conflict:

Two years after, there happened a violent persecution against the preachers of the gospel, raised by the bonzes of that province, who

¹⁴ *Historia Sinarum*, 29v–31r.

assembling together in great numbers from neighboring cities, accused the fathers of rebellion in all the Tribunals of that metropolis. The chief mandarin therefore of the Tribunal of Crimes fearing a revolt, at a time when the kingdom was turmoiled with several insurrections, ordered that the fathers should be well drubbed, and then expelled out of the limits of the province. But they put their confidence in God's assistance and in the protection of the mandarins, of whose greatest part were their friends, would not forsake their station. Thereupon the bonzes every day hung up libels against the fathers, in the principal quarters of the city, as also against the mandarins. But one of the military mandarins, who was a Christian [Thomas Yan], took care to have them pulled down by the soldiers. On the other side, the fathers wrote several books, wherein they explained and asserted the truth of their faith, and refuted the impostures of their adversaries. This persecution lasted three months; but then the bonzes, whether it were that they were afraid of the mandarins who protected the fathers, or whether they lacked money to maintain themselves any longer in the capital city, retired home one after another; and then the governor [*zhixian* Wu Jishan] of the city, who favored the fathers, discharged the superior of the bonzes from his employment; which put all the rest to silence, and absolutely stifled that uproar.¹⁵

Here Buglio mentions important elements: the gathering of monks in Chengdu, a three-month campaign against Christianity by ways of libels or pamphlets, the dispersion of the monks, and the removal of a Buddhist abbot from his position. The intervention of the military officer, Thomas Yan, and of the *zhixian* of Chengdu, Wu Jishan, is also mentioned. Interestingly, Buglio does not make mention of the issue of polygamy.

¹⁵ *A New History of China*, 342–43. The biography was inserted at the end of *Nouvelle relation de la Chine*, an account of China written by Magalhães in Portuguese in Beijing in 1668 and published in 1688 in French translation; 'Abrégé de la vie et de la mort du R. Père Gabriel de Magaillans, de la Compagnie de Jésus, missionnaire de la Chine', in *Nouvelle relation de la Chine*, 373–74.

In *Nouvelle relation de la Chine* [A New History of China], Magalhães alludes indirectly to the conflict while discussing the high esteem that the Chinese have about their own culture and history. He refers to the condemnation of the *ancha shi* 按察使 (surveillance commissioner, translated by Magalhães as president of the tribunal of crimes),¹⁶ expressed in the following words:

If these strangers remain in their habitations without stirring forth or teaching new inventions, ‘*Zhongguo zhi da wusuo burong*’ [中國之大，無所不容], which means: ‘This kingdom is so vast that it is able to contain both the natives and the foreigners, there being room enough for as many more.’ But if they teach any new doctrine different from the sacred and true doctrines we profess in this Great Empire, or if they go about to surprise and delude the people, let every one of them be punished with forty lashes and expelled from the province.¹⁷

Magalhães identified the key problem as the belief in the cultural supremacy of Chinese culture, and this does not allow introducing a new teaching like Christianity.

To be as complete as possible, let us mention that Antonino Lo Nardo has recently edited the obituary of Buglio written in 1682 by Filippo Grimaldi (1638–1712), which gives a more precise and credible accusation brought to the tribunal against Christianity, i.e., crime of rebellion (*delitto di ribellione*). Still, according to Grimaldi, the persecution lasted only three months and the principal monk was removed from his position.¹⁸

After the three short mentions of the conflict by Buglio,

¹⁶ Magalhães translates *anchashi* 按察使 as president of Tribunal of Crimes. In fact, the officer has a double function of justice (*an* 按) and inspection (*cha* 察). In the remainder of the paper, we use the standard translation of surveillance commissioner.

¹⁷ *A New History of China*, 62–63; *Nouvelle relation de la Chine*, 77–78.

¹⁸ Lo Nardo, ‘P. Ludovico Buglio S.J. (1606–1682)’; for the original document, see ‘Breve relatione della vita e morte del padre Ludovico Buglio’.

Magalhães, and Grimaldi in their published writings, we now turn to the Portuguese manuscript written in 1644 by Magalhães. This report is likely the common source of the accounts by Pfister, Gordon, and Szpot Dunin, but this would need to be confirmed by a precise textual analysis of the sources that we shall not undertake here.¹⁹ The report by Magalhães has never been published and we are now working to transcribe it. The few accounts of Buddhist-Christian conflicts in the late Ming tend to be quite succinct, but this report stands out as being very detailed, running over twenty-four *folia* (or forty-eight pages) and including a half-dozen original Chinese documents that Magalhães translated into Portuguese. We shall analyse here the unfolding of the conflict up to its resolution, paying special attention to the involvement of the Chinese monks in the conflict and to the documents they wrote, which are extant only in the Portuguese translation by Magalhães. Our interest is not so much in understanding the Catholic response to the conflict, but in understanding the Buddhist involvement through the only material available, that is, the report of Magalhães. This preliminary investigation allows us to show that the conflict was far from an isolated event but was inspired by Yuanwu.

Let us describe the said document. The full title is: *Relação das viagens que fes o padre Luis Buglio no ano de 1639 o padre Magalhaes no ano de 1642 pera a Provincia de Siecbuen, e da grande persiguição que na metropoli da mesma Provincia levantarão os Bonzos contra a ley de Deos e seus Pregadores, Ao Padre Visitador das provincias de Japão e China em Macao* [Report about the Travels Made by Father Ludovico Buglio in 1639 and Father Magalhães in 1642 towards the Province of Sichuan, and about the Great Persecution that the Buddhist Monks Planned against Christianity and its Missionaries, for Father Visitor of the Jesuit Provinces of Japan and China].

¹⁹ Among modern scholars, only the Italian historian Giuliano Bertuccioli (1923–2001) mentions in his biography of Buglio the existence of this report of Magalhães, and he has a passing remark about the ‘opposition of the Buddhist and Taoist local clergy who tried to raise the population against them’. See Bertuccioli, ‘Buglio, Ludovico’.

The author is clearly Magalhães since the last *folio* (152v) bears his signature. The date of the document is indicated as April 10, 1644. There is no mention of place, but we know that Magalhães was still in Chengdu. As indicated, the document was addressed to the Visitor of the Jesuit provinces of Japan and China, who resided in Macao. The Visitor is not named, but we know that Manuel de Azevedo (1581–1650) held this position in 1644.²⁰

The state of conservation of the document is remarkably good. It contains some headings, and there are a few marginal notes from the hand of Magalhães to give further explanation, and also from another hand, probably António de Gouvea, to indicate points of attention, especially about the way to go from Hangzhou to Sichuan.

As the title indicates, the document has two main parts. The first twelve pages (six *folia*, ff. 129r–134v) relate the arrival in Chengdu of Buglio in 1639 and of Magalhães in 1642. In Nanjing, a *gelao* 閣老 (member of the Grand Secretary) on his way back to his hometown in Sichuan invited Buglio to go there. Since the *gelao* had some business in Nanjing, Buglio first left for Sichuan on October 20, 1639. In his report, Magalhães does not give the name of the *gelao*, but Pfister identified him as Liu Yuliang 劉宇亮 (?–1642) from Mianzhu 綿竹 who held high positions at the court, ending with the highest position of *neige shoufu* 內閣首輔 (Grand Secretary) in 1638–1639.²¹ Liu Yuliang was a strong supporter of the Jesuits, but there is no indication in the report of Magalhães that Liu was ever baptised. On March 1, 1640, Buglio arrived in Chengdu and met with one of the two sons of Liu, either Liu Yichong 劉裔充 or Liu Yixi 劉裔錫. Since his father had been devoted in the past to Daoism and had spent large amounts of money to build temples in Mianzhu, the son feared that Buglio was taking advantage of the credulity of his father, so he gave Buglio little support. The religious beliefs of Liu Yuliang would need special

²⁰ Dehergne, *Répertoire des Jésuites de Chine de 1542 à 1800*, 322.

²¹ See Pfister, *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne Mission de Chine*, 230. Irene Pih identified the birthplace of Liu *gelao* as Mianzhou 綿州, the district where the city of Mianzhu is located; Pih, *Le Père Gabriel de Magalhães*, 36.

investigation. He first sponsored the construction of a Guandi miao 關帝廟, and in 1638 (Chongzhen 崇禎 11) he built a Shangdi gong 上帝宮,²² but it seems that the main hall of this palace, destroyed in the twentieth century, did not have a statue of Christ but of the Jade Emperor (Yuhuang dadi 玉皇大帝). For seven months, Buglio stayed in Chengdu in a small house given to him by the son of Liu Yuliang, living with a boy from Macao. Magalhães does not give his name, but this refers to Cai Anduo 蔡按鐸.²³

Finally, Liu Yuliang arrived in Chengdu and, on October 4, 1640, the feast of Saint Francis of Assisi, Buglio took possession of a house bought by Liu, close to his own house in Chengdu. This became the first church in Sichuan. Through the recommendations of Liu, Buglio gained support from the high officers of Chengdu, and he could also develop Christianity among the common people. Buglio sent a letter to the Jesuit Vice-Provincial Francisco Furtado (傅汎濟, 1588–1653) for financial assistance, who replied to Buglio to send Cai Anduo to collect the money. When Cai arrived in Hangzhou, he informed Furtado that Buglio suffered from bleeding in the mouth. Magalhães, who was supposed to go to Yunnan, volunteered instead to go to Chengdu to help Buglio. In his report, he describes his travels in great detail, from Hangzhou, Suzhou, Nanjing, Wuchang, Jingzhou, Chongqing, and Leshan, up to Chengdu.

Then Magalhães narrates ‘the great persecution that the bonzes of Sichuan raised against Christianity and the missionaries’ (*Grande perseguição que na metropoli da mesma Provincia levantarão os Bonzos contra a ley de Deos e seus Pregadores*), as the second part of the document’s full title and the heading of the second part both indicate. This runs over eighteen *folia* or thirty-six pages (ff. 135r–152v). The events unfolded from June 1643, the date of the first meeting of the monks, up to the resolution of the conflict in March 1644. Since Magalhães had arrived in Chengdu at the end of August 1642, he was a witness to the whole conflict.²⁴ In his account, he

²² Xiao, ‘Changming tianxue chijin weiren’, 227.

²³ See Mei, ‘Luoxia Maizi’.

²⁴ For the arrival date of Magalhães at Chengdu, Irene Pih gives August 28,

stands from the point of view of Christianity, but the report is quite reliable since he provides original Chinese documents in Portuguese translation, even to the point of keeping derogatory mentions of the missionaries (*hums diabolicos filhos bastardos*, those diabolic bastard sons). He is careful enough to insert his own comments in parenthesis. Erik Zürcher (1928–2008) had considered Magalhães’ report on Zhang’s rule as based on personal experience,²⁵ and we do not have serious reason to doubt the veracity of his report on the conflict with Buddhism. The basic content can be divided into sections according to the chart below:

TABLE 1 Thematic division; ARSI Jap.Sin. 126: ff. 135r–152v

Thomas Yan’s conversion to Christianity; conversion of some officers of the surveillance commission, but frustration of some being rejected due to polygamy	135rv
June 1643, first meeting of four thousand monks with anti-Christian discourses and preparation of a campaign of defamation through official requests, pamphlets, and a work by the monk Lizhi; calling of the next meeting for December	135v–136r
Four warnings about Lizhi’s book: (1) mostly an abstract of the Third Discourse of the monk ‘Heavenly Child’, followed by the prologue of Lizhi, petitions and pamphlets; (2) comments are in parenthesis; (3) China has three teachings; (4) names of the mandarins.	136v–137r
Prologue by Lizhi: his discussions with the monk Heavenly Child about Christianity; study of Christianity; three teachings incompatible with Christianity; strategy of missionaries to lure converts; forcing converts to burn Buddhist books and break fasting; borrowings of Christianity from Buddhism; rebellion against the Ming dynasty and fear of military conquest; reproduction of the <i>Third Discourse</i> , published in December 1643	137r–139v
Abstract of the <i>Third Discourse</i>	139v–140r

1642; see Pih, *Le Père Gabriel de Magalhães*, 28. However, our document has August 29, 1642.

²⁵ Zürcher, ‘In the Yellow Tiger’s Den’, 357.

Request to ban Christianity in the name of the people addressed to the surveillance commissioner, December 1643	140v–142v
Orders of the surveillance commissioner against the Christians, December 1643	142v–143v
Intervention of Thomas Yan and Wu Jishan to protect the Christians; intervention of the eunuchs of the local princes of the imperial family (<i>Regulos</i>); siege of the church by the crowd for two weeks up to the publication of the <i>Tianxue chuangai</i>	144r–144v
Texts of three anti-Christian pamphlets; Tibetan monks joining against Christianity; Buddhist monks entering Christian houses to destroy Holy Images	145r–146r
Declaration of Wu Jishan in support of Christianity, and letter of eight high officers to the Abbot	147r–147v
Pamphlets against the mandarins and Thomas Yan	148r–149v
Christian publications and conclusion of the conflict	150r–152v

This basic outline shows a concerted action of the samgha of Chengdu against Christianity, with two large gatherings: one of preparation in June 1643, and the other of execution in December of the same year. The campaign involves the publication of an anti-Christian work, with a preface by the monk Lizhi, and the *Third Discourse* by the monk ‘Heavenly Child’ (*Menino de Ceo*). Besides narrating events in detail, Magalhães adds great value to his report by translating texts and documents into Portuguese, most of which are not extant in Chinese, like the prologue of Lizhi, the accusation against Christianity brought to the surveillance commissioner, and several pamphlets distributed and posted around Chengdu.

Having transcribed the report by Magalhães in its entirety, I noticed that some elements given by Gourdon, like the female relative of Peter practicing Buddhism, or Thomas Yan leading a cavalry with six hundred horsemen, do not seem present in the report by Magalhães. Magalhães probably wrote another, slightly different version.

IV. The Prologue by Lizhi

Who is the monk Lizhi (Li Chi) who played such a central role in the conflict? Fortunately, Magalhães gives us the meaning of the two Chinese characters as ‘splitter of intentions’ (*apartador de intentos*).²⁶ Also, he translates Lizhi’s prologue, which contains a wealth of biographical information.

First, he was born in Sichuan, and starting from the first year of Tianqi 天啓 (1621), he visited Buddhist monasteries in the province, and then went to Guizhou, Shanxi (Mount Wutai 五臺山), Beijing, Shandong, and Nanjing. In the fourth year of Chongzhen 崇禎 era (1631), he finally arrived at Zhejiang where he met with the monk Tiantong 天童, which means Heavenly Child (*Menino de Ceo*). Without any doubt, this refers to Yuanwu, the abbot of the Tiantong Temple 天童寺 (‘Heavenly Child Temple’) in Ningbo. In his prologue, Lizhi mentions that one day his master Tiantong asked him whether ‘the dharma of the heretics had entered Sichuan’ (*Por ventura na vossa Provincia de Sichuan entrou ja aquella Lei dos Hereges?*), but Lizhi answered that he did not understand the question. Indeed, Buglio arrived in Sichuan only in 1639.

The encounter with Lizhi shows that as early as 1631 Yuanwu was concerned about the spread of Christianity. Just before moving to the Tiantong Temple in Ningbo in 1630–1631, Yuanwu had spent eight months at Mount Huangbo 黃檗山 in Fujian, where he revived the Linji School 臨濟宗 of Chan Buddhism. During his stay there, he was in contact with the family of the former *neige shoufu* Ye Xianggao 葉向高 (1559–1627) who had just passed away. Yuanwu surely knew that Ye was a strong supporter of the Italian Jesuit Giulio Aleni (艾儒略, 1582–1649).²⁷ In 1631 in Ningbo, Yuanwu shared with Lizhi his worries about the spread of Christianity, but he wrote his anti-Christian work only four years later, in 1635.

Lizhi went back to Sichuan, and there he went to see the famous monk Poshan, or ‘Breaking Mountains’ (*Quebra Montes*). Now that

²⁶ *Relação das viagens*, 136v.

²⁷ See Wu, ‘Encountering the Jesuits’, 117.

the connection between Lizhi and Yuanwu has been established, it is clear that Poshan is none other than the Chan master Poshan Haiming 破山海明 (1597–1666), who became Yuanwu’s dharma heir in 1627, and returning to Sichuan in 1633, transmitted Yuanwu’s lineage there.²⁸ In his prologue, Lizhi mentions that Poshan had expressed his fears about the spread of Christianity. Lizhi could have met Poshan in 1633 at the Wanfeng Taiping Temple 萬峰太平寺, or later at the Zhongqing Temple 中慶寺, both located in Mount Liang 梁山.

Lizhi stayed several years on the ‘mount called fresh walls’ (*monte chamado frescos muros*), probably referring to Mount Qingcheng 青城山.²⁹ Following his discussions with Yuanwu and Poshan, Lizhi read the ‘nine scriptures and the seventeen commentaries’ (九部經十七論) of Buddhism, and even the entire Buddhist and Daoist collections (大藏經, 道藏), but he could not find the names of Jesus, Adam, and Eve there. Sometime between 1635 and 1642 he read Yuanwu’s *Third Discourse*.

At this point, Magalhães breaks Lizhi’s prologue by inserting a background explanation about Yuanwu. Accordingly, Yuanwu would have very early on written an anti-Christian work and went to Hangzhou, but since Xu Guangqi and Li Zhizao 李之藻 (1571–1630) were still alive, he avoided direct engagement for fear of being defeated! Yuanwu would have kept his work unpublished and passed it to Lizhi who published it in Sichuan. Since Li Zhizao and Xu

²⁸ Wu, *Enlightenment in Dispute*, 97. Poshan was not the first Chan master in Sichuan. If we do not count the legendary Yuan general Zhang Dingbian 張定邊 (1318–1417), the first Chan master may have been Juyun Chuiwan 聚雲吹萬 (1582–1639) who had returned to Sichuan in 1624.

²⁹ There is a Qingliang Temple 清涼寺 at the Mountain of the Nine Peaks 九峰山, some 100 km from Chengdu. According to a legend, Zhang Dingbian after his defeat to Zhu Yuanzhang went there to practice Buddhism and established the branch of the Nine-peaks of the Linji School. But Qingliang does not match with the transliteration of Cim Chin, and I think Mount Qingcheng 青城山 is more likely. Another possibility is that Magalhães confused Lizhi’s birthplace, Mount Bi 璧山, with the meaning of ‘Mount of Murals’.

Guangqi died respectively in 1627 and 1630, this would mean that Yuanwu would have written the *Third Discourse* before 1630. However, the work was written in 1635, as said above. When Magalhães writes his report in 1644, he ignores the fact that Yuanwu's work was already published ten years before.

With all the elements in place, we can now solve the identity of Lizhi. In the *Jinjiang chandeng* 錦江禪燈 [Chan Lights of the River Jin, 1672], the Chan master Zhangxue Tongzui 丈雪通醉 (1610–ca. 1693) presents the biographies of the Chan masters in Sichuan. We can find the following record about the Chan master Lizhi 離指:

Chan master Lizhi, family name Chen, from Bishan, was determined and proud. According to his profession, he used argumentative skills and put people in difficult positions. He received from the monk Ming [Poshan] some predictions about him reaching Buddhahood. He stayed at the Temple of Caotang in Jialing and, meeting with ordinary people, he composed abundant verses to mock them. He often argued that the teaching of the Great West was a heterodox discourse, and that the Lord of Heaven pulls the Christians astray. One afternoon he watched a boat race and wrote the following verse: 'Suddenly I heard the drums on the river, and I was drawn into harmony; I watched the flying paddles and leaning on the rattan chair I listened to the singing. Birds rest a bit on the hills, and the crocodiles roam constantly in the watery kingdom. Looking back, the day has almost passed, and I slowly passed the city.' Later, he moved to the Western bank of Xinfan, and he died without illness. His disciples followed his last orders; he was cremated, and his bones were made into cakes to feed the fish.

離指示禪師，壁山陳氏子。志愷傲骨，氣硬心孤，以本分鉗錘接方來，人或難之。受明和尚[破山]記勅。居嘉陵艸堂寺。見諸方汎汎接人，遂作濫觴偈以嘲之。常辯泰西教為邪說，而天主拉徒眾隱去。午日觀競渡，作偈曰：'忽聞江鼓震，率爾引中和。信步觀飛櫂，倚藤聽唱歌。丘隅少止鳥，水國多遊鼉。回首天將晚，悠悠從市過。'後徙新繁之河西，無恙而終。門人遵遺命，闍維粉骨為餅，施水族焉。³⁰

The meaning of Lizhi 離指 matches the Portuguese ‘apartador de intentos’. Other biographical elements match the indications given in the report of Magalhães. Lizhi is from Sichuan (born near Chongqing at Mount Bi 壁山); he is a disciple of the abbot Poshan. Also, his character was uncompromising. Crucially important for our identification: he often discussed how much the teaching of the Great West (Taixi 泰西) was evil. We have not found any record of an anti-Christian book published by Lizhi in Chengdu in December 1643, nor have we found any trace of his prologue to the work. We may assume that the prologue is extant only through the Portuguese translation of Magalhães. In the short biography by Zhangxue Tongzui above, we learn additional information: Lizhi usually resided at the Caotang Temple 草堂寺 of Jialing 嘉陵 (now attached to Nanchong 南充), but he died in Chengdu. The verse/gāthā composed at the occasion of the Dragon Boat Festival (*Duanwu jie* 端午節) expresses his independent attitude.

The question remains: where was Lizhi staying while in Chengdu? Was it the Daci Temple, the Zhaojue Temple 昭覺寺, or elsewhere? In fact, Lizhi’s connection with the Zhaojue Temple seems the strongest because in 1896 (Guangxu 光緒 22), its abbot, Zhongxun 中恂, with the female lay Buddhist Luo Yonglin 羅用霖, published the *Chongxiu Zhaojuesi zhi* 重修昭覺寺志 [Revised Records of Zhaojue Temple], which includes a biography of Lizhi. In 1649, Magalhães had mentioned that Lizhi was executed by Zhang Xianzhong in 1644,³¹ but the information is obviously incorrect since the *Chongxiu Zhaojuesi zhi* mentions the exact date of his death as January 8, 1664 (the eleventh day of the twelfth month of the *guimao* 癸卯 year). Since it is stated that he died at age sixty, we can deduct that he was born in 1604. It is also stated that he was a monk for thirty-five years.³²

³⁰ See ‘Lizhi shi chanshi’.

³¹ See *Relação da perda e destruição*, 16v.

³² See *Chongxiu Zhaojuesi zhi*:

離指禪師，壁山陳氏子，志秉傲骨，氣硬心孤，本分鏈鏈接方來，人或難之……三十六癸卯，徙新繁之河西寺。于十二月十一日示寂，闍維粉骨為餅，施水族焉，遵遺命也。世壽六十，夏臘三十五，嗣破山明。

Other sources also inform us about Lizhi after 1644. In 1649, the lay Buddhist and Ming loyalist Liu Daokai 劉道開 (1601–1681) came to Jialing 嘉陵, and Lizhi protected him in his hiding.³³ Almost fifteen years later, the high officer and famous poet Yang Sisheng 楊思聖 (1621–1664) who was working for the Qing administration met Lizhi and wrote a poem about Lizhi in his old age,³⁴ and another about his illness.³⁵ At the end of his life, Lizhi was still acquainted with Ming loyalists, like the poet Yan Ermei 閻爾梅 (1603–1679) who mentioned him in one of his poems.³⁶

According to the report by Magalhães, the monks had first gathered in June 1643 and discussed preparation plans in the major temple of Chengdu, probably the Zhaojue Temple. During this meeting, the top monk of Sichuan pronounced a discourse about the threat of Christianity and the need to uproot it from Sichuan. Obviously Magalhães was not present, and he reported the words of the monk as he was told. Perhaps Poshan had pronounced that day the anti-Christian discourse, since he shared with Yuanwu the same worries about the spread of Christianity. It would make sense that Poshan selected Lizhi to write an anti-Christian work because Poshan, along with Yuanwu, had inspired Lizhi to study Christianity to refute it.

³³ See ‘Bianjishimo’ in *X* no. 0303-D: 0096:

己丑[1649年], 至嘉陵, 參離指和尚, 云: ‘有《合轍》全本’. 庚寅[1650年], 乃求得而卒業焉, 則又躍然, 歎未曾有. [離指] 和尚謂余: ‘《合轍》固善, 不如《正脉》之尤善也.’ 余又求正脉讀之, 初苦其科摺煩碎, 屢閱屢冥. 及觀其簡識取根, 不用天台止觀, 種種卓見, 高出羣疏. 相傳蓮師初見此本, 望北焚香, 搭衣禮拜. 良有以也.

³⁴ See ‘Shi Lizhi heshang’: 鐘動黃昏山寺秋, 白雲紅樹隱沙洲. 老僧閒坐心無事, 獨對門前江水流.

³⁵ See ‘Bingzhong zeng Lizhi heshang’ in *X* no. 0049, 0331: 病廢苦奄然, 來求避世方. 峨眉何處是, 爲我散清涼. 險路巴山遠, 塵心旅夢長. 皈依如不棄, 瓶鉢任徜徉.

³⁶ See ‘Yufengliyoxu’: 川北楊總戎十月既望獵於閬中之玉峰, 招余往觀, 將以騎射犬鷹示武於遠人也. 圍令而復移者三, 竟日無雙蹄片羽, 楊不樂, 余作此歌志之. 時同楊猶龍、孫黃中、離指和尚.

After the general speech by the top monk of Sichuan, there was another speech to lay down concrete future actions: infiltration of the Catholic community to gather accusations, requests to several bureaus, distribution of pamphlets in the city, a mass protest in front of the yamen and the church, and even burning houses of the Christians. Magalhães reports that the top monk sent a message to all the temples of Sichuan and asked the monks to gather in Chengdu on the eleventh month (i.e. December). Perhaps this corresponds to the Buddhist festival of the enlightenment of Buddha (*Puti jie* 菩提節), held on the eighth day of the twelfth month (臘八節). The project of murder seems hardly believable. Though Magalhães depicts a violent conflict, nobody was killed in the end.

Magalhães also describes strange behaviours during this first anti-Christian meeting, like the monks drinking wine and even sacrificing a rooster to the god of vengeance! While Tantric Buddhists would occasionally sacrifice a rooster to Yamāntaka, the wrathful expression of Mañjuśrī, it is impossible that Chan monks would have made such a bloody sacrifice, and we believe the information is incorrect. This shows that Magalhães had a limited understanding of Buddhism, of the differences between Chan and Pure Land, and of the distinction between orthodox Buddhism and heterodox groups.

V. Yuanwu's *Third Discourse* and Portuguese Abstract by Magalhães

In 1635, the lay Buddhist Huang Zhen 黃貞 showed his anti-Christian work *Buren buyan* 不忍不言 [I Cannot but Speak] to Yuanwu who wrote in September 1635 a very short essay (around eight hundred Chinese characters), later called 'Biantian chushuo' 辨天初說 (hereafter, the *First Discourse*).³⁷ Muchen Daomin 木陳道忞 (1596–1674), Yuanwu's secretary, added to Yuanwu's text his own preface entitled 'Shuoyou' 說繇 [Origin of the Discourse]. One may suppose that

³⁷ For the background of Huang Zhen and the *Third Discourse*, see Lancashire, 'Buddhist Reaction to Christianity in Late Ming China'.

Lizhi used the version of the *Third Discourse* in the *Poxie ji* (1639), but in fact he used an early edition because Magalhães translates elements which come from Daomin's prefaces, which were deleted altogether from the *Poxie ji*.³⁸ For example, the words translated by Magalhães as 'Esta Lei, que chamam de Tianzhu foi instituida pelo barbaro Matteo Ricci' (The teaching of the Lord of Heaven was established by the barbarian Matteo Ricci) are a translation of the words of Daomin ('Tianzhujiao zi Li Madou zhe chang' 天主教[...] 自利夷瑪竇者倡也), but are not found in the preface from Yuanwu. Also, there is the mention that Christianity was especially strong in Guangdong and Fujian (多有其人, 而廣閩尤甚), but this is a mistake because Jesuits did not have any permanent base in Guangdong, having closed the early missions of Zhaoqing 肇慶 and Shaoguan 韶關, unless this refers to Macao. This problematic mention of Guangdong is carried over from Daomin to Lizhi and Magalhães, but it is absent from the *Poxie ji*. Concerning the text of the *First Discourse* itself, Magalhães summarises the main argument of Yuanwu as: 'They attempt to destroy and speak ill of Buddha, ignoring that Buddha is none other than each human being; therefore, to speak ill of Buddha is the same as speaking ill of oneself.'³⁹ Interestingly, Magalhães understands this as a logical argument (*sylogismo ou solecismo*).

After Yuanwu wrote the *First Discourse*, he sent the monk Weiyi Purun 唯一普潤 (?–1647) to post it all over Hangzhou, hoping to force the Christians to engage in a formal dispute. But after three

³⁸ This extremely rare edition was discovered some twenty years ago by Zhou Yan 周岩 (alias Zhou Erfang 周駟方) at the Library of Shanghai 上海圖書館. Zhou, 'Ba tiantong Miyun Yuanwu biantianshuo'.

³⁹ *Relação das viagens*, 139v: 'destruir e dizer mal do Pagode Fe; não sabendo elle que cousa he Fe, porque o Fe não he outra cousa que cada hum dos homens em si mesmo; logo dizendo mal do Fe, he o mesmo, que dizer mal de simesmo.' Compare with 'Biantian chushuo', 386:

余觀其立天主之義以闢佛, 則知彼不識佛者, 果何為佛, 又何足與之辨哉?..... 我佛睹明星悟云: '奇哉! 一切眾生皆有如來智慧德相, 但以妄想執著不能証得.' 今彼以妄想執著而欲闢佛, 是則自暴自棄, 自闢自矣.

weeks, there was still no reaction, and Zhang Guangtian 張廣湑, a lay disciple of Zhuhong, was sent to the church of Hangzhou and read the *First Discourse* to Francisco Furtado, asking for his reaction. However, the Portuguese Jesuit did not answer and called instead Li Cibin 李次彪, son of Li Zhizao, but he did not answer either and asked that Yuanwu himself come. When Zhang answered that Yuanwu was living in Ningbo, the Christians promised to give a Christian work, the *Bianxue yidu* 辯學遺牘 [Testament on the Distinction between Schools, ca. 1624], but when Zhang returned to the church, they refused to give the book. This prompted Yuanwu to write the ‘Biantian ershuo’ 辨天二說 (hereafter, *Second Discourse*), which was around twelve hundred Chinese characters, slightly larger than the First Discourse. Daomin added again a short preface, also entitled ‘Shuoyou’ 說繇 [Origin of the Discourse] (six hundred Chinese characters).

In his abstract of the *Second Discourse*, Magalhães mentions only two points. First, the Buddhists accuse the Christians of not diffusing their books, and Magalhães sees this accusation as ‘the greatest lie’ (*grandissima mentira*). In fact, the refusal to give the *Bianxue yidu* was not mentioned by Yuanwu, but by Daomin, and it is therefore absent from the *Poxie ji*. Yet, Yuanwu in his own text hints at the esoteric transmission of Christianity, comparing it to the Bailian 白蓮 (White Lotus) and the Wenxiang 聞香 groups. The second point mentioned by Magalhães is the central idea of Chinese Buddhism that ‘Buddha is a power of understanding without fixed form, being heaven in heavens, human in humans, invisible to the eyes and impossible to hear with ears, so that to speak ill of Buddha is to speak ill of oneself’.⁴⁰ Magalhães does not make further comment but this idea of Buddha being present in everyone would have certainly struck him as pantheistic.

⁴⁰ *Relação das viagens*, 139v. Compare with the original Chinese: ‘Biantian ershuo’, 388:

佛者覺也, 覺者悟也.....故佛無定形, 在天而天, 處人而人, 不可以色相見, 不可以音聲求, 以其即汝我人人從本以來具足者也. 以汝我從來具足者不自覺悟, 而乃闢之, 非自暴自棄與?

Same as the *First Discourse*, the *Second Discourse* was posted in Hangzhou, but again it failed to elicit a reaction from the Christians. In fall 1635, Yuanwu asked Zhang Guangtian to return to the church of Hangzhou to show Furtado his *Second Discourse*. Timothy Fan Zhong 范中, a disciple of Yang Tingyun, accepted the *Second Discourse*, but without even looking at it, he rejected further discussion because the two teachings were too different to come to an agreement. This prompted Yuanwu to write the *Third Discourse*, much longer than the *First* and the *Second*, with around forty-two hundred Chinese characters, and expressing radical differences between Buddhism and Christianity. Daomin added again a short preface, also entitled ‘Shuoyou’ 說繇 [Origin of the Discourse] (six hundred Chinese characters).

Magalhães this time translates nothing from Daomin, but only the text of Yuanwu, selecting three points. First, Zhang Guangtian had reported the words of Fan Zhong to Yuanwu, words expressing the Riccian distinction between the Buddhist emptiness (*kong* 空) and the Christian reality (*shi* 實). Yuanwu corrects this by saying that the Buddhist teaching itself is not empty but comes from emptiness, and Yuanwu quotes the *Xinjing xu* 心經序 [Preface to the Heart Sūtra] by the Ming emperor Hongwu 洪武 (r. 1368–1398): ‘The Buddhist teaching is empty of moral vices and real with all virtues’ (佛之教實而不虛，正欲去愚迷之虛，立本性之實).⁴¹ In his translation, Magalhães displays the moral dimension of Buddhism, but he misses its metaphysical dimension which identifies the emptiness of the phenomenal world with the reality of the Buddha nature.

The second point selected by Magalhães is Yuanwu’s rejection of the existence of the human soul and its origin in God: if God does not have a soul, He cannot give it to human beings, and if God has a soul, the souls of human beings should be perfect, but we can see

⁴¹ *Relação das viagens*, 140r. Compare with the original Chinese: ‘Biantian sanshuo’, 393:

范君謂‘佛教雖重性靈，然偏虛不實，唯我天教明言人之靈魂出自天主，則有著落，方是大全真實之教……’佛教偏虛不實，余言不足重。

this is not the case.⁴² Magalhães understands this again as a logical argument (*dilema*).

The third and final point concerns the Buddhist transmigration, that Magalhães, like Ricci, associates with Pythagoras. Yuanwu sees the transmigration of souls as the result of karmic forces and of our failure to grasp our true nature, and therefore human souls do not come from God. Magalhães ends with this remark, and he omits the remaining part of the *Third Discourse*.⁴³

In brief, Yuanwu criticised Christianity on doctrinal grounds and on its refusal to engage into public debate, preferring esoteric transmission like the Bailian and the Wenxiang. Yet, in his writings, Yuanwu never calls Christianity *xiejiao* 邪教 (perverse teaching), and he never calls upon the government to ban Christianity. In contrast, the prologue of Lizhi expresses very forcefully the idea of Christianity as *xiejiao*, being in rebellion against the Ming dynasty, and therefore advocating for a campaign to eradicate Christianity.

Magalhães tells us that the work of Lizhi was printed in thousands of copies, and widely distributed to the high officers and to the people. Yuanwu had used similar tactics in Zhejiang, and the Buddhists in Chengdu may have copied this work. According to Magalhães, the campaign towards the general public backfired because people started to insult officers for being too lax in dealing with Christianity. Magalhães's

⁴² *Relação das viagens*, 140r. Original Chinese: 'Biantian sanshuo', 395–97:

若無靈魂，天主且屬烏有，何以靈魂出自天主？若有則天主之魂，渾然至善之體，出者既然則為所出者莫不皆然：今一家之內，一鄉一邑之間，何以智者愚者仁者暴者，萬有不齊？……然此如如正體，無始無終，不自天來，匪从人得，故曰：無所從來，亦無所去，故名如來。但迷之則生死始，悟之則輪迴息，使天主苟不自悟，則亦浮沉三界之人耳，烏能以靈魂與人哉？

⁴³ *Relação das viagens*, 140r. Original Chinese: 'Biantian sanshuo', 396–97:

一切眾生所以輪轉三界、流浪四生者，蓋業感為其累也。業感之累，始於妄想之所因；妄想之因，始於不達本性之故，以其不達本性，著於前境，緣境為識，循識為業，由業得報，故有六道種種差別之異果。果識為因，熏發現行，而輪回於是乎不息矣……然此如如正體，無始無終，不自天來，匪从人得，故曰：無所從來，亦無所去，故名如來。但迷之則生死始，悟之則輪迴息，使天主苟不自悟，則亦浮沉三界之人耳，烏能以靈魂與人哉？

report suggests that the anti-Christian campaign was quite successful among the common people, but not among the literati. Indeed, they were aware of the protection from which Christianity benefited, especially since 1635, the year when the Jesuits in Beijing had completed the imperial calendar and presented it to the emperor Chongzhen.

VI. Request to the Surveillance Commissioner and Launch of the Investigation

The surveillance commissioner had initially rejected a first accusation against Christianity, but on Christmas day, the main monk in Chengdu gathered a crowd in front of the surveillance commission. The assembly grew from the previous four thousand people during the June meeting to six thousand. The officers of the surveillance commission who sympathised with Buddhism and those who had been rejected for baptism pleaded with the magistrate to receive the accusation. The officers mentioned that Shaanxi 陝西 had already fell to the rebels. Clearly, the conquest of Xi'an by Li Zicheng 李自成 (1606–1645) created great anxiety, and some officers of the surveillance commission saw Christianity as a rebellious group working to overthrow the Ming dynasty.

Magalhães translated the request presented to the surveillance commissioner in December 1643. The request provides precious information about the installation of the first Christian church for males thanks to a *gelao* from Mianzhu who bought them a house in the street 'Wire of bronze' (*Fio de bronze, tongxian* 銅線). As said above, the *gelao* refers to Liu Yuliang 劉宇亮. The request also mentions the Church of Mary for females, installed in the residence of Captain Yan (i.e., Thomas Yan), and that thirteen Jesuits were sent across thirteen provinces with ten thousand cruzados each, but this last point seems an invention. Precise information about the life of the Christian community is given, like an accurate depiction of the ritual of baptism.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ *Relação das viagens*, 141r.

The request is said to be presented ‘in the name of the people’, but according to Magalhães, it was in fact written by Buddhist monks. There is some ground to this because the first accusation is that Christians are proselytising to the Buddhists, asking them not to worship Buddha, to break their fasting, and even encouraging monks to marry. The request mentions a quick development of Christianity among the elite class, including the two sons of Liu Yuliang (though the two sons, like their father, did not seem to have been baptised) and the *zhixian* of Chengdu (i.e., Wu Jishan, also non-baptised). Magalhães comments that the Christian community was still very small, and he sees the rapid spread of Christianity as an exaggeration and as proof that the request was written by Buddhist monks. The request mentions that Christianity threatens the very existence of Buddhism and more generally the Three Teachings, and that the Christians may even kill monks. The request recalls that among the Three Teachings, Buddhism is more important, and that the founder of the Ming dynasty, the emperor Hongwu, was himself a Buddhist monk.⁴⁵

The request to the surveillance commissioner frankly declares the unwillingness of the *xunfu* 巡撫 (provincial governor), the *xun'an* 巡按 (imperial inspector), and the *zhifu* 知府 (prefect) to ban Christianity, and states the only hope rests on him alone. The main argument of the request is to establish a ‘tacit correspondence’ (*tacita correspondencia*) between Christianity and rebel groups who wanted to replace orthodox Buddhism and to overthrow the Ming dynasty, pointing out the similarities between Christianity and the *xiejiao* (*Lei diabolica*) of the Bailian.⁴⁶ It accuses Christianity of harming the people by spreading superstitions by way of medals (*veronicas*), and it urges the surveillance commissioner to make a search for medals, books, and weapons in all the houses of Chengdu, including the houses of civil and military officers. It also urges the surveillance commissioner to seize from the church four boxes of money which are marked with the sign of the *xun'an*.⁴⁷ The request ends by urging

⁴⁵ *Relação das viagens*, 142v.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 142r.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 142v. Liu Zhibo 劉之勃 (d.u.) was the *xun'an* for Sichuan, but his

quick and swift action, and it is dated December 1643 (the eleventh month of the sixteenth year of Chongzhen).⁴⁸

In response to the request, the surveillance commissioner issued an order (*despacho*) for the prefect and subprefects of Chengdu to investigate and punish the Christians. The order, as translated by Magalhães, indicates that the request presented ‘in the name of the people’ in fact came from the main monk of Sichuan, probably Poshan. It repeats and corroborates many elements mentioned in the request, but also adds other arguments. For example, the Christians hold that soul and body perish at death, and therefore they do not make sacrifices to the dead. Another argument is that Christianity promotes an ethic based on the individual, apart from the five relations.⁴⁹

Following the order of the surveillance commissioner, the police officer (*buting* 補序) issued a mandate, dated December 1643, to arrest Buglio.⁵⁰ Strangely enough, the police officer asks high officers not to interfere with the mandate. However, Thomas Yan did interfere, and through money and arguments, he convinced the police officer to drop the case and let the *zhifu* handle it. Also, Wu Jishan, the *zhixian* of Chengdu who had just returned from Beijing, interfered, telling the surveillance commissioner that the Jesuits were in fact appreciated by the emperor because of their help with the calendar. The surveillance commissioner dropped the accusation but warned the Jesuits not to irritate the monks. However, the monks came to fetch support from the eunuchs of the local princes of the province (*Regulos da Provincia*) and officers of second degree (*segunda letra*), and they continued to amass large crowds in front of the surveillance commission and to surround the church for two weeks. The two

connection with Christianity is not documented. When Zhang Xianzhong entered Chengdu in 1644, he refused to submit and was executed.

⁴⁸ *Relação das viagens*, 142v.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 142v–143r. In fact, Ricci had allowed Chinese Christians to perform rituals to ancestors, and the reason invoked here is quite erroneous.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 143rv. Magalhães identifies the *buting* as the equivalent of *Meirinho-mor* or *Alcaide-mor* in Portugal.

Jesuits and the local Christians inside the church were prepared to die as martyrs of faith.⁵¹

VII. Defamation Campaign through Pamphlets and Attacks of Christian Houses

Pamphlets played an important role in the conflict, and this was probably inspired by the method of Yuanwu. In 1635, to provoke the Christians into an open dispute, he had posted his *Third Discourse* in the streets of Hangzhou. Similarly in Chengdu, Lizhi wrote and distributed anti-Christian pamphlets with the aim of stirring up anti-Christian feelings in the city. Magalhães translated three of those pamphlets. The first pamphlet names only the barbarian Buglio, and it reports the decision of the surveillance commissioner to launch an investigation, warning people not to attempt to protect Buglio so that the city can return to safety.⁵² The second pamphlet, slightly shorter, mentions Christian activities in Chongqing, including the use of sorcery to make money. It states that the Christians are inviting rebel groups to enter Sichuan, and they should be investigated by local officers.⁵³ The third is even shorter and warns that the Christians are using fire and fumes as signs to call for rebellion, and it laments that the authorities are doing nothing.⁵⁴ In brief, the three pamphlets attack Christianity and criticise the authorities for their inaction. Magalhães mentions that the monks deny having written those pamphlets, saying instead they were framed by Christians to put the blame on the Buddhists. The prefect understood this diabolic malice and yet he accepted the story that the Christians fabricated the anti-Christian pamphlets.

Magalhães mentions that Tibetan monks came to Chengdu as ambassadors of the ruler of Tibet, and being under the influence of

⁵¹ *Relação das viagens*, 143v–144r.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 145r.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

Chinese monks in Chengdu, they presented in the name of their king a request to banish the Christians as enemies of Buddha. The request of the Tibetan monks was supported by one of the local princes (*Regulos*) but rejected by a mandarin. Magalhães mentions the name of Tibet and its Chinese rendering as Wusizang guo 烏斯藏國. Also, he explains that the name *lama* 喇嘛 comes from a Tibetan word. Magalhães mentions his plan to collect more information and write about Tibet to the Jesuit Visitor, but it seems that the tragic end of the Jesuit mission in Chengdu in 1647 did not allow him to realise his project.⁵⁵

Magalhães reports two cases of monks entering Christian houses to destroy the Holy images of Christ and Mary. Those two incidents seem to be individual cases, and not part of a planned attack. However, many Christian converts faced the social pressure of their family and friends asking them to hide the Holy images, but the Christians showed their resolution to not hide their faith.⁵⁶ This highlights the role of Holy images as markers of Christian identity in the community of Chengdu.⁵⁷

The Christians gathered every day at the church to write petitions and report the abuses of the monks, but without mentioning their names. The persecution in its more violent form lasted from December 25, 1643 to January 6, 1644. The Christians were again accused of making silver through alchemy, and an incident of arson against the church was averted by a Christian.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ *Relação das viagens*, 145r. Before coming to China, Magalhães had spent three years (December 1634–April 1637) in India, and he certainly heard there about Antonio de Andrade (1580–1634), the founder of the Jesuit mission in Tibet who had just passed away. The Jesuit mission in Tsaparang was founded in 1624 under the protection of the ruler of Guge, but in 1631 he was overthrown, and the mission was destroyed.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 145v–146r.

⁵⁷ Since Matteo Ricci's time, the Christians avoided displaying the cross, often misunderstood as a sign of criminal punishment, but instead they displayed in their house (or even outside) images of Christ the Saviour and Mary. See Zürcher, *Kouduo richao*, vol. 1, 45–46.

⁵⁸ *Relação das viagens*, 146v.

VIII. Support of High Officers toward Christianity but Liu Family's Withdrawal

As we mentioned above, the surveillance commissioner had decided to launch an investigation into the Christian community. However, some high officers showed their support to Christianity. The *zhixian* Wu Jishan affirms in writing that the teaching of the Lord of Heaven conforms to the teaching of the literati, and that the imperial court has entrusted the missionaries with the reform of the calendar due to the excellence of their astronomy (*mathematica*). Wu Jishan dismisses the petition as importune, and even insults the monks as evil people. Also, the *zhifu* of Chengdu vocally defended the Christians.⁵⁹

On December 28 (day of the Holy Innocents), eight literati among the highest in Chengdu went to the Christian church and wrote a common letter to the abbot, stating that Christianity is perfect in all aspects, not at all rebellious against the emperor, and that instead of worrying about the Christians, the abbot would better worry about wandering monks (*youseng* 游僧).⁶⁰

However, Zhang Xianzhong had already entered Sichuan, and the Buddhists were convinced that the Catholics were spies to be eradicated. This shows the growing panic among the Buddhists about the collapse of the Ming dynasty. They wrote a pamphlet accusing nominally six high officers of protecting Christianity: the *zhifu*, the two *zhixian*, and three others.⁶¹

A famous literatus, friend of the late Liu Yuliang, wrote to Buglio with an astonishing declaration about the four teachings (i.e., Confucianism, Buddhism, Daoism, and Christianity) as being four ancient Lords (*senhores*) who are all in peace in heaven. This is perhaps the first declaration we have which harmonises the four teachings, something rejected by mainstream Buddhists and Confucians, as well as

⁵⁹ *Relação das viagens*, 147r.

⁶⁰ Magalhães calls the abbot Ki çay with the meaning of 'continuado presente', which may correspond to Jizai 繼載; *ibid.*, 147v.

⁶¹ Named He, Jia, and Zhi Lin; see *ibid.*, 148r.

by the Jesuits and Chinese Christians. The literatus tells Buglio that Ricci showed a compromising attitude towards Buddhism since he maintained in the *True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven* the existence of hell, like Buddhism, and Ricci did not ask in his work to burn Buddhist sūtras and statues.⁶²

The literatus is criticising here the practice of burning Buddhist statues, which was quite frequent among the late Ming Christians. On the Buddhist side, he criticises uneducated people who do not understand that the Christian God and Buddha are in fact the same as Heaven. We do not know precisely what the literatus meant by the identity between God, Buddha, and Heaven, however Magalhães explains in a note that, for the Confucians, the goodness of the saints makes them identical to heaven and earth. Accordingly, Confucius, Buddha, Laozi, and Jesus would be all identical to Heaven. The literatus ends with practical advice: since the Buddhists of Chengdu are now furiously against Christianity, the two Jesuits should leave Chengdu and move to Mianzhu, the hometown of Liu Yuliang, two days away from Chengdu.

Following the letter of the literatus, Buglio did send a letter to Liu Yichong, the elder son of Liu Yuliang, but Buglio did not request taking refuge in Mianzhu, and instead asked him to write to the high officers of Chengdu and give his own testimony. However, a bloody family conflict had just happened in the Liu family, and the elder son declined to help. When the Liu family refused to show support, the high officers who had previously supported the Christian community in Chengdu started to keep their distance and avoided the church, while other officers came to the church but only at night. However, the two Jesuits still decided to stay in Chengdu.⁶³

⁶² In fact, Ricci in his work was very critical of Buddhism, and suggested that the Buddhists copied from the West the idea of hell. See Ricci, *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven*, chapter III, 117, note 130.

⁶³ *Relação das viagens*, 148v–149r.

IX. Yan's Conversion and his Support for Christianity

According to Pfister and Gourdon, the military officer Yan was a *daoshi*, and the persecution against the Church was launched by the *daoshi* who felt threatened by Christianity. But what does it mean more precisely? According to the report of Magalhães, Yan belonged to a group which was strictly vegetarian, did not worship Buddha, and waited for a saviour to come. Here the expression of not worshipping Buddha could be understood as not having Buddha as the main object of worship. One possibility is that Yan was affiliated with a sectarian group like the Bailian, which waited for the coming of Maitreya (Mile fo 彌勒佛). However, this seems unlikely for several reasons. First, the Ming dynasty considered groups like the Bailian as rebellious, and it is almost impossible that a military officer would join. And as we shall see just below, a writing by Yan argues that Christianity conforms to Confucianism. Second, Lizhi in his Prologue to the work of Yuanwu mentioned the Bailian once, and Magalhães translated it phonetically as *Pe Lian*.⁶⁴ Therefore, Magalhães is aware of the Bailian and of similar groups, but he never mentions that Yan belongs to one of them. Finally, Yan is closely connected to a certain monk, or bonze (*daoshi* for Gourdon), and this broad expression of bonze should refer in this case to a Buddhist monk. Excluding a sectarian affiliation, the more likely affiliation of Yan is Pure Land Buddhism, which mostly worships Maitreya but does not exclude Buddha. His conversion to Christianity may not seem so extravagant: the two faiths share the expectation of a saviour to come (Maitreya or Christ).

Yan's conversion happened only one month before the start of the anti-Christian campaign, i.e., in November 1643. Magalhães sees his timely conversion as an arrangement of the divine providence. Amid the campaign, Yan went to the church, and having removed all the impediments to baptism (probably meaning that he abandoned his previous vegetarian diet),⁶⁵ he received baptism and took the

⁶⁴ *Relação das viagens*, 142v.

⁶⁵ About the admission to baptism for vegetarians, see Meynard, 'Could

Christian name of Thomas, probably on December 21, the feast day of Saint Thomas the Apostle. His brothers, sons, and grandsons all joined the Church.⁶⁶

The conversion of Thomas Yan enraged a bonze called Cotu, who was with Lizhi and the main abbot of Chengdu, among the three heads of the anti-Christian campaign. Since we have suggested that Yan was originally affiliated with Pure Land, this Cotu was most likely a monk of a Pure Land Temple in Chengdu. In the past, he had killed a man in his hometown, later became a monk, and he was initially protected in Chengdu by Yan. Cotu wrote a short pamphlet, translated by Magalhães, in which the monk invites people to the killing of Thomas Yan and the two Jesuits.

Thomas Yan expressed his wish to die as a martyr for his new faith. With his two sons and one grandson, he wrote a pamphlet expressing support for Christianity, and with fifty soldiers and musical fanfare, went to affix the pamphlet in several places of Chengdu.⁶⁷

X. Publication of Four Christian Works and the Conflict's Resolution

In response to the anti-Christian work of Lizhi, the Christian community of Chengdu reprinted three writings by Chinese Christians and one by a Portuguese Jesuit. The first in the list is the *Tianxue chuangai* 天學傳概 [Survey on the Spread of the Learning of Heaven] by Huang Mingqiao 黃鳴喬 (*jinsbi* 進士 1604), which was first published in 1639. The choice for this work is strategic because it explains the antiquity of Christianity in China since the Tang dynasty, as well as the favours received from the Ming emperors. The second

Chinese Vegetarians Be Baptized?'; *idem*, 'Could Chinese Vegetarians Be Baptized? (2)'.

⁶⁶ *Relação das viagens*, 149r.

⁶⁷ In the persecution of Zhang Xianzhong, Magalhães declared to have adopted one grandson of Thomas Yan, baptised as Francis (Francisco); see *Relação da perda e destruição*, 11v.

work, the *Xiaoluan bubingming shuo* 鴉鸞不並鳴說 [The Owl and the Phoenix Do Not Sing Together] by Yang Tingyun, is older, published around 1616–1622. The third work, the *Tianzhu shengjiao yueyan* 天主聖教約言 [Brief Account on the Teaching of the Lord of Heaven] by João Soeiro 蘇如望 (1566–1607), is a basic catechism presenting the Christian faith, and exists in shorter and longer versions, reprinted several times in the late Ming. The last-mentioned work is the *Tianxue jiehuo* 天學解惑 [Answering Questions in Heavenly Studies] by the Chinese Christian Zhang Geng 張賡 (ca. 1570–1646/1647), which consists of an apology of Christianity.

Except from their mention in this report of Magalhães, those four Chengdu editions of 1644 are unknown. We can notice that the anti-Buddhist writings of Yang Tingyun, like his *Tianshi mingbian* 天釋明辨 [Clear Distinction between the Teaching of the Lord of Heaven and Buddhism] and *Daiyipian* 代疑篇 [Treatise for Removing Doubts], were not selected, but only his *Xiaoluan bubingming shuo*. This work does not directly attack Buddhism but differentiates Christianity from *xiejiao* and more explicitly from the Bailian and the Teaching of Non-Action (*Wuwei jiao* 無為教). Those works intended to show that Christianity was not a rebellious group but an ancient teaching present in China since the Tang dynasty which had recently received the protection of the Ming emperors. According to Magalhães, their publication completely changed the perception of Christianity.

Wu Jishan ordered the expulsion from Chengdu of the three monks: the main abbot of the city, the monk Cotu who was opposed to the conversion of Thomas Yan, and Lizhi who wrote the anti-Christian work. The Buddhists used their connections to prevent further punishment against the saṃgha, and the two Jesuits expressed their willingness to forgive the Buddhists for their anti-Christian campaign. People flocked again to the church, and even the local princes (*Regulos*), who had previously supported the anti-Christian campaign, came to the church. Unexpectedly, the expulsion of the three monks saved their lives, since a few months later Zhang Xianzhong exterminated not only the Ming loyalists and the saṃgha, but also almost all the population of Chengdu, including the Christian community.

XI. Conclusion

In the late Ming, Christianity was proposing a model of exclusivist religion positioning itself in opposition to the established religions of Buddhism and Daoism. In Chengdu, Buglio, Magalhães, and Chinese Christians may have engaged in hostile actions like the burning of sūtras and statues. However, the timing of the campaign (six months of preparation from June to December 1643, followed by three months of active campaign from December 1643 to February 1644), its scope (thousands of people involved, including the saṃgha and high officers of Chengdu), and the diversity of tools (official requests, publication of a book, pamphlets, and mass protests) indicate a very well organised and planned campaign which aimed to ban Christianity from Sichuan, and which cannot be understood unless placed in a wider framework. As his prologue shows, when Lizhi understood in 1643 that Christianity was gaining foot in Sichuan, he launched the anti-Christian campaign of Chengdu, accomplishing a mission that Yuanwu gave him and continuing Yuanwu's campaign in Zhejiang and Fujian. Since the conflict in Chengdu found its roots within a nationwide conflict between Christianity and Buddhism, its resolution drew not only from local but also national powers. The local conflict engaged intellectual and institutional resources which were not developed exclusively by local Christian and Buddhist communities, but were largely imported from Beijing and the Jiangnan area. Lizhi reprinted the *Third Discourse* of Yuanwu, and the Chengdu Christians reprinted the works of Chinese Catholics. The political status of Christianity in the capital in the final years of the Ming dynasty also played a decisive role. Somehow, the arguments were already shaped elsewhere and re-enacted in Chengdu.

Yet the conflict in Chengdu has local specificities that we cannot find elsewhere. In 1643, the armies of Zhang Xianzhong were marching over Chengdu, and the situation in Sichuan had become extremely perilous. Under the context of this military crisis, the conflict was not about doctrinal differences, nor different religious practices, but essentially about the loyalty or lack thereof to the Ming dynasty. The saṃgha in Sichuan was extremely sensitive to a political threat which

could destroy the Ming dynasty as well as the political foundations of Ming Buddhism. The Buddhist monks in Chengdu perceived Christianity as one of the rebellious groups trying to overthrow the Ming dynasty, and they launched an extremely violent campaign because they felt the urgency of the danger. The conflict in Chengdu may have resulted from local incidents, like the issue of polygamy. Magalhães sees this issue as an important reason for the conflict, and this is carried over in the analysis of Pfister and Paternicò, but our analysis of the text shows that the political reason was more predominant.

The Buddhist campaign against Christianity on the grounds of saving the Ming dynasty was misdirected because the Christians had long helped the Ming court with cannons and a new calendar. High officers in Chengdu had a better understanding of Christianity as a supporter of the Ming dynasty, and they did not want to deprive themselves of this small but strategical ally. While Yuanwu had succeeded in 1632 in Fujian in gathering the support of the literati, the saṃgha in Chengdu failed to gain their support. The Buddhist attack against Christianity was deprived from the decisive element of Confucian authority, and it may have appeared to the non-Buddhists as the attack of one religious group against another. The Buddhist camp was defeated, and Christianity could resume its activities.

The Buddhist-Christian conflict ended with the success of Christianity, but the two communities were exterminated by Zhang Xianzhong. Because the saṃgha remained loyal to the Ming dynasty, it was decimated by Zhang. The Catholic community went through a more twisted path: Wu Jishan surrendered to Zhang and was rewarded with the position of *libu shangshu*. When the two Jesuits received the invitation to work at Zhang's court, they saw this as a unique opportunity to promote Christianity, but in 1645, Wu committed a mistake in a ritual and was executed. It was then too late for Buglio and Magalhães to escape, and they witnessed the extermination of the entire Catholic community which they had founded.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

X (Wan) *Xuzang jing* (卍) 字續藏經. See Secondary Sources, Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi 新文豐出版公司, comp.

Primary Sources

- A New History of China*. By Gabriel de Magaillans. Translated from the French by John Ogilby. London: Thomas Newborough, 1688.
- ‘Bianji shimo’ 編輯始末 [The Whole Story of Composition]. By Liu Daokai 劉道開, 1668. In *Lengyanjing guanshe* 楞嚴經貫攝 [Comprehensive *Sūrangama Sūtra*]. *X* no. 0303-D, vol. 15: 0096.
- ‘Biantian chushuo’ 辨天初說 [First Discourse]. By Yuanwu 圓悟 (1566–1642). In Zhou, ed., *Mingmo Qingchu Tianzhujaoshi wenxian xinbian, shang juan*, 385–86.
- ‘Biantian ershuo’ 辨天二說 [Second Discourse]. By Yuanwu 圓悟. In Zhou, ed., *Mingmo Qingchu Tianzhujaoshi wenxian xinbian, shang juan*, 387–90.
- ‘Biantian sanshuo’ 辨天三說 [Third Discourse]. By Yuanwu 圓悟. In Zhou, ed., *Mingmo Qingchu Tianzhujaoshi wenxian xinbian, shang juan*, 391–401.
- ‘Bingzhong zeng Lizhi heshang’ 病中贈離指和尚 [Given to Monk Lizhi during Illness]. By Yang Sisheng 楊思聖. In *Emeishan zhi* 峨眉山志 [Mount Emei Gazetteer]. 18 *juan*. Comp. Jiang Chao 蔣超, 1672. *X* no. 0049, vol. 45: 0331. For modern gazetteer edition, see Secondary Sources, Jiang, comp.
- Breve relatione della vita e morte del padre Ludovico Buglio missionario della Cina scritta dal padre Filippo Grimaldi nella corte imperiale di Pekin allì 4 ottobre 1682* [Short Report about the Life and Death of Father Ludovico Buglio, Missionary of China, Written by Father Filippo Grimaldi at the Imperial Court of Beijing on October 4, 1682]. By Filippo Grimaldi. Ms. ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico, 722/4. Miscellanei dei Gesuiti, arm. VIII, 58,

- ff. 16r–21v; Archivio di Stato – Roma, Gesuiti, Miscell. Pacco 5. *Chongxiu Zhaojuesi zhi* 重修昭覺寺志 [Revised Records of Zhaojue Temple]. 8 *juan*. By Zhongxun 中恂 and Luo Yonglin 羅用霖. Chengdu: Zhaojue si 昭覺寺, 1896 (Guangxu 光緒 22).
- Historia Sinarum* [Chinese History]. 250 *folia*. By Tomasz Ignacy Szpot Dunin, ca. 1702. Ms. ARSI, ms. Jap.Sin. 103: 29v–31r.
- ‘Lizhi shi chanshi’ 離指示禪師 [Chan Master Lizhi]. By Zhangxue Tongzui 丈雪通醉. In *Jinjiang chandeng* 錦江禪燈 [Chan Lights of the River Jin]. 20 *juan*. X no. 1590, vol. 85.
- Notes du P. Gourdon sur l’histoire de la mission du Sichuan, 1646–1647* [Notes by P. Gourdon on the History of the Mission in Sichuan, 1646–1647]. 58 pages. By François-Marie-Joseph Gourdon. Ms. AMEP 596.
- Nouvelle relation de la Chine* [A New History of China]. By Gabriel de Magaillans. Paris: Claude Barbin, 1688.
- Relação da perda e destruição da Provincia e Christandade de Suchuen e do que os padres Luis Buglio e Gabriel de Magalhães passarão em seu cativoiro, Pro Padre Visitador das Provincias de Japoa e China* [Report about the Loss and Destruction of Christianity in Sichuan and What Happened to Ludovico Buglio and Gabriel de Magalhães in their Captivity, for the Father Visitor of the Jesuit Provinces of Japan and China]. By Gabriel de Magalhães, May 18, 1649. Ms. ARSI, Jap.Sin. 127: 1r–36v.
- Relação das viagens que fes o padre Luis Buglio no ano de 1639 o padre Magalhaes no ano de 1642 pera a Provincia de Siechuen, e da grande persiguição que na metropoli da mesma Provincia levantarão os Bonzos contra a ley de Deos e seus Pregadores, Ao Padre Visitador das provincias de Japão e China em Macao* [Report about the Travels Made by Father Ludovico Buglio in 1639 and Father Magalhães in 1642 towards the Province of Sichuan, and about the Great Persecution that the Buddhist Monks Planned against Christianity and its Missionaries, for Father Visitor of the Jesuit Provinces of Japan and China]. By Gabriel de Magalhães, 1644. Ms. ARSI, Jap.Sin. 126: 129r–152v.
- Shengchao Poxie ji* 聖朝破邪集 [Collection for the Destruction of the Heresies]. By Xu Dashou 許大受 (1580–1650). Tokyo: Bibliothèque Sonkeikaku bunko 尊經閣文庫, 1639. Reprint

edited by Tokugawa Nariaki 徳川齊昭. Mito: Kōdōkan 弘道館, 1855. For modern Chinese edition, see Secondary Sources, Xu. For the modern Chinese-French edition, see Secondary Sources, Meynard and Yang, eds.

Shengjiao ruchuan ji 聖教入川記 [Records of the Entry of the Holy Teaching in Sichuan]. By Gu Luodong 古洛東 (a.k.a. François-Marie-Joseph Gourdon), 1918. For modern edition, see Secondary Sources.

‘Shi Lizhi heshang’ 示離指和尚 [On Monk Lizhi]. By Yang Sisheng 楊思聖, 1721, 60th year of Kangxi 康熙 era. In *Qieting shi* 且亭詩 [Poems of Quieting]. 8 *juan*. Available in *Airusheng lidai bieji ku* 愛如生歷代別集庫 [Airusheng Digital Database], vol. 8, 5a.

The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven. By Matteo Ricci, 1603. Revised edition by Thierry Meynard. Boston: Jesuit Sources, 2016.

‘Yufeng lieyou xu’ 玉峰獵有序. By Yan Ermei 閻爾梅. In *Baida shanren shiwen ji* 白奩山人詩文集 [Collectanea of Poems by Yan Ermei]. 12 *juan*. Of Kangxi 康熙 era (1662–1723). In Wang and Cai, eds., *Baida shanren shiwen ji bian nian zhu*.

Secondary Sources

Bertuccioli, Giuliano. ‘Buglio, Ludovico’. *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* [Biographical Dictionary of Italians], volume 15. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1972. Accessed November 1, 2022. https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/ludovico-buglio_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/

Criveller, Gianni. *Preaching Christ in Late Ming China: The Jesuits’ Presentation of Christ from Matteo Ricci to Giulio Aleni*. Taipei: Ricci Institute, 1997.

Dehergne, Joseph. *Répertoire des Jésuites de Chine de 1542 à 1800* [Directory of Jesuits of China from 1542 to 1800]. Rome: IHSI, 1973.

Gernet, Jacques. *Chine et Christianisme : Action et réaction* [China and Christianity: Action and Reaction]. Paris: Gallimard, 1982.

Gu Luodong 古洛東 (a.k.a. François-Marie-Joseph Gourdon). *Shengjiao ruchuan ji* 聖教入川記 [Records of the Entry of

- the Holy Teaching in Sichuan]. Chengdu: Sichuan renmin chubanshe 四川人民出版社, 1981.
- Jiang Chao 蔣超, comp. *Emeishan zhi* 峨眉山志 [Mount Emei Gazetteer]. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社, 1995.
- Kern, Iso. *Buddhistische Kritik am Christentum im China des 17. Jahrhundert* [Buddhist Criticisms of Christianity in the Seventeenth Century]. Bern: Peter Lang, 1992.
- Lancashire, Douglas. 'Buddhist Reaction to Christianity in Late Ming China'. *Journal of the Oriental Society of Australia* 6 (1968–1969): 92–95.
- Lo Nardo, Antonino. 'P. Ludovico Buglio S.J. (1606-1682)'. *Intorcettiana* 2.3 (2020): 52–57.
- Meynard, Thierry. 'Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? The Canton Conference and Adrien Grelon's Report of 1688'. *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu (AHSI)* 87.173 (2018-I): 75–145.
- . 'Could Chinese Vegetarians be Baptized? (2) The Canton Conference and Prospero Intorcetta SJ's Report of 1668'. *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu (AHSI)* 88.176 (2019-II): 285–341.
- , (a.k.a. Mei Qianli 梅謙立). 'Luoxia Maizi: Aomenji Yesuhui fuli xiushi Cai Anduo shengping kaolüe' 落下麥子: 澳門籍耶穌會輔理修士蔡按鐸生平考略 [A Grain of Fallen Wheat: Brief Investigation on the Life of the Macanese Jesuit Brother Antonio Cai]. *Aomen ligong daxue xuebao* 澳門理工大學學報 [Journal of the Polytechnic University of Macao] 4 (2022): 67–75.
- Meynard, Thierry (a.k.a. Mei Qianli 梅謙立), and Yang Hongfan 楊虹帆, eds. *Shengchao Poxie ji* 聖朝破邪集 [Collection for the Destruction of the Heresies]. Kaohsiung: Foguang 佛光, 2018.
- Paternicò, Luisa M. 'Ludovico Buglio e la sua rocambolesca avventura cinese' [Ludovico Buglio and his Fantastic Adventure in China]. *Sulla via del Catai* [On the Way to Cathay] 11 (2014): 63–71.
- Pfister, Louis. *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne Mission de Chine : 1552–1773* [Biographical and Bibliographical Notes on Jesuits of the Ancient Chinese Mission:

- 1552–1773]. Shanghai: Imprimerie de la mission catholique, 1932–1934.
- Pih, Irene. *Le Père Gabriel de Magalhães, un jésuite portugais en Chine au XVIIe siècle* [Father Gabriel de Magalhães, a Portuguese Jesuit in China in the Eighteenth Century]. Paris: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1979.
- Ricci, Matteo. *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven*. Translated by Douglas Lancashire and Peter Kuo-chen Hu. Revised edition by Thierry Meynard. Chestnut Hill: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2016.
- Wang Rutao 王汝濤, and Cai Shengyin 蔡生印, eds. *Baida shanren shiwen biannian zhu* 白耄山人詩集編年注 [Chronicles of Collectanea of Poems by Yan Ermei]. Beijing: Zhongguo wenlian chubanshe 中國文聯出版社, 2002.
- Wu, Jiang 吳疆. 'Encountering the Jesuits: Intellectual Interactions between Christians and Chan Buddhists in Seventeenth-Century China'. In *Duoyuan gongcun hexie gongsheng weilai gongxiang* 多元共存和諧共生未來共享: 2018嵩山論壇論文集 [Multicultural Coexistence, Harmonious Symbiosis, Sharing Future, Collectanea of Songchan Forum 2018], 108–33. Unpublished.
- . *Enlightenment in Dispute: The Reinvention of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-Century China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- . 'Orthodoxy, Controversy and the Transformation of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-century China'. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 2002.
- Xiao Qinghe 肖清和. 'Changming tianxue chijin weiren; Li Leisi yu Chaoxing xueyao' 昌明天學, 吃緊為人——利類思與《超性學要》 [Spread the Learning of Heaven and Be an Upright Person; Study on Louis Buglio (1606–1682) and *Chaoxing xueyao*]. *Daofeng Jidu wenhua pinglun* 道風基督教文化評論 [Logos and Pneuma Journal] 48 (2018): 224–63.
- Xu, Dashou. *Aide à la réfutation de la Sainte Dynastie contre la Doctrine du Seigneur du Ciel* [Help to the Holy Dynasty in Refuting the Teaching of the Lord of Heaven, *Shengchao zuopi* 聖朝佐闢]. Edited and translated by Thierry Meynard and Thérèse Yang Hongfan. Paris: Belles Lettres, 2022.

- Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi 新文豐出版公司, comp. (*Wan*) *xu zangjing* (卅) 續藏經 [Man Extended Buddhist Canon]. 150 vols. Taipei: Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi 新文豐出版公司, 1968–1970. Reprint of Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧 et al., comps. *Dai Nihon zoku zōkyō* 大日本續藏經 [Extended Buddhist Canon of Great Japan], 120 cases. Kyoto: Zōkyō shoin 藏經書院, 1905–1912.
- Zhou Erfang 周駢方. ‘Ba Tiantong Miyun chanshi biantianshuo’ 跋天童密雲禪師辯天說. *Wenxian* 文獻 [The Documentation] 82.4 (1999): 285–87.
- Zhou Yan 周岩, ed. *Mingmo Qingchu Tianzhujiashih wenxian xinbian* 明末清初天主教史文獻新編 [New Edition of Historical Documents of Catholic Church in Late Ming and Early Qing]. Beijing: Guojia tushuguan chubanshe 國家圖書館出版社, 2013.
- Zürcher, Erik. ‘In the Yellow Tiger’s Den Buglio and Magalhães at the Court of Zhang Xianzhong, 1644–1647’. *Monumenta Serica* 50.1 (2002): 355–74.
- . *Kouduo richao: Li Jiubiao’s Diary of Oral Admonitions*. Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica, 2007.