

Introduction

The Jesuits' approach to their enterprise of propagating Christianity in China was so different and so promising in itself, and is so much to the point today, that our discussion of the Asian peoples' encounter with the West would be incomplete if we did not take into consideration the line which the Jesuits in China and India opened out.

—Arnold Toynbee, *The World and the West*

The fact is that the Jesuits had become certain by the end of the sixteenth century that cultural affiliation was an indispensable first step if the Christians were to win acceptance among Asian peoples of high culture. The Jesuits, as revealed in their writings, nonetheless retained conversion as their ultimate goal, and this objective should never be lost sight of in using their writings as historical sources.

—Donald F. Lach, *Asia in the Making of Europe*

This book considers the concepts and practices of friendship and hospitality in the Jesuit mission to China during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The arrival of the Jesuit missionaries in China marked not only the coming together of the West and China that has been ongoing until the present day, but also an early stage of globalization, which has shaped and continues to reshape the world. During this Jesuit-Chinese exchange four hundred years ago, both friendship and hospitality were practiced and discussed. While the Jesuits promoted the Western concept of friendship as they sought to befriend the Chinese, especially the Confucians (the elite class in China), the Confucians displayed their hospitality—responding in their own way—to these missionaries from the West. Given this fact, a study of the exchanges between the Jesuits and the Confucians, with a focus on friendship and hospitality as they were practiced, will advance primarily scholarly understanding of the Jesuit mission to China and, at the same time, general understanding of the current world.

To study in depth the cross-cultural and interreligious exchanges between the Jesuits and the Confucians, friendship and hospitality provide a unique perspective, as both of these social conventions were frequently articulated, practiced, and displayed by the Jesuits and the Confucians in their encounters. More importantly, friendship and hospitality as concepts are primarily concerned with two subjects in a relation; that is, concerning the relation and exchange between the self and the other, concepts of friendship and hospitality offer guidelines to how the self should see and deal with the other. Bearing in mind the essential use of friendship and hospitality when reviewing the Jesuit-Confucian encounter, it becomes obvious why both the Jesuits and Confucians resorted to friendship and hospitality in their exchange. In taking their mission to China, the Jesuits—and the Confucians they met as well—found themselves faced not only with people of strange customs and faith but also with a culture vastly different from their own. To help negotiate the differences, personal as well as cultural, the Jesuits and Confucians each sought guidance from their own understanding of friendship and hospitality. Through their respective use of friendship and hospitality, both sides hoped to achieve their separate goals. For the Jesuits on an evangelical mission, that goal would be to bring China into the Christian community by assimilating its fundamental cultural and religious differences, while, for the Confucians, proud of their civilization, the goal would be to assert the Middle Kingdom's cultural supremacy by rejecting the religious faith of the Jesuits. To clarify the topic of this book, friendship and hospitality being understood and used more as models for a cross-cultural relationship than for a relationship between two individuals in the Jesuit-Confucian encounter, it is necessary to look at some examples, starting with the Jesuit understanding of friendship.

Rooted in the Christian ideal of a brotherhood under God, Jesuit understanding and practice of friendship were fundamentally governed by the spirituality developed in the works of Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556), founder and first general of the Society of Jesus. Ignatius's spirituality, as one scholar points out, “was shaped not only by his religious experience but also by the world he lived in.”¹ Witnessing the unfolding of the Protestant Reformation, Ignatius lived at a time when papal authority was severely undermined, owing to the schism of the church, which became irreversible and final. Determined “to live the Christian gospel in response to questions and needs in the world of his time,”² Ignatius developed his spirituality “to aid souls” (*juvare animas*),³ helping individuals become friends in God (i.e., form their divine union with God). Because Ignatius's plan was to aid

not only the souls of his followers but also the souls of those people to be converted to Christianity, he offered his order to the pope as the leader of the worldwide church, vowing that Jesuits would take Christian missions to countries beyond Europe. The fact that Ignatian spirituality from the beginning closely related the conversion of hearts to the conversion to Christianity determined the nature of Jesuit friendship and its application during the Jesuit mission.⁴ To show how the Jesuit missionaries to China used friendship for their evangelical goal by blending together Jesuit spirituality, Christian theology, classical literature, and the philosophy of the West, Matteo Ricci (1552–1610), an early Jesuit missionary to China, and his work on friendship should offer a telling example.

An Italian Jesuit, Ricci was one of the first to take the Catholic Church's expansion to China. From his arrival in 1582 until his death in 1610, he spent twenty-eight years in China. Ricci's mission has been regarded as "the first successful penetration into China by representatives of the modern—that is, the post-Renaissance—West."⁵ Indeed, his extended stay in China marked the beginning of a new era of Chinese-European relations. And his association with many Chinese literati and Confucian officials provided him with an excellent opportunity to carry out many cultural exchanges and execute his missionary project of converting the Chinese to Catholicism.

Ricci hoped to achieve more than simply converting the Chinese. Owing to his faith and theology that the world was created and externally controlled by a divine being called God, one argument Ricci repeatedly made was that the Chinese civilization had from the very beginning been a "natural" segment of Christianity. As one scholar puts it, Ricci's work in China aimed at serving his evangelical goal: "to naturalize Christianity in the Chinese setting."⁶ It was to this end that he wrote in Chinese many of his works, including *Jiaoyou lun* (交友論), or *On Friendship*.

Composed in 1595, *On Friendship* is a collection and translation into Chinese of one hundred aphorisms and anecdotes concerning friends and friendship from Plato, Aristotle, Alexander the Great, Cicero, Seneca, Saint Augustine, and other authors.⁷ The work introduced to Chinese readers the Western understanding of friendship. Though the book certainly had an immediately practical need to meet—that is, to thaw or to attenuate the strong Chinese xenophobia that regarded virtually everything and everyone foreign to be hostile and dangerous to Chinese culture—the real use of the work was to help achieve the ultimate goal of Ricci's mission.

Ricci's expectation that his book on friendship should help his project of cultural and religious assimilation reveals his excellent understanding

of the traditional concept of friendship and his adept application of it to his cross-cultural context. As is well known, Western thinkers in history seldom fail to see the political and religious implications that underwrite friendship. In works by such pagan philosophers as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and others, one finds repeated emphasis on how friendship unites humans with sameness or binds friends together by and for a common cause. In the works of the church fathers, friendship was viewed as synonymous with Christian solidarity, sharing a heart and love for God.⁸ Related closely to, if not always identical with, such terms or concepts as *agapē*, *caritas*, and others, Christian friendship means it is a person's duty both to accept grace, a current of love flowing from God to oneself, and to communicate it to one's neighbors.⁹ To these theologians, friendship always remained a crucial issue. There was the biblical command to love one's neighbor as one's self, which readily incorporated elements of the classical belief in "the friend as another self."¹⁰ What is more, many have shared the assumption expressed in Aquinas's dictum, in *Summa Theologica*, "Charity [*caritas*] signifies not only love of God but also a certain friendship with God," a "familiar colloquy with God" begun in this life and culminating in the next.¹¹ What should become clear from this quick summary is that friendship, by no means a simple concept, must be seen as a politically conditioned metaphor and subtext of a culture.¹² In other words, encompassing a complicated set of political, religious, social, and cultural values, friendship often requires the individuals involved in a relationship to submit to certain transcendent ideals.

Another reason for Ricci to find friendship a fitting topic for his Chinese readers must be that, since antiquity, friendship has been used to describe, evaluate, and even form allies between cultures. Here the Greeks offer a good example, because they frequently applied the language of friendship to foreign relations. According to scholars, in Greek usage beginning at least as early as the sixth century BCE, *philia*, an abstract noun commonly rendered as "friendship," was the normal word for a treaty or alliance between states. Also, their word *xenoi* (*xeinoi* in epic diction) describes friends belonging to different communities.¹³ The inference from such Greek understanding of friendship certainly goes beyond the confirmation that friendship is seldom a simple concept. It is often a metaphor and subtext, politically conditioned, of a culture. To reiterate, a model for the relation between any two individuals, friendship does not merely represent a highly valued relationship within a culture. It often reflects the attitude of a culture in dealing with other cultures.

Taking into consideration the political and religious aspects of friendship and its usefulness and suitability in cross-cultural relations, one can say that

Ricci's *On Friendship* exemplifies an effort, purposefully made, to negotiate the Western and Chinese cultures and to eliminate the differences between the two. For Ricci, there had to be a higher ideal or principle to regulate the relation of the two cultures, just as there was, supposedly, one to determine the relation between two friends. That is perhaps why one of the first aphorisms in *On Friendship* came from Aristotle: "My friend and I exist as two bodies. But within the two bodies, there is only one mind" (友之於我, 雖有二身, 二身之內, 其心一也). The idea of "one mind" was emphasized time and again in *On Friendship*, sometimes as "perpetual virtue" (永德). Though Ricci in this work never specified what this higher principle was, the reader would have no difficulty in identifying it with the Christian faith, given Ricci's religious faith and his overall theological agenda. To examine how this higher principle supposedly regulates the relationship between the West and China—that is, to see how *On Friendship* was designed to help his assimilation of China—it is appropriate to discuss the relationship between Confucianism and Catholicism as Ricci presented it.

Though Ricci found certain parts of Confucianism acceptable from his Christian point of view, he insisted that the true meaning, or teaching, of what he called "original Confucianism" (先教) had been lost in China. For Ricci, many Confucian notions failed to restrain people from sinfulness, because these teachings had their own innate inadequacy. As Ricci saw it, the only way to regenerate the usefulness of these teachings was to have them either substituted or enhanced by Christian morals. A good example here would be his discussion on Confucius's teaching that "a man of benevolence [*ren* 仁] loves others" in his *Tianzhu shiyi* (天主實義), or *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven*, a catechism propagating the Catholic faith to the Chinese.¹⁴ Ricci believed that the idea of "benevolence" had been partially forgotten or completely misunderstood by his Chinese contemporaries, owing to many of them yielding more and more to their selfish desires. The remedy—for both the idea of benevolence and for the morality of the people—recommended by Ricci was the love of God. According to him, only the love of God could assure that people would love each other genuinely and continuously. Ricci made this point when he offered a new and clearly extended definition of Confucian benevolence:

The definition of *jen* [*ren*] can be summed up in the following two sentences: "Love the Lord of Heaven," [and] "Regard him as superior to all as well as love others as you love yourself for the sake of the Lord of Heaven." If one carries out these two

commands, everything one does will be perfect. But these two commands are, after all, one. If one loves a person passionately one will love what that person loves. The Lord of Heaven loves people; if I genuinely love the Lord of Heaven can I fail to love the people he loves? The reason why the virtue of *jen* is so noble is precisely that it signifies love for the Sovereign on High.¹⁵

As is indicated clearly in the above passage, Ricci's ideal love is the love of and for God, and it is far more important than the love for any other fellow men, even one's parents. God must be loved because, in Ricci's words, God as the creator of the world is the "common father" *gongfu* (公父), or father of all:

The supreme head of a nation and I stand in relationship to each other as sovereign to subject, and the head of my household and I stand in the mutual relationship of father and son. Although human beings make distinctions between sovereign and subject, father and son, when they are seen in their relationship to the common fatherhood of the Lord of Heaven they all become brothers with an equal standing; it is essential to understand this principle.¹⁶

Posing God on top of the most fundamental values or morals of the Chinese, Ricci does not merely supplement Confucianism. Under his notion of a unified history in which nothing takes place without God and nothing makes sense until it is related to God, Ricci appropriates Chinese civilization as a whole and makes it a subordinate part of the Christian God.

From this hierarchical relationship that Ricci perceived between Confucianism and Christianity, and from his assurance that Confucianism could regain its legitimacy as a system of thought or a religious doctrine, what can be expected from the Western ideas of friendship so earnestly presented by Ricci and his fellow Jesuits becomes clear. Cultivating among the Chinese a friendship in which all must submit to the Christian God was certainly a way to help Ricci not only convert the Chinese but also achieve China's assimilation to the West.

By now, the close association between friendship and hospitality should become apparent. When Ricci preached Christian friendship to the Chinese, friendship was supposed to serve as a hospitable gesture, welcoming China into Christianity. From early on, hospitality has been described as

a virtue in the Hebrew scriptures, to be displayed by a host to his or her guests or strangers.¹⁷ In Christian theology, hospitality is viewed as the very nature and meaning of God's love for humans. That is why God is called a welcoming deity—because he gives his unconditional love and shows his hospitality to humans who have fallen away. Specifically, God's hospitality to people suggests both a type of knowledge that every human being must have and an effort that he or she must make. In other words, humans are created by God for communion with God and others. Such communion, as seen from the Christian perspective, means

that we are part of a tradition in which we are dependent on others (including those not explicitly within our tradition) to demonstrate to us what we are to be. Such a politics does not depend on individualism but rather on *friendship*. It depends less on the language of rights and more on the language of *gift*. In fact, education made possible by friendship can be described as *the circulation of gift*, which is also a way to describe hospitality.¹⁸

Though this passage seems to limit its argument to Christians, its identification and relation of hospitality with friendship—that is, relating *agapē* and *caritas*—serves to demonstrate the very structure of Ricci's mission to China. Hoping to convince the Chinese that God's love, exemplifying his friendship and hospitality, was his ultimate gift to humans, Ricci worked to expand “the circulation of gift” under God to China.

Concerning Christian friendship and hospitality and their relation to *agapē* and *caritas*, one more point must be considered. One would be particularly naive to assume that the ideal of Christian charity is as unreserved and comprehensive as the Christian love for God.¹⁹ Indeed, Saint Augustine answers, “Everyone” (*Omnis homo*), as many other Christian thinkers also would, to the question “Who is my neighbor?” (*Proximus quis*, meaning literally “Who is next to me?”).²⁰ Reality, however, often poses a different picture with numerous examples of Christians dividing and distinguishing the self from the other based on religious and political beliefs. Even if one chooses to exclude the dynamic, aggressive, and continuous conflict between Jesus and Satan,²¹ the Holy Scriptures still contain abundant telling examples of how humans often oppose one another. There is the story of how the ancient Israelites in captivity hang up their harps and refuse to sing their holy songs so as not to grace their captors and a foreign land (Ps 137:1–4), or another about how Jesus insists that his followers demonstrate their

absolute devotion to him by hating and abandoning their family members (Lk 14:26). Even one of the best-known and most-quoted teachings of Jesus, “love your enemies” (ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν; *diligite inimicos vestros*),²² may contain less benevolence than is often supposed. Here is why. In Koine Greek, the language used in the majority of the original texts in the New Testament, there are two commonly used terms to signify “enemy”: πολέμιος (or *hostis*, in Latin), meaning a political or public enemy to be fought against collectively, and ἐχθροὺς (or *inimicus*), signifying a private or personal adversary. And the word used by Jesus in this teaching, as quoted above, is none other than ἐχθροὺς (*inimicos*) or “private enemies.” According to Carl Schmitt, who discusses the importance of distinguishing friend and enemy in his *The Concept of the Political*, Jesus’s selection of “private enemies” instead of “public enemies” should confirm that he is fully aware of the impossibility of befriending certain groups of people.²³ Whether Jesus’s wording reduces the significance and power of Christian charity lies beyond the scope of this discussion. What is certain from Schmitt’s interpretation is that, while one must stand and fight without compromise against political and public enemies, one should always have love for one’s private enemies.²⁴ It is true that Schmitt in his book is more concerned with what determines the political, but his argument that the political only becomes possible with the identification of friend and enemy is readily applicable to religions, where such identification is no less crucial and decisive.²⁵

Looking back at the Society of Jesus, one sees that a similar dichotomy of friends and enemies—self and other—sustains the work and life of the Jesuits, a fact to be borne in mind in a discussion of the Jesuit mission in China. It is a fact worth noting, because the Jesuits in China, while promoting friendship and extending hospitality mainly to the Confucian class, rejected vehemently and completely other religious groups such as Chinese Buddhists and Daoists. It is true that some early Jesuits, out of their misunderstanding, dressed themselves up as Buddhist monks in the hope of attracting the attention of the Chinese. They later not only shed the monk’s robes to replace them with the Confucian gowns but also would frequently engage in written and face-to-face debates with Buddhist and Daoist representatives to reject their doctrines.

Having spoken of the Jesuit distinction between friends and enemies, or their hospitality to the Confucians and lack of it to others such as the Buddhists and Daoists, I would like to look at Confucian hospitality, or their response to the Jesuits, a topic to be discussed later in this book. As there will be a short chapter outlining the deconstructive theory of hospitality

and reviewing the Confucian definition and use of hospitality in history, including the late Ming period, what will be said here will be brief.

The Confucian response to the Jesuits—both friendly reception and outright rejection—is referred to here as hospitality primarily because the term hospitality, or *bin* (賓), was applied exclusively to the governmental agency in charge of international affairs in traditional China. Until a little more than one and a half centuries ago,²⁶ China had never in its history had a foreign affairs office in its government. The agency in charge of receiving and hosting foreign guests had been a section in the Department of Rites (禮部). This section was responsible for extending the so-called *binli* (賓禮), or rite of hospitality, to foreign delegations, and it often worked as, among other things, the instrument of the government to propagate, subtly or bluntly, the Chinese idea of Sino-centrism founded on an assumed hierarchy of cultures. The Department of Rites could serve this role simply because, like the Christian idea of hospitality that encompasses virtually all the aspects of the human-God relationship, Confucian hospitality represented all of the most important ideologies governing human relations in China.

To be sure, as uninvited guests, the Jesuit missionaries did not have to deal directly or formally with the Department of Rites. But this fact does not mean that they were free from Confucian hospitality. As a scholar points out, “Hospitality is always inseparable from power because it is an ability, capacity, or strength to receive and give shelter to a stranger, foreigner, or other.”²⁷ Indeed, out of the Jesuit-Confucian encounter manifested an unbalanced and highly complicated power relation involving the two parties. Such a relation required first of all that the missionaries behave in a way deemed acceptable by the host, who would accordingly chose either to be receptive by displaying hospitality or to be rejective by denying it. The judgment of the Jesuits’ behavior was based on the Confucian view of “a dichotomized world,” in which, as Mark Mancall observes, individuals would be defined in terms of a pair of concepts, civilization or barbarism.²⁸ In general, as Mancall elaborates, the inhabitants of this dichotomized world “will not perceive the emblem of civilization to be the nation with its flags and titles; rather, they will perceive the emblem to be the palpable form of civilization, which is culture in the sense of manners, morals, and arts, including the foods eaten and the clothes worn.”²⁹ Ming history carries many examples about hospitality being either given to or reserved from the Jesuits, depending on how the missionaries were perceived.³⁰ These examples make clear that hospitality is truly a matter of power that, displayed or denied, means to impose hegemony and homogeneity.

This discussion, however, seeks to do more. It will demonstrate that what further complicates the Jesuit-Confucian relation is that the Confucian host was not always the one to determine when and if to give or withhold hospitality. With their arrival in China and by staying in different places in the country to carry out their evangelical activities, the Jesuits were the other with whom the Confucian host was forced to negotiate. Facing the missionaries, the Confucian host ceased to be the one to decide when and if he would relate and respond. In the exchange with the missionaries, the Confucian hospitality could no longer be reserved or controlled but became unconditional in the sense that the host had to receive the Jesuit strangers, or deal with them, as Jacques Derrida puts it, “without invitation, beyond or before the invitation.”³¹ In this book, the discussion on the Confucian reception of the missionaries will highlight the implications of the Confucian imperial ideology and expose the limits of the empire by revealing the dilemma facing Confucian Sino-centrism.

In the pages that follow, the book will treat friendship and hospitality as concepts, discourses, and recognition of alterity, as postulated by some deconstructive philosophers, mainly Emmanuel Levinas and Jacques Derrida. Through examples from the works of the Jesuits and the Confucian response, I will argue that difference is the absolute condition of possibility under which friendship and hospitality—the friendship and hospitality between two individuals or between two cultures—happen.

A deconstructive reading, enhanced by recent theories of cultural studies, will be particularly conducive to the present study of friendship and hospitality because of the subject’s historical import, its philosophical and theological richness, and its applicability to actual human relations on both interpersonal and intercultural levels. Treating the concepts of friendship and hospitality in an intensive fashion, I hope both to reveal and critique the ideological and religious implications behind the friendship and hospitality exercised by the Jesuits and the Confucians. The analysis of how the Jesuits presented their concept of friendship in order to realize their religious agenda and how the Confucians reacted, through displaying or denying their hospitality to the missionary strangers, will shed light on the comparative study of culture and of the interaction between religion, philosophy, and literature.

The book is divided into two parts, each of which approaches from a specific perspective the issues concerned. Part 1, under the title “The Concept of Friendship and the Jesuits,” contains two chapters concentrating on the missionaries and their discourse on friendship. Entitled “The Cul-

ture of Hospitality and the Confucians,” part 2, with three main chapters following a brief introductory chapter, applies the deconstructive discussion on hospitality to the interpretation of the Chinese response to the Jesuits. The following is an outline of the chapters.

Chapter 1 examines Jesuit spirituality and mission strategy, both determined by and related to the Jesuit understanding of Christian friendship, that is, union with God. The discussion begins with a detailed analysis of Jesuit spirituality, which required all Jesuit members to become friends in the Lord, the Wholly Other. Following the gospel teaching to “deny the self” (Matt 16:24), the Jesuits took the erasure of the individual’s self, an indication of this person’s undivided devotion to God, to be an absolute condition for his union with God. Such submission to God and constant effort for union with God seemed to go well with another Jesuit commitment, the commitment to mission, which likewise aimed at a divine union, the union/reunion between God and the pagans and unbelievers to be converted through Jesuit missions. In my discussion, I point out that the seemingly closely connected and interdependent Jesuit spirituality and mission are actually paradoxical. The paradox or dilemma manifests because of the Jesuit attitude toward the otherness. For Jesuits, only one otherness is impossible to appropriate. It is the otherness of God, the Wholly Other. All other otherness including the self, which is something preventing humans from the union with God, is deemed to be the otherness to be eliminated. However, going through the Jesuit spiritual process and mission, I argue that the human otherness, exactly like the otherness of the Wholly Other, cannot be erased. Quite the contrary, both when the Jesuits cultivate their spirituality and during their missions, especially their mission to China, it is clear that the Jesuit actions confirm that the human otherness is what must be kept, even pursued, in the same way God the Wholly Other is kept, respected, and pursued.

Chapter 2 continues the investigation of the Jesuit promotion of friendship. But the focus is placed on one single work, *On Friendship*, by Matteo Ricci. It is clear that Ricci hoped to use this work on friendship to assimilate China by forming a friendly relation with the Chinese. But through a close reading of the work, the reader finds that Ricci, owing to his accommodation, failed to fully present the Jesuit or Catholic concept of friendship; that is, instead of urging the Chinese to become God’s friends, Ricci presented in the main the classical or pagan view of friendship, the friendship that concerned itself more with other humans than with a divine being. The discussion will argue that Ricci’s deviation showed that the

deviation was inevitable, given Ricci's mission. It was his dilemma. Living in China, mingling with Chinese, and studying Chinese language and Confucian classics in order to convert the Chinese into Christians, Ricci seemed to succumb at first to the cultural transformation instilled in him by the Chinese. In other words, his mission of assimilation was designed to make China and the Chinese the same as Christian Europeans. But instead, he had the other in his self.

With the conclusion of this chapter, the book moves to part 2 of the discussion—examining through the concept of hospitality the Confucian response, hospitable or hostile, to the Jesuit strangers. Chapter 3 introduces and sets up the theoretical framework for the discussion by summarizing some of the important points about hospitality from the works of Levinas and Derrida. It then briefly reviews the Confucian rite of hospitality in traditional China, particularly during the Ming dynasty (1368–1644), showing in particular how the Confucian worldview shaped the use of hospitality.

Once the theoretical underpinning and the historical background have been elucidated, the three remaining chapters of part 2 approach the topic of Confucian hospitality from three separate but related angles—namely, how the modern science and technology introduced into China by the Jesuits put into question Confucian Sino-centrism by generating new understandings of the self and other in the country. Even the Christian teachings, as will become clear later in the book, stimulated some renewed energy to elaborate on and explore old Confucian doctrines.

Chapter 4 concentrates on the world map that Ricci made in Chinese around 1584. It will argue that this map, presenting a world entirely new to the Chinese, marks off an ideological high ground where the Confucian host and the Jesuit visitor enact some of the very essence as well as paradox of hospitality as discussed by Levinas and Derrida. In the Jesuit-Confucian encounter, the map and the Chinese reactions to it represent some vigorous and highly complicated cultural negotiations or accommodations through which both sides would, knowingly or not, cross back and forth over the boundaries that they themselves had set up. Both sides would keep blurring the demarcation between inside and outside, the distinction between the Self and the Other, and the host and the stranger. Without doubt, each side would attempt to claim authority over the other—the Confucians with their Sino-centrism and the Jesuits with the map containing new geographic information and modern cartographical presentation, plus the Catholic faith in the omnipotence of God. The chapter will concentrate on the impact the map left on the Chinese worldview. It will demonstrate how the seemingly

closed Ming circle of the Same was more than penetrated and infiltrated by the missionaries; it was ripped open by the world map. What the map made manifest, first of all, were the limits of the Middle Kingdom. These imperial limitations in turn demonstrated the fact that the Middle Kingdom existed and functioned in a world where innate heterogeneity granted no stability to the roles of host, stranger, or hostage.

If Ricci's world map only worked to remove, in a symbolical fashion, the Middle Kingdom from its imagined center of the world, the Jesuits' work for the Ming court regarding the calendar reform, the topic of chapter 5, actually turned the Confucian host into a hostage. In traditional China, the calendar was central government's monopoly, because the calendar, besides serving practical agricultural needs, had crucial political and religious uses for the government. That is why the Ming, like many previous dynasties, had a ban on any private study of the calendar and astronomy. The government even made the positions at the royal agency of astronomy hereditary to prevent outsiders from acquiring this highly guarded and particularly sensitive knowledge. It is from this perspective that I argue that the Jesuits' work on the Ming calendar became significant. It shows that the Ming host, so proud of its cultural supremacy, had now to depend on the assistance of missionary strangers in order to sustain the well-being of its government and country. To further illustrate this reversed power relation, I also investigate the Confucian response that resulted in Chinese thinkers and scholars debating how to maintain the hegemony of China while continuing, without losing face, to benefit from the usefulness of foreign technology. Turning to some of the arguments emerging from these debates, I point out that the effort to rethink the China-West relation in the late Ming period should be seen as the herald of what happened in the second half of the nineteenth century, when, faced again with advanced technology from the West, some Confucians expressed concerns about how to maintain their doctrine and at the same time make use of the imported technology.

Of the three main chapters in this part, chapter 6 tackles a delicate as well as complicated problem—that is, how the Christian teaching of a deity and revealed religion seemed to stimulate, among the anti-Christian Confucians, certain new ways to think about old Confucian doctrines. In their apologetic writings, these Confucians certainly mounted a harsh rejection of the Jesuits and their religion. But it is in this clash of Confucian and Christian ideologies and theologies, the discussion will show, that the inhospitable Confucian host, afraid of being transformed by the foreigners and eager to sustain the assumed univocality of Confucianism, opened up in

a curious fashion to Christian teachings and doctrines so as to find models for their attempt to rebuild Confucianism.

The conclusion will summarize the discussion in the book by reiterating how the encounter between the West and China, through a small group of men in China over four hundred years ago, actually initiated the beginning of a changed world, a world that has since then been fundamentally different. As there had never been unicity in this world, the coming together of the two continents represented by two civilizations has made this fact much more keenly felt. And it instilled in people a new understanding of the relation between the self and the other and a recognition that the other has always been a part of the self.