

Special Issue 【專題論文】

「中國性」的歐洲解釋：
耶穌會中國傳教區的「風格」問題初探
A European Distinction of Chinese Characteristics:
A Style Question in Seventeenth-Century Jesuit
China Missions

Hui-Hung CHEN
陳慧宏*

Keywords: Chineseness, Europeanness, style, the Jesuits, materiality

關鍵詞：中國性、歐洲性、風格、耶穌會士、物質性

* Assistant Professor of History, National Taiwan University.

Abstract

This paper discusses the issues regarding Jesuit expression and characterization, and the question they raised regarding pictorial style in their China mission, focusing especially on visual materials. Style, or the history of representation in Western history, is an essential issue involving categories of expression and methods of characterization both in rhetoric and in the visual arts. Style, moreover, can indicate a quality or manner to present and represent a culture. The cultural encounters through visual materials, which took place between the Chinese and European by means of visual activity, are a kind of material contact. One perspective in material culture is to seek for materiality, which emphasizes not only the form of the object but also the human activity or practice caused by the object in question. This materiality is a useful concept in addressing the two terms "Chineseness" and "Europeanness" in the cross-cultural missionary framework. The sense of culture in "Chineseness" and "Europeanness" can be phrased as an anthropological quality, which can be well observed in the material contacts between the two sides and recorded in Jesuit own accounts, since materiality could evince not only objectivity but also subjectivity. By investigating these records, I would like to argue that how to in effect apply the concept of style—which might be thought of as an old approach in art history—to a cross-cultural historical observation.

摘要

這篇論文探討耶穌會的表達和特徵化的概念，以他們在中國傳教區所提出的一些關於繪畫風格的評價為主要史料。所謂的「風格」，在西方表達發展的歷史中，是一個牽涉到表達的分類和特徵化的方法之基礎核心議題，在視覺藝術和修辭學上都是。「風格」，也是代表文化觀念的性質或方式。在視覺資料的跨文化接觸中，藉由視覺活動而運作的中歐文化互動，實則為一種物質接觸。但在物質文化中的一種研究取向，是把「物質性」界定為不只是指物象的形式，也包含因此物象所引發的人類行為和實踐。這個「物質性」的觀念在跨文化的傳教架構中，可以是指向「中國性」和「歐洲性」的兩個性質觀念的一個很有用的研究方法。因為「中國性」和「歐洲性」是指一種人類學的性質，一種風格的觀念，在物質接觸中可以很明顯地被觀察到。而且耶穌會的中國傳教區紀錄，就有相當多藉由視覺活動接觸所引發的對於這個兩個性質的意見。本文希望藉由這個主題的討論，可以申論「風格」——也許被視為藝術史研究的老方法——如何能有效地運用在跨文化的歷史觀察上。

"Style" was a penetrating concept for old art-historical scholarship. That style as a manner decides the division of various schools over the course of time was once thought to form the main line of evolution in art history, but this idea was almost abandoned and has lost its historical centrality since the "history of images" or "visual culture" have gradually been becoming the principal terms for the visual arts, instead of the "history of art."¹ The use of such terms as "Renaissance style" or "Baroque style" in the earlier scholarship to label a certain period of time has been seen as inadequate to reflect the complexity of visuality or visualization in a society or culture.² On the other hand, style, or the history of representation in Western history, is an essential issue involving categories of expression and methods of characterization both in rhetoric and in the visual arts.³ In the sixteenth century, European terminology and frameworks to reveal judgment and taste were seen both in literary and artistic criticism, which had drawn parallels from antiquity and been reformulated during the period of Renaissance Humanism. Therefore, as John Shearman points out, the language and reference apprehended in the arts at that time was common to all of them.⁴ By examining this terminology and its surrounding discussions, we gain insight into the forms of expressions and characteristics that people in the sixteenth century represented and judged. In other words, we can investigate their points of view on the matter of "style."

1 There are many works on the evolution of the tendency toward "history of image" or "visual culture" as defining terms in art-historical study. Here are three examples: David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp. xix-xxv; Hans Belting, *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), pp. xxi-xxiv; W. J. T. Mitchell, "Interdisciplinarity and Visual Culture," *The Art Bulletin*, 77 (1995), pp. 540-544.

2 As John Shearman states, "It is an unrealistic tendency to regard periods of style, in themselves increasingly artificial as we go further back into history, as tidily homogeneous." See John Shearman, *Mannerism* (London: Penguin Books, 1967), p. 23.

3 Ernst H. J. Gombrich, *Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation* (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1960), pp. 8-12.

4 John Shearman, *Mannerism*, pp. 30-39, 135-170. For an analogy of what happened to the artistic disciplines and other fields in the Renaissance period, see also Ernst H. J. Gombrich, "From the Revival of Letters to the Reform of the Arts: Niccolò Niccoli and Filippo Brunelleschi," in *Gombrich on the Renaissance*, vol. 3: The Heritage of Apelles (London: Phaidon Press, 1976), pp. 93-110.

In this paper, I would like to bring to the fore the issues regarding Jesuit expression and characterization, and the question they raised regarding pictorial style in their China mission, focusing especially on visual materials. Although Jesuit expression and characterization can commonly be grounded in the literary and artistic discourses as reflected in their European context, here I call attention especially to a non-linguistic and non-written discourse, for which I have particular reasons. The Jesuits' engagement with Renaissance rhetoric in Europe has been studied extensively by Marc Fumaroli, and Jesuit rhetoric in the China mission was also presented splendidly in the comparative studies of Li Shershiueh.⁵ In scholarly work, however, Jesuit visual materials, especially situated in their broader international enterprises, are at a comparatively lower level of visibility. Moreover, visual materials are regarded as objects or images, and their significance to historical studies has been appraised largely in recent decades. As mentioned above, the term "art history" has been overshadowed by the new claim to the thoughts and practices of those concerned with visuality and hence renamed the "History of Images" or "Visual History."⁶ In other words, non-written discourse, in contrast to the written, can expand the vision of historians into the worlds of those people who were not expressive linguistically, verbally and literarily. One perspective in this

5 Here are listed only some of the recent works of Marc Fumaroli and Li Shershiueh, both of them specialists in their fields: Marc Fumaroli, "The Fertility and the Shortcomings of Renaissance Rhetoric: The Jesuit Case," in John W. O'Malley et al. (eds.) *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), pp. 90-106; Li Sher-shiueh, "History as Rhetoric: The Jesuit Use of Chreia in Late-Ming China," paper presented at the 53rd Meeting of the American Association of Asian Studies (Chicago: American Association of Asian Studies, Mar. 23-25, 2001); *Zhongguo wanming yu ouzhou wenxue: mingmo yesu hui gudian xing zhengdao gushi kaoquan* 中國晚明與歐洲文學：明末耶穌會古典型證道故事考證 (Chinese Late Ming and European Literature: Jesuit Classical Exempla in Late Ming) (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 2005).

6 Ivan Gaskell's chapter in the book entitled *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* is named "Visual History," in which he states that visual material has been recognized by historians for those "thoughts and practice" that concern the visual. See Ivan Gaskell, "Visual History," in Peter Burke (ed.) *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, 2nd ed. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), pp. 187-217. For the nature of the history of images and its difference from traditional art history, see Hans Belting, *Likeness and Presence*, pp. xxi-16; Norman Bryson, Michael Ann Holly and Keith Moxey (eds.), *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1994), pp. xv-xxix.

growing importance of "visual studies" has benefited by the research on the relationship between subject and object in material culture. A different approach to materialism is to seek for materiality, which emphasizes not only the form of the object but also the human activity or practice caused by the object in question. Materiality is not separate from the being of things, and things as social objects also suggest a production of relating both to persons and things, all of which involve the sociality of subject.⁷ This materiality in the study of material culture is a useful concept in addressing questions regarding two terms I would like to introduce, "Chineseness" and "Europeanness" in the cross-cultural missionary framework. The sense of culture in "Chineseness" and "Europeanness" can be phrased as an anthropological quality, which can be well observed in the material contacts between the two sides, because materiality could evince not only objectivity but also subjectivity. The cultural encounters through visual materials, which took place between the Chinese and European by means of visual activity, are a kind of material contact.

The third reason for shedding light on visual materials relates to the issue of style. Style, and thus also judgment and taste, are useful conceptions that can indicate favorably the cultural quality we are looking into.⁸ As the scholar writing the most classic work on the concept of style, Meyer Schapiro defines, "style" as the constant forms, elements, qualities, and expression applied to an individual, a

7 Michael Rowlands, "A Material Approach to Materiality," paper presented as a speech by invitation (Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, May, 2004), pp. 1-15. For the theoretical evolution in anthropological research about things and material culture, refer to Ying-Kuei Huang 黃應貴, "Introduction," in Ying-Kuei Huang (ed.) *Wu yu wuzhi wenhua 物與物質文化* (Substance and Material Culture) (Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, 2004), pp. 1-26. On the research of material culture from history, see John Kieschnick, *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), pp. 15-23.

8 For example, on several occasions Roy McMullen's essay entitled "Style in the Arts" discusses how the concept of style is linked to a cultural quality, such as "Frenchness" and "Englishness." See "Style in the Arts," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica Macropaedia* (Chicago: The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1974), pp. 141, 148.

society, or even a civilization. Schapiro further elaborates on the concept as follows:⁹

For the synthesizing historian of culture or the philosopher of history, the style is a manifestation of the culture as a whole, the visible sign of its unity. The style reflects or projects the inner form of collective thinking and feeling.

Style, therefore, can indicate a quality or manner to present and represent a culture. In seventeenth-century Europe, moreover, judgment and taste could be conceived as "an expression of the innate genius or wit," or "innate faculties," which "determined the sensibility and quality of an artist's style."¹⁰ Innate faculty indicates that the style question could retain an anthropological feature, so this question is pertinent for demonstrating the cultural quality of "Chineseness" and "Europeanness."

In the history of representation, as David Summers explicates, a representation can extend our power of imagination generated from the soul and sense to a unified projection of the world, thus constituting a worldview or *Weltanschauung*. This concept supposes a synthesizing imagination or collective subjectivity, Summers continues, and many art-historical practices envelope this concept while they strive to work on not only on *what* is represented, but also *how* a representation is represented. Thus, in this art-historical discourse, a work of art "'expresses' both personal and collective 'point of view'."¹¹ In addition, Erwin Panofsky recognizes

9 Meyer Schapiro, "Style," in Alfred L. Kroeber (ed.) *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp. 287-312. This work was recently reprinted in a series on historiography, and the theme of the volume is about "Ideas," in which Part 3 deals with "the arts." Under this category "the Arts," Schapiro's "Style" is the first article. See Robert M. Burns (ed.), *Historiography: Critical Concepts in Historical Studies*, vol. 3 (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 237-267. Here the quotation comes from this reprint on page 238.

10 Jeffrey M. Muller has a discussion of taste and judgment as innate faculties for the case of the seventeenth-century artist Peter Paul Rubens, see Jeffrey M. Muller, *Rubens: The Artist as Collector* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), pp. 8-9.

11 David Summers, "Representation," in Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff (eds.) *Critical Terms for*

European perspective as "a factor of style," and perspective demonstrates a spatial-temporal field of vision and embraces also a *Weltanschauung*.¹² As the following discussion will show, both a "collective point of view" for European artistic style and European perspective are seen in Jesuit visual discourse from the China mission, and they give rise to the question of the style that labels a culture or period. The worldview, and the way this question of style would relate to it, is certainly intriguing to think over in an intercultural setting. Hence as I will argue, this paper on the Jesuit visual encounter with China in effect is intended to show how to apply the concept of style—which might be thought of as an old approach—to a cross-cultural historical observation.

In addition, the problem of "Jesuit style" is among the most prominent to raise questions about the complex relationship between "style" and "institutes," or a specific society in art-historical research. The style question is also germane to the Jesuits' own characterization of their Society. The renowned and unique phrase for the Jesuits, *noster modus procedendi* or "our way of proceeding," was invented by one of the most significant Jesuits in the early periods of the order, Jerome Nadal (1507-1580). It is applied to all of their missions, and to their artistic projects as well. Early from the seventeenth century on, "Jesuitism" and "*Jesuitenstil*" were terms coined in anti-Jesuit literature, explaining the characteristic nature of the Society and the recognition of a specific way or manner for the Jesuits. However, they accompanied the negative and pedantic judgment attributed to the Jesuits in historical courses. To use Gauvin Bailey's terms, "style" for the Jesuits is "precisely the qualities implied by *noster modus*."¹³ In the past few decades, as the myth of a "Jesuit style" in art has been discounted, new research interests have moved from

Art History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 3-16; the quotation is on page 13.

12 Erwin Panofsky, *Perspective as Symbolic Form* (New York: Zone Books, 1991), pp. 13-15, 40 (quotation here).

13 For the above discussion on the question of style for the Society and Jesuitism, refer to Gauvin A. Bailey, "'Le style jésuite n'existe pas': Jesuit Corporate Culture and the Visual Arts," in John W. O'Malley et al. (eds.) *The Jesuits*, pp. 38-47; the quotation is from page 45.

the implication of a uniform "Jesuit style" as an example of European artistic hegemony to Jesuit adaptations of local styles and components for their individual needs.¹⁴ Thus, works of arts produced in a missionary background are no longer judged as an inferior hybrid of a "pure" style. The devaluation in the past of these works of art has also evolved around the issue of the Church's attitude towards indigenous artistic traditions.¹⁵ Yet, the multicultural character of these works embraces their persistence, and the resistance of any accommodation, inculturation, or syncretism, three concepts that they demonstrated either singly or all together. And recently they have been re-evaluated for their contributions to the primary traditions of the visual arts on which they drew.¹⁶ Visual objects produced in a foreign or colonial land have been carefully re-considered in the past decade, from the perspective that the indigenous peoples associated with these objects were not simply passive and mute to the imposition of European artistic forms.

To use the term "mission art," on which Bailey elaborated "for want of a better term," the question deserves to be asked whether this view of local agency in the forming of mission art would be in opposition to Jesuit collective subjectivity or identity as it was represented in visual materials.¹⁷ Or, to rephrase the problem

14 The most prominent work, in English at least, to argue that Jesuit thinking on art and architecture was not uniform, and thus that the term "Jesuit style" is not a useful concept is Rudolf Wittkower and Irma B. Jaffe (eds.), *Baroque Art: The Jesuit Contribution* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1972). A new comprehensive discussion of the historiographical debate on "Jesuit style" is Gauvin A. Bailey, "Le style jésuite n'existe pas," pp. 38-89.

15 The depreciation of arts in missions in the early periods has been described and disapproved of in the following works: Celso Costantini, *L'Arte Cristiana nelle Missioni* (Vatican City: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1940); Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Le Origini dell'Arte: Cristiana Cinese (1583-1640)* (Rome: Reale Accademia d'Italia, 1939), pp. 11-13; Gonçalo Couceiro, *A Igreja de S. Paulo de Macau* (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 1997), pp. 9-10.

16 An example on Renaissance art is Claire Farago (ed.), *Reframing the Renaissance: Visual Culture in Europe and Latin America 1450-1650* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995). In the introduction, Farago asks the following two questions as the premise for the essays that follow: "What did new awareness of other cultures contribute to European conceptions of the arts?" and "How did the exportation of Renaissance ideal and material culture, from Italy to other parts of Europe and worldwide, fare in this environment of intensified interaction?" (p. 1).

17 Gauvin A. Bailey, *Art on the Jesuit Missions in Asia and Latin America 1542-1773* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), pp. 4-5. For the concept of "collective identity," I benefited from Peter Nosco's paper entitled "The Place of China in the Construction of Japan's Early Modern

better: by considering the joint contributions of both the Jesuits and the indigenous people, we may complicate or enrich our understanding of mission art, and thereby deepen our analysis of an intercultural production. The question of style with respect to the visual materials from the Jesuit China mission may well highlight the qualities that "Chineseness" and "Europeanness" entail, as the above argument suggests. The visual materials in question include those that the missionaries brought into China and the ones they made after they arrived, or else they had them created there. In this cross-cultural context, Jesuit expression and characterization do not shore up the image of a uniform "Jesuit style"; they actually point to what and how that mission art was regarded by the Jesuits. These two terms—"expression" and "characterization"—used with reference to the Jesuits, are not one-dimensional and implacable. There might have been a collective point of view for the arts, but for the Jesuits there could also have been several methods of expression and characterization.

The way in which the anthropological quality of the "sense of culture" in "Chineseness" and "Europeanness" may be seen in the material contact from visual images, and the way the Jesuits projected an identity of European artistic style into this encounter, can be illustrated by the following story. In the account of his journey to Beijing around 1600, the Jesuit Matteo Ricci (1552-1610) described how, before he reached the Chinese capital, he had showed to the governor of the Province of Shandong 山東省 an image of the Virgin Mary holding the Infant Child with St. John the Baptist, which was to be presented to the Chinese emperor Wanli 萬曆. The image of the Virgin Mary came to China from Spain via Mexico and the Philippines.¹⁸ Unfortunately, this type of Marian image has not survived

World View," paper presented at the International Conference on the Development of Worldviews in Early Modern Asia (Taipei: Center for the Study of East Asian Civilizations, National Taiwan University, Aug. 5-6, 2005).

18 Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane: Documenti originali concernenti Matteo Ricci e la storia delle prime relazioni tra l'Europa e la Cina (1579-1615). Storia dell' introduzione del Cristianesimo in Cina scritta da Matteo Ricci*, vol. 2 (Roma, Libreria dello Stato, 1942-1949), p. 123; Nicolas Trigault, *China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journal of Matthew Ricci, 1583-1610*, translated by

from the China mission. The legend of this event tells that the wife of the governor had dreamed of a foreign god with two little children, and thus she wanted to have a copy of the same figures that were in the image in Ricci's possession. Because the wife of the governor had proposed to send an artist to Ricci's boat in order to make a replica, and because she seemed in a hurry to do so, Ricci feared that a bad copy might be the result; he gave one instead that had been made by a young artist in the Jesuit house of Nanjing 南京.¹⁹ This young artist was a Chinese Christian, who, while working with Ricci in Nanjing, had been baptized as Emanuel Pereira (1572-1630; his Chinese name was You Wenhui 游文輝). Born in Macao, Pereira had studied at the artistic seminary of the Jesuit Giovanni Niccolo located in Japan (Niccolo had been born in 1560, in Nola in the Kingdom of Naples). Due to Ricci's mistrust that a copy of the image might be produced that was unworthy of the subject matter, Pasquale M. d'Elia suggested that Pereira would have to make a replica in a reliably European style.²⁰ Both Ricci's original and the replica by Pereira are presently unknown.²¹ This story illustrates a European distinction with regard to Chinese characteristics. Ricci did not want to count on an indigenous artist, untrained in a Christian European style, to make a copy of the image. He had in mind to make a distinction between two pictorial expressions, and it is clear that he may have had some ideas about why or how a Chinese expression would not be suitable. At this point, Ricci's judgment was made from a European standard and the understanding he possibly had of Chinese pictorial traditions. If Pereira's work was truly based on European models, once again Ricci could have had a criterion

Louis J. Gallagher (New York: Random House, 1953), p. 180; Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Le Origini dell'Arte*, pp. 32-33. Trigault's Latin translation of Ricci's account was published in 1615 in Europe. D'Elia proposed that this image sent to China could have had the same origin as another painting with the same subject, the latter dated 1576, which was previously housed in the room of Ignatius of Loyola and acquired from Spain, the homeland of Loyola. See *ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

19 Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane*, vol. 2, p. 105.

20 Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Le Origini dell'Arte*, pp. 36-37.

21 There is only one oil painting extant to the present that was supposed to have come from the hands of Pereira, a portrait of Ricci created around Ricci's death in Beijing. This painting is currently housed in the Chiesa del Santissimo Nome di Gesù all'Argentina, Rome, and is probably the oldest extant oil painting by a Chinese artist.

for judging the value of such a duplication. We might suggest further that Ricci had his own idea of what "Europeanness" and "Chineseness" should be, and that this replica of the sacred image indicated that the European quality was to be insisted on. This story is a vigorous statement concerning the dialogue at the time between "Europeanness" and "Chineseness." In this confrontation between two sides, Ricci expressed his collective view of European visual characterization making it by means of a contrast to that of the Chinese.

Moreover, although we are not aware by what Chinese characteristics Ricci made this distinction, his decision could simply reflect a taste that was inherent in Ricci himself, an innate faculty. Ricci stated that a Chinese copy *non avrebbe potuto far questo sì bene* (would have not been able to do this so well), and the one by Pereira was *assai bella* (very beautiful).²² This judgment could have been made by some standard or standards which we do not know from the description, but it is likely, as Ricci thought, that a replica of a European model could not be created by a non-European's untrained hand (in Ricci's terms). Given that the expressive modes of representation in Western history were tangled with the problems of "varying skills," as E. H. Gombrich states, it can be deduced that Ricci's perception of the Chinese characteristics in pictorial traditions could, to a considerable extent, include a comparison at the level of techniques and skills.²³ Therefore, for a Jesuit mind like Ricci's, Chinese pictorial skills were sufficiently different from European ones as to render a Chinese artist, untrained in the latter, incapable of duplicating a European image in a worthy way. This inference also proves that the materiality of objects can circumscribe the subject—making the subject inseparable from object. Here materiality is the physical appearance through the rendering of pictorial skills.

Perspective as a factor of style, as mentioned above, returns to our focus here, because it involved the very problems of skills in the first reaction of the Jesuit

22 Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane*, vol. 2, p. 105.

23 Ernst H. J. Gombrich, *Art and Illusion*, p. 8.

mission to Chinese artistic traditions. Again, this reaction explains a European distinction with respect to Chinese characteristics, and the following sources show that the standard on which the Jesuit based their judgment is, precisely, perspective. The earliest record is in a letter by the Jesuit Niccolò Longobardo (1565-1655) to the General Claudio Aquaviva, dated October 18, 1598. In it, Longobardo comments on the respect of the Chinese for all the European books and images that the missionaries had shown them, on how they saw them as skillful and delicate, since they had used shadows (*ombre*) that Chinese paintings did not have.²⁴ The use of shadow, that is, the skill of *chiaroscuro*, was part of Renaissance perspective. During this year 1598, Longobardo was preaching in Shaozhou 韶州, a prefecture of the Province of Guangdong (廣東省). Immediately afterward in 1599, he began preaching in rural areas surrounding the town, coming face to face with the common people and villagers.²⁵ It might be a coincidence that later, around 1603 to 1605, Longobardo discovered a Chinese copy of the above-named image of the Virgin with the Child and St. John the Baptist in a house inhabited by Chinese people on the outskirts of Shaozhou. However, at the time Longobardo did not say anything about the style of this Chinese copy. Longobardo paid his respect, "full of marvel and consolation" (*pieno di meraviglia e consolatione*), and the following text describes how this picture served to arouse devotion among the Chinese. Because we do not know about its making and style, we cannot deduce that Longobardo accepted what the Chinese artistic type is, in contrast with his remark mentioned above about the disadvantage of Chinese skills.²⁶

As the above example shows, Ricci's comments on Chinese art appeared in his account and are similar to Longobardo's remark. Because the Chinese were familiar neither with painting in oil nor with the rendering of shadow, their paintings, as Ricci states, are "pale and dull, without any vivacity" (*smorte e senza nessuna*

24 ARSI (Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, Rome, Italy), JapSin 13, 177r, quoted by Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Le Origini dell'Arte*, p. 80.

25 Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane*, vol. 2, p. 192-195.

26 *Ibid.*, pp. 330-331.

vivezza). Additionally, Chinese paintings done by famous people were only rendered in ink without colors (*pittura di persone famose, senza colori, ma di solo inchiostro*). In the description of his gifts to Wanli in 1601, Ricci repeats that the Chinese cannot appreciate the figures depicted in his European prints because of their lack of knowledge of the use of shadow and colors to generate shading.²⁷ This Jesuit opinion was translated fully into Chinese, when the Chinese in Nanjing 南京 asked Ricci how Western paintings could achieve such a lifelike visual effect, as was recorded in Gu Qiyuan's 顧起元 (1565-1628) *Ke zuo zhui yu* 客座贅語 (c. 1618):

利瑪竇，西洋歐邏巴國人也……來南京居正陽門西營中，自言其國以崇奉天主為道，天主者，制匠天地萬物者也。所畫天主，乃一小兒，一婦人抱之曰天母。畫以銅板為幀，而塗五采於上。其貌如生，身與臂手，儼然隱起幀上，臉之凹凸處，正視與生人不殊。人問畫何以致此？曰：「中國畫但畫陽不畫陰，故看之人面軀正平，無凹凸相。吾國畫兼陰與陽寫之，故面有高下，而手臂皆輪圓耳。」

Matteo Ricci, a European of the Western Ocean……came to Nanjing, and staying in the western quarter of the Gate of Zheng-yang, said that his country regarded the devotion to the Heavenly Lord as the principle of their worship. The Heavenly Lord is the Creator and Governor of the universe and all things. The Lord was depicted as a child, and a woman holding it who was called the Mother of the Lord. The image was carried out on a copper plate, then colored. It appeared like a living being. The body, arms

27 Ricci's three remarks are found in Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane*, vol. 1, pp. 32, 91; vol. 2, p. 131. The paragraphs relating to the remarks appear in full in Nicolas Trigault's version, despite slightly changed wordings and phrasings. See Nicolas Trigault, *China in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 21-22, 79, 375-376. An English translation of Ricci's first whole paragraph (Pasquale M. d'Elia, *Fonti Ricciane*, vol. 1, pp. 31-32) can be seen in Gauvin A. Bailey, *Art on the Jesuit Missions in Asia and Latin America 1542-1773*, p. 88.

and hands looked as though it were coming out of the plate, and the facial concavity and convexity were seen exactly the same as if they were alive. People asked how the image could be so, and he said: "Chinese painting only depicts the convexity, so the body and face of the image appears to be straight and flat, without the concavity and convexity. The painting of our country depicts both concavity and convexity, so the face of the image has differences, and the arms and hands can be rounded."²⁸

This statement shows how the Chinese were attracted by Western pictorial techniques, and Ricci explained the reason for the cultural shock that resulted as Western chiaroscuro came face to face with the visual habit of the Chinese. There are two other accounts that state the Chinese reaction to Ricci's religious images, corroborating the sense of the pictorial advance of Western chiaroscuro to the Chinese mind and Chinese admiration for this skill as their first impression of the missionaries' religious images. These descriptions explain a *Chinese* distinction of *European* characteristics:

1. Jiang Shaoshu 姜紹書, *Wu sheng shi shi* 無聲詩史 (first half of the 17th century):

利瑪竇攜來西域天主像，乃女人抱一嬰兒，眉目衣紋，如明鏡涵影，
踴躍欲動，其端嚴娟秀，中國畫工無由措手。

The image of the Heavenly Lord brought in by Matteo Ricci from the Western Ocean is of a woman holding an infant. The eyebrows, eyes, and drapery are like a

28 A facsimile of an edition of Gu Qiyuan 顧起元, *Ke zuo zhui yu* 客座贅語, in *Baibu congshu jicheng* 百部叢書集成, vol. 100 (Taipei: Yi wen yinshuguan 藝文印書館, 1968), orig. p. 19r. Ricci first arrived at Nanjing in 1595. This translation from the Chinese, as those of the two quotations following, are all mine.

reflection in a mirror, much like walking or moving. The delicacy and grace of the image cannot be achieved by the hands of Chinese artists and craftsmen.²⁹

2. Zhang Geng 張庚 (1685-1760), *Guo chao hua zheng lu* 國朝畫徵錄 (early Qing; early 18th century):

明時有利瑪竇者，西洋歐邏巴人。通中國語。來南都，居正陽門西營中。畫其教主，作婦人抱一小兒，為天主像，神氣圓滿，采色鮮麗可愛。

In the Ming Dynasty there was one Matteo Ricci, who had come from Europe of the Western Ocean. He knew the Chinese language and came to Nanjing, staying in the western quarter of the Gate of Zheng-yang. He painted the Lord of his religion, which was a woman holding a little child. This is the image of the Heavenly Lord. Its expression and dignity are full and complete, and the colors are bright and graceful.³⁰

It can be said that Ricci and Longobardo presented a "collective point of view" of European and Chinese pictorial traditions. Their remarks on the lack of chiaroscuro in Chinese painting are concrete examples showing how Renaissance thought was embedded in the system of Jesuit knowledge, and, on the part of the missionaries, was applied further to a one-dimensional judgment of non-Western arts. This collective identity may also point to the fact that the Jesuits had a

29 Jiang Shaoshu 姜紹書, *Wu sheng shi shi* 無聲詩史, in Yu Haiyan 于海晏 (comp.) *Huashi congshu* 畫史叢書, vol. 2 (Taipei: Wen shi zhe chubanshe 文史哲出版社, 1974), p. 1091. Jiang's work covers the periods down to the latest era of the Ming, the Chongzhen 崇禎 period (1628-1644).

30 Zhang Geng 張庚, *Guo chao hua zheng lu* 國朝畫徵錄, in Zhou junfu 周駿富 (ed.) *Qingdai zhuanji congkan* 清代傳記叢刊 (Taipei: Ming wen shuju 明文書局, 1985), p. 122.

common idea of how an image should be represented, even more, of a common style as they identified it, in which European perspective was the standard. The attitude that Chinese painting and artifice were inferior was an exception to the more typical response of seventeenth-century Jesuits, which was an admiration of Chinese culture. The superior tone the Jesuits adopted with respect to European pictorial traditions can be seen in contrast to their reaction to those of the Chinese. Hence, this reaction became an impetus for missionaries to introduce European paintings and other arts to China. An attraction on the part of the Chinese for Western pictorial techniques could have become a kind of strategy for the Jesuits' use of visual objects.

Furthermore, from the sources about Chinese responses to European perspectival images discussed so far, it may be concluded that one particularly important and conspicuous feature, and a primary concern in the way the Chinese viewed Western images and pictures, is perspective by chiaroscuro, the use of light and the making of shadow. The visual effect generated by chiaroscuro is a kind of illusionism, rather than the realistic and scientific utilization that Renaissance perspective theoretically assumed it to be. As Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) states about light and color, "It is evident that colours vary according to light, as every colour appears different when in shade and when placed under rays of light....Philosophers say that nothing is visible that is not endowed with light and colour. There is, then, a very close relationship between colours and lights in the function of sight."³¹ John Pecham (ca. 1240-92) in his *Perspectiva communis*, also acknowledges the important roles light and color play in optics.³² Chinese pictorial traditions never recognized such a theory; thus there would inevitably be a fundamental discrepancy between the West and the Chinese in questions of what one sees in nature and in pictures, and

31 Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting: Leon Battista Alberti*, translated by Cecil Grayson (London: Phaidon Press, 1972), p. 44.

32 Paul Hills, *The Light of Early Italian Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), pp. 64-71.

of the manner in which things are depicted in a painting. The customary way in which Chinese artists employed brushstrokes with ink was criticized by Ricci as lacking in color and shade. However, in late-Ming pictorial traditions, the renderings of convexity and concavity on a flat surface were achieved by the calligraphic skill of the brushstroke instead of by the use of colors. As the late-Ming master and literati Dong Qichang 董其昌 (1555-1636) said, the "renderings of convexity and concavity should be immediately perceived upon the falling of a brush on panel (下筆便有凹凸之形)."³³ Thus the Western means of reaching a three-dimensional effect using colors would simply be dismissed by Chinese critics as "without any rule of brushstroke (筆法全無)."³⁴

To continue, the case of perspective in China demonstrates a particular worldview of visual representation, as the following example shows. The Chinese woodcut series entitled *Tianzhu jiangsheng chu xiang jing jie* 天主降生出像經解 (*Biblical Explanations and Illustrations of the Heavenly Lord's Incarnation*, abbreviated *Chu xiang jing jie*; first edition 1637) was edited by the Jesuit Giulio Aleni (1582–1649) and published by a Catholic church of the County of Jinjiang (晉江景教堂), in the southeast coastal Province of Fujian (福建省).³⁵ Given its scope and the number of surviving editions and copies, this is the most important publication of Chinese Gospel illustrations in the seventeenth century. There are at least twenty-nine editions or copies extant today. The *Chu xiang jing jie* is an intentionally faithful yet indigenized duplicate of its European original—the Jesuit Jerome Nadal's illustrated

33 Dong Qichang 董其昌, *Hua chan shi sui bi* 畫禪室隨筆, in *Biji xiaoshuo daguan* 筆記小說大觀, vol. 22: 5 (Taipei: Xin xing shuju 新興書局, 1978), p. 3091.

34 Zou Yigui 鄒一桂, *Xiao shan hua pu* 小山畫譜, in Yu Yuan 于玉安 (ed.) *Zhongguo lidai meishu dianji huibian* 中國歷代美術典籍匯編, vol. 12 (Tianjin: Tianjin guji chubanshe 天津古籍出版社, 1997), p. 405.

35 For the following discussion of this work and the details about it, see Hui-Hung Chen, "Encounters in Peoples, Religions, and Sciences: Jesuit Visual Culture in Seventeenth Century China," Ph. D. dissertation (Brown University, 2004).

Gospel *Evangelicae Historiae Imagines* (*Images of Evangelical History*, abbreviated *Evangelical History*), first published in Antwerp in 1593. It retains the European format and composition, with the exception that the European pictorial techniques (engraving) and languages are replaced by Chinese ones. Further to be noted is that the visual format of the *Evangelical History* forms the main component of this publication, which gives the image the primary focus, with a caption beneath each image. It represents the first example of a new type of book in this period, in which the illustrations of the Gospel are privileged over the text.³⁶ Moreover, Nadal's work includes 153 engravings that detail the life story of Christ, but the number of the prints in the *Chu xiang jing jie* was reduced to between fifty and sixty in various editions. The *Chu xiang jing jie* is still a self-sufficient publication for the whole story of Christ's Life, and the title change of the Chinese work indicates that the Incarnation is the paramount concept for this abridged version. The duplication of this Chinese woodcut series indicates a kind of Jesuit expression and characterization in visual images, which shows how a style of Jesuit adaptation was presented. To put it another way, in what way and how much the local agents took action were crucial aspects in Jesuit characterization.

James Cahill made an observation that is relevant to the issue of worldview in visual representation, which illustrates a particular worldview of visual representation in the case of perspective in China. Speaking of the illusionistic effect that the shading of rocks and trees in Western prints might have caused to the Chinese eye, Cahill suggested, "any good Chinese artist,

36 In his well-known book *The First Jesuits*, John O'Malley stated as follows: "The magnificent series of 153 copper-plate illustrations that accompanied the text in the first edition (Antwerp, 1594) is the earliest such series of the whole of the New Testament of any size or importance ever produced." See John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 164. The first edition of 1594 means the one including the complementary text that the 1593 edition did not have.

drawing on his native tradition, could have painted rocks that looked more like rocks in nature than these [the rocks in Nadal's prints; his example is the print of no. 14]."³⁷ If we consider this statement to be valid, then the visual perception of light and shade would involve not only a different descriptive style between the East and West, but also a completely different way of viewing nature. If one makes a careful comparison of Aleni's and Nadal's originals, the subject the "Cure of the Centurion's Servant," for instance, shows different visual effects generated by the Chinese woodcut and the European engraving (Figs. 1a, 1b). The second figure from the left and three others in Jesus' entourage are depicted completely in the dark in Nadal's print, in contrast to the other figures, which are rendered through a forceful three-dimensional use of chiaroscuro. However, this contrast is completely eliminated in Aleni's woodcut, which depicts all of the figures illuminated by the same source of light. Thus Nadal's chiaroscuro effect, which is so strong, is replaced by a linear depiction that disregards the importance of light and shade. This example demonstrates concretely and explicitly that, whether consciously or not, Aleni altered a significant visual effect found in Nadal's original print, adapting to a style customary in Chinese woodcut technique. This alteration might have been due exactly to Chinese unfamiliarity with, or even intentional distaste for, European chiaroscuro.

To be precise, Aleni's woodcuts are hybrid works, and this hybridity highlights the Jesuit method of characterization adapted in them. Nadal's prints provided the European guideline in this process, but the Jesuits in China made up their minds to accommodate Chinese skills for the publication of the woodcuts. The extensive use of Nadal's work in the missionary context is well evinced in two other series of Chinese woodcuts, which appeared under different titles but were both extracted from Nadal's originals: *Song nian zhu gui cheng* 誦念珠規程 (*Method for Reciting*

37 James Cahill, *The Compelling Images: Nature and Style in Seventeenth-Century Chinese Painting* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), p. 96.

the Rosary; first edition circa 1619) (Figs. 2a, 2b) and *Jin cheng shu xiang* 進呈書像 (*Tribute of Texts and Images*; 1640). These two Chinese illustrations of the Christian Gospels were not published or bound together either with the Gospel texts or the Bible; like Aleni's, they were publications in their own right, and served different purposes and fitted other conventions. The former served as a visual aid to the meditation on and recitation of the Rosary, and the latter was an explanatory series of Christ's Life dedicated to the Chinese emperor Chongzhen 崇禎.³⁸ These two works, like the *Chu xiang jing jie*, are under Jesuit authorship or editorship, so they indicate the other methods of Jesuit characterization in visual representation. The remarks of Ricci and Longobardo could be regarded as expressing a point of view on style, a distinctive identification of both a European and non-European quality, yet the Chinese versions of Nadal's prints in the above three publications were a cultural blend resulting from the encounters of "Europeanness" and "Chineseness." The three different appearances of the prints in the *Chu xiang jing jie*, *Song nian zhu gui cheng* and *Jin cheng shu xiang* express three types of characterizations. As stated above, the difference might be caused by their individual functions, but they could also display the respectful interpretations of their subjects by the combining of European and Chinese styles. Previous scholarship has mostly discussed these Chinese Gospel illustrations in terms of the encounters and conflicts between Chinese and Western pictorial traditions, thus making the bilateral comparison in style and techniques the only focus of research. Unfortunately, such studies on these intriguing prints in China have been limited to an approach that specializes in visual and pictorial matters alone. From this perspective, the *Song nian zhu gui cheng* and *Jin cheng shu xiang* were often considered to be artistically superior, because the style or techniques were far more sinicized than were those of the other prints. To illuminate the cross-cultural interaction using the concept of hybridity with reference to earlier

38 Some prints in the *Jin cheng shu xiang* derive from other European prints, although Nadal's *Evangelical History* still supplies the most models. For a detailed discussion of these two works, see Hui-Hung Chen, "Encounters in Peoples, Religions, and Sciences," pp. 204-230, 358-375.

scholarly works does not in fact avoid the pitfall of cultural imperialism, which judges cultural production based on how it is appropriated from the original Western model.³⁹ Even though we recognize the role of the Western models and the Jesuit idea in the making of the Chinese versions, Jesuit expression and characterization that demonstrate their adaptation of local skills or styles should be valued in a more balanced way. When the level of sinicization is emphasized, it implies the level of the capacity to deviate from the Western model, so the latter still becomes the standard of value. Sinicization is part of the accommodation manifested in Jesuit methods of expression, but the myth by which the percentage of sinicization is treated as a judgment should be challenged, because it might simply reflect historical hindsight. I would like to argue that the hybrid works of the Jesuits should be seen as the adaptive proceedings between two agents, European and Chinese, since there is no documentation to confirm that the Jesuits ever recognized the most sinicized style as a supreme representation of hybridity. For these three different modes of expression, we should only return to the cultural and historical contexts to decipher the possible reasons for their individual representations. In other words, the concept of hybridity does not mean that the analysis is based upon a visual comparison.⁴⁰

39 In his book *Art on the Jesuit Missions*, Gauvin Bailey begins with this concept for interpreting the arts in missions. Problems arise when, for instance, he praises the prints in the *Song nian zhu gui cheng* "whose subtle sinicization ranks it among the most thoroughly hybrid of Chinese Christian artworks" (103). This appraisal causes something of a problem for evaluating other Christian prints such as those of the more faithful translation of the *Chu xiang jing jie*. This methodology was also questioned from another angle in a book review of Bailey's work by Jonathan Chaves, who writes, "the tendency to praise the Jesuits because of their role as cultural intermediaries threatens throughout the book." This explains the risk of treating the Jesuits as those playing the primary and most active role for the production of hybrid art outside of European codes; see Jonathan Chaves, "Inculturation versus Evangelization: Are Contemporary Values Causing us to Misinterpret the 16-18th Century Jesuit Missionaries?," *Sino-Western Cultural Relations Journal*, 22 (2000), p. 59.

40 In another article, I argue that sinicization in those Jesuit biblical images in seventeenth-century China could have been a way to raise the soul's image-making capacity in a more local way apparent to the Chinese onlooker, based on the notion of Western vision from the point of view of the missionaries, see Hui-Hung Chen, "Image and Soul: Jesuit Vision in Seventeenth-Century China," *Chinese Cross Currents*, 5, 1 (Jan., 2008), p. 92.

The remarks of both Ricci and Longobardo and the Chinese versions of Nadal's prints in the above three publications, show the missionaries' distinction between "Europeanness" and "Chineseness." The former case is clear as Ricci and Longobardo revealed a distinctive identification of a European and a non-European quality. The latter, even though they are a blend of two qualities, or an adaptation, demonstrates three different modes of expression, and they can be seen as a conscious adaptation of two different cultural qualities for their individual purposes. To put it another way, three series of the prints initiated by the Jesuits indicate that the missionaries had to decide how to deal with the confrontation of two visual styles for the sake of the publication, in which the local agents could also contribute to any adaptation. The Jesuits' sensibility to artistic style and appreciation can be ascribed to their Renaissance background of judgment and taste. From the cross-cultural context, we can observe their approach to differentiating styles or cultures, or the cultural quality in an anthropological sense, such as "Chineseness" and "Europeanness," both highlighted by means of the materiality of visual objects. Following this line of thinking, both on the European as well as the specifically missionary cross-cultural backgrounds, the dialogues about arts or visual materials are a concrete example of the confrontation of the sense of cultures. Therefore, the cases presented in this paper indicate how "style" as "a manifestation of the culture as a whole," as Schapiro states, can be valuable for the employment of this concept to a culture and even a civilization.

However, considering "style" as a collective way thinking or identity, or isolating out the concepts of "Chineseness" and "Europeanness," may run the risk of seeming trapped in reductionism or essentialism; that is, of reducing or generalizing the whole complex of a culture to a fixed idea.⁴¹ This

41 For this question, I pay my greatest gratitude to Professor Chu Pingyi 祝平一 of the Institute of History and Philology, the Academia Sinica in Taipei, as he reminded me of this risk while I

approach is rightly opposed to a recent one that challenges reductionism or essentialism by means of articulating the reciprocal relationship between the self and other, while many scholars consider the latter approach to reveal interaction between cultures in a more nuanced way and propose that neither the self nor the other is fixed at all times. Rather it is possible for the self and other to be changed or reshaped because of the relational reciprocity between the parties.⁴² In other words, to return to our example, neither Ming China nor Renaissance Europe would be an unchangeable cultural entity, especially when either one encountered another culture, but would to a great extent display an adaptive cultural re-definition. The above cases as I present them to demonstrate "Chineseness" and "Europeanness" in the Jesuit mission incline one to suppose that a fixed concept of "Renaissance Europe" was confronted with another cultural reality, while the missionaries were characterizing the self and other. It is not my intention in this paper, however, to delve into this matter of an articulation of the self and other. If the concept of style in a culture can be valuable in a cross-cultural historical observation, we shall be able to consider how to deal with a possible conflict between the way to look for a characteristic cultural quality and the perspective of a relational reciprocity between the self and other.♦

presented a talk entitled "Rethinking about the Relationship between Style and Time: Sixteenth Century and the Baroque," at the same institute, January 2008.

42 This recent theoretical reflection on cultural encounters, especially with regard to China as the example for the larger field of "Christianity in China," has been presented by the leading scholar of the field, Nicolas Standaert, "Methodology in View of Contact between Cultures: The China Case in the Seventeenth Century," *CSRCS Occasional Paper*, 11 (Centre for the Study of Religion and Chinese Society, Chung Chi College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong) (Dec. 2002), pp. 1-64. I have written an extensive reviewing of Standaert's methodology and of his theory about cultural encounters, see Hui-Hung Chen 陳慧宏, "Wenhua xiangyu de fangfa lun: pingxi zhong ou wenhua jiaoliu yanjiu de xin shiye 文化相遇的方法論：評析中歐文化交流研究的新視野 (New Perspective on the Methodology of Cultural Contacts in the Studies of the Cultural Encounters between China and Europe in the Seventeenth Century)," *Historical Inquiry*, 40 (Dec., 2007), pp. 239-278.

♦ Responsible editor: Shih-Chiang Fan (范世蕃).



Figure 1a.

"Cure of the Centurion's Servant," no. 27, Jerome Nadal, *Evangelicae Historiae Imagines* (Images of Evangelical History) (1593), © Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, Rome.



Figure 1b.

The same title in Giulio Aleni, *Tianzhu jiangsheng yan xing ji lue* 天主降生言行紀略 (*Biblical Narratives of the Words and Deeds About the Incarnation of the Heavenly Lord*; first edition 1635), 1738, Fu-szu Nien Library, Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan, A FT053R. © Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taiwan.

Aleni's *Tianzhu jiangsheng yan xing ji lue* was published in 1635, two years earlier than *Chu xiang jing jie*, and these two works should be a pair of publications for Aleni's introducing the Incarnation.

The edition used here is a later one, which combines the texts and images from the above two works. The seventeenth-century editions of the *Yan xing ji lue* do not include the images. This same image also appears in some seventeenth-century editions of the *Chu xiang jing jie*.



Figure 2a.

"Meeting of Jesus in the Temple," no. 9, Jerome Nadal, *Evangelicae Historiae Imagines* (Images of Evangelical History) (1593), © Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, Rome, Italy.



Figure 2b.

The same title in *Song nian zhu gui cheng* 誦念珠規程 (*Method for Reciting the Rosary*; first edition circa 1619), JapSin I-43b, © Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, Rome, Italy.

Bibliography

Alberti, Leon Battista

1972 *On Painting: Leon Battista Alberti*, translated by Cecil Grayson
(London: Phaidon Press, 1972)

Bailey, Gauvin Alexander

1999a *Art on the Jesuit Missions in Asia and Latin America 1542-1773*
(Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999)

1999b "Le style jésuite n'existe pas': Jesuit Corporate Culture and the Visual Arts," in John W O'Malley et al. (eds.) *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999)

Belting, Hans

1994 *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art*
(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994)

Bryson, Norman, Michael Ann Holly and Keith Moxey (eds.)

1994 *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1994)

Burns, Robert M. (ed.)

2006 *Historiography: Critical Concepts in Historical Studies*, vol. 3
(London: Routledge, 2006)

Cahill, James

1982 *The Compelling Images: Nature and Style in Seventeenth-Century Chinese Painting* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982)

Chaves, Jonathan

2000 "Inculturation versus Evangelization: Are Contemporary Values Causing us to Misinterpret the 16-18th Century Jesuit Missionaries?," *Sino-Western Cultural Relations Journal*, 22 (2000)

Chen, Hui-Hung 陳慧宏

2004 "Encounters in Peoples, Religions, and Sciences: Jesuit Visual Culture in Seventeenth Century China," Ph. D. dissertation (Brown University, 2004)

2007 "Wenhua xiangyu de fangfa lun: pingxi zhong ou wenhua jiaoliu yanjiu de xin shiye 文化相遇的方法論：評析中歐文化交流研究的新視野 (New Perspective on the Methodology of Cultural Contacts in the Studies of the Cultural Encounters between China and Europe in the Seventeenth Century)," *Historical Inquiry*, 40 (Dec., 2007)

2008 "Image and Soul: Jesuit Vision in Seventeenth-Century China," *Chinese Cross Currents*, 5, 1 (Jan., 2008)

- Costantini, Celso
1940 *L'Arte Cristiana nelle Missioni* (Vatican City: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1940)
- Couceiro, Gonçalo
1997 *A Igreja de S. Paulo de Macau* (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 1997)
- D'Elia, Pasquale M.
1939 *Le Origini dell'Arte: Cristiana Cinese (1583-1640)* (Rome: Reale Accademia d'Italia, 1939)
1942-1949 *Fonti Ricciane: Documenti originali concernenti Matteo Ricci a la storia delle prime relazioni tra l'Europa e la Cina (1579-1615). Storia dell' introduzione del Cristianesimo in Cina scritta da Matteo Ricci* (Roma, Libreria dello Stato, 1942-1949)
- Dong, Qichang 董其昌
1978 *Hua chan shi sui bi* 畫禪室隨筆, in *Biji xiaoshuo daguan* 筆記小說大觀, vol. 22: 5 (Taipei: Xin xing shuju 新興書局, 1978)
- Farago, Claire (ed.)
1995 *Reframing the Renaissance: Visual Culture in Europe and Latin America 1450-1650* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995)
- Freedberg, David
1989 *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989)
- Fumaroli, Marc and Sher-Shiueh Li
1999 "The Fertility and the Shortcomings of Renaissance Rhetoric: The Jesuit Case," in John W O'Malley et al. (eds.) *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999)
- Gaskell, Ivan
2001 "Visual History," in Peter Burke (ed.) *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, 2nd ed. (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001)
- Gombrich, Ernst H. J.
1960 *Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation* (Oxford: Phaidon Press, 1960)
1976 "From the Revival of Letters to the Reform of the Arts: Niccolò Niccoli and Filippo Brunelleschi," in *Gombrich on the Renaissance*, vol. 3: The Heritage of Apelles (London: Phaidon Press, 1976)
- Gu, Qiyuan 顧起元
1968 *Ke zuo zhui yu* 客座贅語, in *Baibu congshu jicheng* 百部叢書集成, vol. 100 (Taipei: Yi wen yinshuguan 藝文印書館, 1968)

Hills, Paul

1987 *The Light of Early Italian Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987)

Huang, Ying-Kuei 黃應貴

2004 "Introduction," in Ying-Kuei Huang (ed.) *Wu yu wuzhi wenhua 物與物質文化* (Substance and Material Culture) (Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, 2004)

Jiang, Shaoshu 姜紹書

1974 *Wu sheng shi shi 無聲詩史*, in Yu Haiyan 于海晏 (comp.) *Huashi congshu 畫史叢書*, vol. 2 (Taipei: Wen shi zhe chubanshe 文史哲出版社, 1974)

Kieschnick, John

2003 *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003)

Li, Sher-shiueh 李爽學

2001 "History as Rhetoric: The Jesuit Use of Chreia in Late-Ming China," paper presented at the 53rd Meeting of the American Association of Asian Studies (Chicago: American Association of Asian Studies, Mar. 23-25, 2001)

2005 *Zhongguo wanming yu ouzhou wenxue: mingmo yesu hui gudian xing zhengdao gushi kaoquan 中國晚明與歐洲文學：明末耶穌會古典型證道故事考詮* (Chinese Late Ming and European Literature: Jesuit Classical Exempla in Late Ming) (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 2005)

McMullen, Roy

1974 "Style in the Arts," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica Macropaedia* (Chicago: The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1974)

Mitchell, W. J. T.

1995 "Interdisciplinarity and Visual Culture," *The Art Bulletin*, 77 (1995)

Muller, Jeffrey M.

1989 *Rubens: The Artist as Collector* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989)

Nosco, Peter

2005 "The Place of China in the Construction of Japan's Early Modern World View," paper presented at the International Conference on the Development of Worldviews in Early Modern Asia (Taipei: Center for the Study of East Asian Civilizations, National Taiwan University, Aug. 5-6, 2005)

O'Malley, John W.

1993 *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993)

- Panofsky, Erwin
1991 *Perspective as Symbolic Form* (New York: Zone Books, 1991)
- Rowlands, Michael
2004 "A Material Approach to Materiality," paper presented as a speech by invitation (Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, May, 2004)
- Schapiro, Meyer
1953 "Style," in Alfred L. Kroeber (ed.) *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953)
- Shearman, John
1967 *Mannerism* (London: Penguin Books, 1967)
- Standaert, Nicolas
2002 "Methodology in View of Contact between Cultures: The China Case in the Seventeenth Century," *CSRCS Occasional Paper*, 11 (Centre for the Study of Religion and Chinese Society, Chung Chi College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong) (Dec. 2002)
- Summers, David
1992 "Representation," in Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff (eds.) *Critical Terms for Art History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992)
- Trigault, Nicolas
1953 *China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journal of Matthew Ricci, 1583-1610*, translated by Louis J. Gallagher (New York: Random House, 1953)
- Wittkower, Rudolf and Irma B. Jaffe (eds.)
1972 *Baroque Art: The Jesuit Contribution* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1972)
- Zhang, Geng 張庚
1985 *Guo chao hua zheng lu* 國朝畫徵錄, in Zhou junfu 周駿富 (ed.) *Qingdai zhuanji congkan* 清代傳記叢刊 (Taipei: Ming wen shuju 明文書局, 1985)
- Zou, Yigui 鄒一桂
1997 *Xiao shan hua pu* 小山畫譜, in Yu Yuan 于玉安 (ed.) *Zhongguo lidai meishu dianji huibian* 中國歷代美術典籍匯編, vol. 12 (Tianjin: Tianjin guji chubanshe 天津古籍出版社, 1997)